

*To be had from JAMES & Co.,  
(Publishers of Pollock and Mulla's Indian Contract Act)  
Shushtary Building, 19, Rampart Row, Fort, Bombay*

## **PRINCIPLES OF HINDU LAW**

BY

**D F MULLA MA, LLB,**

*Advocate, High Court, Bombay*

**6th Edition      1929      Price Rs 14 (nett)**

---

### **In Press**

## **INDIAN CONTRACT ACT AND SPECIFIC RELIEF ACT**

**With a Commentary, Critical and Explanatory**

BY

**THE RIGHT HONOURABLE  
SIR FREDERICK POLLOCK, BART,**

AND

**SIR DINSHAH FARDUNJI MULLA, KT**

**6th Edition**

**Price Rs 22**

---

## **THE INDIAN REGISTRATION ACT WITH AMENDMENTS UP-TO-DATE**

IN

**PREPARATION**

BY

**SIR DINSHAH FARDUNJI MULLA, KT**

*Advocate, High Court, Bombay*

24 NOV 1950

# To The Memory

OF THE LATE

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE

SIR LAWRENCE HUGH JENKINS, K C I E

CHIEF JUSTICE

OF

THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY





# PREFACE TO THE NINTH EDITION.

The present edition contains cases in the authorised and unauthorised series reported up to the end of 1929

Since the publication of the last edition there have been a number of important rulings both by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council and the High Courts of India. This rendered it necessary to rewrite many portions of the Commentary.

Order 31 which relates to suits on mortgages has been amended by the Transfer of Property (Amendment) Supplementary Act 1929 and the Transfer of Property (Amendment) Supplementary Act, 1930. The commentary under that Order has been entirely rewritten and the distinction between the old and the new law has been pointed out. The Letters Patent of the various High Courts have also been amended by the Letters Patent of 1923 and the Letters Patent of 1929. These amendments also have been dealt with in their proper place.

The writer desires to acknowledge gratefully the valuable assistance rendered by Mr Justice Pratt in preparing the present edition.

The High Courts Act 1861 the Government of India Act 1915 and the Letters Patent of the seven High Courts with an exhaustive commentary on each clause are relegated to an Appendix. The Rules made from time to time by the Chartered High Courts will be found in the remaining Appendices. The writer has to thank the Registrars of the High Courts of Bombay Calcutta Madras Allahabad Patna Lahore and Rangoon for the assistance kindly rendered in furnishing him with copies of the Rules of those High Courts and with complete information in connection with them.

Pursuant to the desire of a large number of legal practitioners references have been given throughout to Indian Cases and the All India Reporter. The mode of citation of the All India Reporter is as follows —

|  |             |
|--|-------------|
| (29) A PC = (1929) All India Reporter, Privy Council | 802         |
| (29) A A = (     ) ,                                 | Allahabad " |
| (29) A B = (     ) ,                                 | Bombay "    |
| (29) A C = (     ) ,                                 | Calcutta "  |
| (29) A L = (     ) ,                                 | Lahore "    |
| (29) A M = (     )                                   | Madras "    |
| (29) A P = (     )                                   | Patna "     |
| (29) A R = (     ) ,                                 | Rangoon "   |
| (29) A O = (     )                                   | Lucknow "   |

For the revision of the proofs the writer is indebted to Mr B K Desai MA LLB, Advocate (O S) of the High Court of Bombay Mr K S Shavaksha BA of the Middle Temple Barrister at Law Mr B D Mehta (A S) of the High Court of Bombay, and Mr J R Dhurandhar, BA, LLB, of the Legal Department, Government of Bombay The Index has been brought up to date by Mr B K Desai

The author desires to thank the Times of India Press, Bombay for the remarkable despatch in printing the work and for the accuracy throughout in the work

CHAMBERS No 17  
HIGH COURT, BOMBAY  
*February 1930*

D F M

## PREFACE TO THE THIRD EDITION.

IN preparing the present edition I had the unique assistance of the notes of Sir Lawrence Jenkins—the eminent and illustrious lawyer who filled the office of Chief Justice of the High Court of Bombay with great ability and distinction for well nigh ten years. The notes above referred to were prepared by Sir Lawrence Jenkins while he was on the Special Committee which met at Simla in June 1907 and modelled the Code of Civil Procedure in its present form. That the Code of 1908 is a considerable improvement upon its predecessor is beyond all question. The arrangement though novel is scientific. It proceeds upon the lines of the Judicature Acts and the Rules framed under those Acts. It consists of two parts—the first containing provisions of a substantive character and the second containing provisions which relate to matters of mere machinery. The 153 sections which form the body of the Code constitute the first part. The Rules and Orders comprised in Schedule I constitute the second part. The provisions of the Code of 1852 relating to arbitration have been transferred to a separate schedule being Schedule II, the object being to facilitate the repeal of these provisions on the passing of a new and comprehensive Arbitration Act. Sections 321 to 325 C of the same Code which relate to execution of decrees by Collectors have been transferred to Schedule III. Schedule IV contains a list of enactments amended and Schedule V a list of enactments repealed by the new Code.

The arrangement of the present work is a simple one. Long familiarity with the section numbers of the Code of 1852 has rendered it necessary to give a comparative table of the sections of the old and the new Code. Such a table has accordingly been given and to facilitate reference to it which is likely to be constant the table portion has been marked off by a piece of tape attached to the volume. At the same time we have given at the beginning of each section and rule of the new Code references to the corresponding sections of the Code of 1852 in thick black types enclosed in square brackets. There are besides a large number of rules comprised in the First Schedule which have been borrowed from the Rules made under the Judicature Acts. References to the latter rules also have been given in square brackets at the beginning of the corresponding rules of this Code and are indicated by the letters RSC, being an abbreviation of the words Rules of the Supreme Court of England. see for instance, Order 1 rule 1, at p. 304.

There have been numerous alterations and additions introduced into the new Code of which the following require the immediate attention of practitioners —

- 1 S 2 cl 2 —definition of decree
- 2 S 2 cl 11 —definition of legal representative
- 3 S 7 O 50 —Provincial Small Cause Courts
- 4 S 8 O 51 —Presidency Small Cause Courts
- 5 S 20 cl (c) —arising of *part* of cause of action within jurisdiction
- 6 S 21 —objections to jurisdiction
- 7 S 21 —general power of transfer and withdrawal of suits
- 8 S 25 —power of Governor General in Council to transfer suits
- 9 S 30 —costs
- 10 S 37 —definition of Court which passed a decree
- 11 S 40 —transfer of decree to Court in another province
- 12 S 46 —precepts
- 13 S 47 —questions to be determined by the Court executing decree
- 14 S 48 —execution barred in certain cases
- 15 S 53 —liability of ancestral property in execution
- 16 S 55 sub s (1) second proviso and sub s (4) —arrest and detention
- 17 S 60 sub s (1) cls (a) (b) (h) and (k) —property liable to attachment and sale in execution of decree
- 18 S 61 O 21 rr 44 45 rr 74 75 O 38 r 12 —agricultural produce
- 19 S 62 sub s (2) —seizure of property in dwelling house
- 20 S 64 *Explanation* —private alienation pending attachment
- 21 S 65 —execution purchaser's title
- 22 S 73 —sub s (2) rateable distribution
- 23 S 89 —interpleader
- 24 S 91 —public nuisances
- 25 S 92 sub s (1) —public charities
- 26 S 96 sub s (3) —appeal from original decree
- 27 S 97 —appeal from preliminary decree
- 28 S 99 —material irregularity
- 29 S 103 —power of High Court to determine issues of fact in second appeal
- 30 S 104 O 43 —appeal from orders
- 31 S 105 sub s (2) —appeal from order of remand
- 32 Ss 121 131 —Rules See also Index under the head Rules
- 33 S 141 —application of procedure provided in Code to miscellaneous proceedings
- 34 S 144 —application for restitution
- 35 S 145 —enforcement of liability of surety
- 36 Ss 146 to 153 —these sections are new
- 37 O 1 rr 1 to 5 r 7 —joinder of parties
- 38 O 2 r 2 *Explanation* r 4 r 7 —frame of suit
- 39 O 5 r 17 —procedure where defendant refuses to accept service or cannot be found
- 40 O 6 —pleadings The whole of this order is new
- 41 O 7 —rr 7 8 —plaint
- 42 O 8 rr 2 3 rr 7 8 —written statement
- 43 O 9 r 13 —setting aside decree *ex parte*
- 44 O 11 r 12 r 15 r 19 —discovery and inspection
- 45 O 12 —admissions and judgment on admissions

- 46 O 16 r 1—witness summons  
 47 O 20 r 11 r 12 r 17 r 19—decrees  
 48 O 21 r 3 r 11 r 23 sub r (—) r 32 sub r 5 rr 47 48 rr 49 50 r 53 r 56  
     r 57 r 60—execution  
 49 O — rr 3 4 r 6—abatement  
 50 O 23 r 3—compromise of suit  
 51 O 30 suits by or against firms  
 52 O 33 r 4—next friend and guardian  
 53 O 33 r cl (d)—rejection of petition for leave to sue as a pauper  
 54 O 34—suits relating to mortgages of immovable property  
 55 O 3 r 3—leave to appear in summary suit  
 56 O 40 r 1—appointment of receiver  
 57 O 41 r 2 r 5 sub r 1 r 6 r 11 r 22 sub r 4 r 33—appeal from  
     original decrees  
 58 O 43 r 1 cl (m)—appeal from orders  
 59 O 45 rr 4 5 appeal to the Privy Council  
 60 Schedule II para 1 para 15 cl (c) para 18 para 21 arbitration

The High Courts Act and the Charters of the High Courts have been set out respectively in Appendix I and Appendix II

D F M

26th October 1905

There have been numerous alterations and additions introduced into the new Code, of which the following require the immediate attention of practitioners —

- 1 S 2 cl 2 —definition of decree
- 2 S 2 cl 11 —definition of legal representative
- 3 S 7 O 50 —Provincial Small Cause Courts
- 4 S 8 O 51 —Presidency Small Cause Courts
- 5 S 20 cl (c) —arising of part of cause of action within jurisdiction
- 6 S 21 —objections to jurisdiction
- 7 S 24 —general power of transfer and withdrawal of suits
- 8 S 25 —power of Governor General in Council to transfer suits
- 9 S 30 —costs
- 10 S 37 —definition of Court which passed a decree
- 11 S 40 —transfer of decrees to Court in another province
- 12 S 46 —precepts
- 13 S 47 —questions to be determined by the Court executing decree
- 14 S 48 —execution barred in certain cases
- 15 S 53 —liability of ancestral property in execution
- 16 S 53 sub s (1) second proviso and sub s (4) —arrest and detention
- 17 S 60 sub s (1) cls (a) (b) (h) and (k) —property liable to attachment and sale in execution of decree
- 18 b 61 O 71 rr 44 45 rr 74 75 O 38 r 12 —agricultural produce
- 19 b 61 sub s (2) —seizure of property in dwelling house
- 20 S 64 Explanation —private alienation pending attachment
- 21 S 65 —execution purchaser's title
- 22 S 73 —sub s (2) rateable distribution
- 23 S 88 —interpleader
- 24 b 91 —public nuisances
- 25 S 92 sub s (2) —public charities
- 26 S 96 sub s (3) —appeal from original decree
- 27 S 97 —appeal from preliminary decree
- 28 S 99 —material irregularity
- 29 S 103 —power of High Court to determine issues of fact in second appeal
- 30 S 104 O 13 —appeal from orders
- 31 S 105 sub s (2) —appeal from order of remand
- 32 Ss 121 131 —Rules See also Index under the head Rules
- 33 S 141 —application of procedure provided in Code to miscellaneous proceedings
- 34 S 141 —application for restitution
- 35 S 145 —enforcement of liability of surety
- 36 Ss 146 to 153 —these sections are new
- 37 O 3 rr 1 to 5 r 7 —joinder of parties
- 38 O 2 r 2 Explanation r 4 r 7 —frame of suit
- 39 O 5 r 17 —procedure where defendant refuses to accept service or cannot be found
- 40 O 6 —pleadings The whole of this order is new
- 41 O 7 —rr 7 8 —plaint
- 42 O 8 rr 2 5 rr 7 8 —written statement
- 43 O 9 r 13 —setting aside decrees *ex parte*
- 44 O 11 r 12 r 15 r 19 —discovery and inspection
- 45 O 19 —admissions and judgment on admissions

- 46 O 16 r 1—witness summons  
 47 O 20 r 11 r 12 r 17 r 19—decrees  
 48 O 21 r 3 r 11 r 22 sub r (2) r 37 sub r 4 rr 47 48 rr 49 50 r 53 r 56  
 r 57 r 60—execution  
 49 O 22 rr 34 r 6—abatement  
 50 O 23 r 3—compromise of suit  
 51 O 30 suits by or against firms  
 52 O 33 r 4—next friend and guardian  
 53 O 33 r 5 cl (d)—rejection of petition for leave to sue as a pauper  
 54 O 34—suits relating to mortgages of immovable property  
 55 O 37 r 7—leave to appear in summary suit  
 56 O 40 r 1—appointment of receiver  
 57 O 41 r 2 r 5 sub r 1 r 6 r 11 r 22 sub r 4 r 33—appeal from  
 original decrees  
 58 O 43 r 1 cl (m)—appeal from orders  
 59 O 45 rr 4 5 appeal to the Privy Council  
 60 Schedule II para 1 para 15 cl (c) para 18 para 21 arbitration

The High Courts Act and the Charters of the High Courts have been set out respectively in Appendix I and Appendix II

D F M

26th October 1905





# CONTENTS

|   | PAGE   |
|---|--------|
| PREFACE   | v      |
| TABLE OF CASES CITED  | xxxvii |
| COMPARATIVE TABLE OF THE SECTIONS OF THE OLD AND THE NEW CODE | cxvii  |
| CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF PREVIOUS AND AMENDING ACTS             | cxlv   |
| ADDENDA   | cxv    |

## Sections

### PRELIMINARY

|   |   |    |
|---|---|----|
| 1 | Short title commencement and extent       | 1  |
| 2 | Definitions                               | 5  |
| 3 | Subordination of Courts                   | 17 |
| 4 | Savings                                   | 18 |
| 5 | Application of the Code to Revenue Courts | 19 |
| 6 | Pecuniary jurisdiction                    | 19 |
| 7 | Provincial Small Cause Courts             | 20 |
| 8 | Presidency Small Cause Courts             | 21 |

## PART I

### SUITS IN GENERAL.

#### JURISDICTION OF THE COURTS AND RES JUDICATA.

|    |   |    |
|----|---|----|
| 9  | Courts to try all civil suits unless barred | 22 |
| 10 | Stay of suit                                | 31 |
| 11 | <i>Res judicata</i>                         | 33 |
| 12 | Bar to further suit                         | 80 |
| 13 | When foreign judgment not conclusive        | 80 |
| 14 | Presumption as to foreign judgments         | 86 |

#### PLACE OF SUING

|    |   |     |
|----|---|-----|
| 15 | Court in which suits to be instituted   | 87  |
| 16 | Suits to be instituted where subject matter situate                                     | 91  |
| 17 | Suits for immovable property situate within jurisdiction of different Courts            | 91  |
| 18 | Place of institution of suit where local limits of jurisdiction of Courts are uncertain | 97  |
| 19 | Suits for compensation for wrongs to person or movables                                 | 98  |
| 20 | Other suits to be instituted where defendants reside or cause of action arises          | 98  |
| 21 | Objections to jurisdiction  | 110 |
| 22 | Power to transfer suits which may be instituted in more than one Court                  | 115 |
| 23 | To what Court application lies  | 116 |
| 24 | General power of transfer and withdrawal  | 117 |
| 25 | Power of Governor General in Council to transfer suit                                   | 121 |

#### INSTITUTION OF SUITS

|    |                      |     |
|----|----------------------|-----|
| 26 | Institution of suits | 121 |
|----|----------------------|-----|

| SECTIONS   | PAGE |
|--|------|
| <b>SUMMONS AND DISCOVERY</b>   |      |
| 2. Summons to defendant  | 121  |
| 2 <sup>a</sup> . Service of summons where defendant resides in another province  | 121  |
| 29. Service of foreign summons   | 122  |
| 30. Power to order discovery and the like  | 122  |
| 31. Summons to witness   | 123  |
| 3. Penalty for default   | 123  |
| <b>JUDGMENT AND DECREE</b>   |      |
| 33. Judgment and decree  | 123  |
| <b>INTEREST</b>  |      |
| 34. Interest   | 123  |
| <b>COSTS</b>   |      |
| 35. Costs  | 127  |
| 35A. Compensatory costs in respect of false or vexatious claims of defences  | 133  |
| <b>PART II.</b>  |      |
| <b>EXECUTION</b>   |      |
| <b>GENERAL</b>   |      |
| 36. Application to orders  | 135  |
| 37. Duration of Court which passed a decree  | 137  |
| <b>COURTS BY WHICH DECREES MAY BE EXECUTED</b>   |      |
| 38. Court by which decree may be executed  | 139  |
| 39. Transfer of decree   | 142  |
| 40. Transfer of decree to Court in another province  | 144  |
| 41. Result of execution proceedings to be certified  | 144  |
| 42. Powers of Court in executing transferred decree  | 145  |
| 43. Execution of decrees passed by British Courts in places to which this Part does not extend or in foreign territory | 147  |
| 44. Execution of decrees passed by Courts of Native States   | 147  |
| 4. Execution of decrees in foreign territory   | 148  |
| 41. Precept  | 149  |
| <b>QUESTIONS TO BE DETERMINED BY COURT EXECUTING DECREE</b>  |      |
| 47. Question to be determined by the Court executing decree  | 149  |
| <b>LIMIT OF TIME FOR EXECUTION</b>   |      |
| 48. Prescription barred in certain cases   | 150  |
| <b>TRANSFEREE AND LEGAL REPRESENTATIVES</b>  |      |
| 49. Transferee   | 150  |
| 50. Legal representative   | 150  |
| <b>PROCEDURE IN EXECUTION</b>  |      |
| 51. Powers of Court to enforce execution   | 150  |
| 5. Enforcement of decree against legal representative  | 150  |
| 52. Inalienability of ancestral property   | 152  |
| 5. Partition of estate or alienation of share  | 154  |

## SECTIONS

## PAGE

## ARREST AND DETENTION

|    |   |     |
|----|---|-----|
| 53 | Arrest and detention  | 185 |
| 56 | Prohibition of arrest or detention of women in execution of decrees for money | 188 |
| 57 | Subsistence allowance   | 189 |
| 58 | Detention and release   | 189 |
| 59 | Release on ground of illness  | 190 |

## ATTACHMENT

|    |  |     |
|----|--|-----|
| 60 | Property liable to attachment and sale in execution of decrees | 191 |
| 61 | Partial exemption of agricultural produce                      | 202 |
| 62 | Seizure of property in dwelling house                          | 203 |
| 63 | Property attached in execution of decrees of several Courts    | 203 |
| 64 | Private alienation of property after attachment to be void     | 206 |

## SALE

|    |   |     |
|----|---|-----|
| 65 | Purchaser's title   | 213 |
| 66 | Suit against purchaser not maintainable on ground of purchase being on behalf of plaintiff                | 218 |
| 67 | Power for Local Government to make rules as to sales of land in execution of decrees for payment of money | 224 |

DELEGATION TO COLLECTOR OF POWER TO EXECUTE  
DECREES AGAINST IMMOVABLE PROPERTY

|    |   |     |
|----|---|-----|
| 68 | Power to prescribe rules for transferring to Collector execution of certain decrees | 224 |
| 69 | Provisions of Third Schedule to apply   | 225 |
| 70 | Rules of Procedure  | 225 |
|    | <i>Jurisdiction of Civil Courts barred</i>  | 226 |
| 71 | Collector deemed to be acting judicially  | 227 |
| 72 | Where Court may authorize Collector to stay public sale of land                     | 228 |

## DISTRIBUTION OF ASSETS

|    |  |     |
|----|--|-----|
| 73 | Proceeds of execution sale to be rateably distributed among decree holders | 229 |
|----|--|-----|

## OBJECTION TO EXECUTION

|    |                        |     |
|----|------------------------|-----|
| 74 | Objection to execution | 243 |
|----|------------------------|-----|

## PART III

## INCIDENTAL PROCEEDINGS

## COMMISSIONS

|    |                                     |     |
|----|-------------------------------------|-----|
| 75 | Power of Court to issue commissions | 244 |
| 76 | Commission to another Court         | 244 |
| 77 | Letter of request                   | 244 |
| 78 | Commission issued by foreign Courts | 245 |

## PART IV

## SUITS IN PARTICULAR CASES

## SUITS BY OR AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT OR PUBLIC OFFICIALS IN THEIR OFFICIAL CAPACITY

|    |   |     |
|----|---|-----|
| 79 | Suits by or against Government                | 210 |
| 80 | Notice  | 217 |
| 81 | Exemption from arrest and personal appearance | 222 |
| 82 | Execution of decrees                          | 222 |

## SUITS BY ALIENS AND BY OR AGAINST FOREIGN AND NATIVE PRINCES

|    |  |     |
|----|--|-----|
| 83 | When aliens may sue  | 223 |
| 84 | When Foreign States may sue  | 223 |
| 85 | Persons specially appointed by Government to prosecute or defend for Princes or Chiefs | 224 |
| 86 | Suits against Princes, Chiefs, ambassadors and envoys                                  | 225 |
| 87 | Style of Princes and Chiefs as parties to suits  | 228 |

## INTERPLEADER

|    |  |     |
|----|--|-----|
| 88 | When interpleader suit may be instituted | 229 |
|----|--|-----|

## PART V

## SPECIAL PROCEEDINGS

## ARBITRATION

|    |             |     |
|----|-------------|-----|
| 89 | Arbitration | 230 |
|----|-------------|-----|

## SPECIAL CASE

|    |  |     |
|----|--|-----|
| 90 | Power to state case for opinion of Court | 231 |
|----|--|-----|

## SUITS RELATING TO PUBLIC MATTERS

|    |   |     |
|----|---|-----|
| 91 | Public nuisances  | 231 |
| 92 | Public charities  | 232 |
| 93 | Exercise of powers of Advocate General outside licensed towns | 233 |

## PART VI

## SUPPLEMENTAL PROCEEDINGS

|    |   |     |
|----|---|-----|
| 94 | Supplemental proceedings  | 234 |
| 95 | Compensation for obtaining arrest, attachment or injunction on insufficient grounds | 234 |

## PART VII

## APPEALS

## APPEALS FROM ORIGINAL DECREES

|    |  |     |
|----|--|-----|
| 96 | Appeal from original decree  | 238 |
| 97 | Appeal from final decree where no appeal from interlocutory decree | 239 |

| SECTIONS   | PAGE |
|--|------|
| 98 Decision where appeal heard by two or more Judges   | 295  |
| 99 No decree to be reversed or modified for error or irregularity not affecting merits or jurisdiction | 297  |
| APPEALS FROM APPELLATE DECREES   |      |
| 100 Second appeal  | 299  |
| 101 Second appeal on no other grounds  | 307  |
| 102 No second appeal in certain suits  | 307  |
| 103 Power of High Court to determine issues of fact  | 309  |
| APPEALS FROM ORDERS  |      |
| 104 Orders from which appeal lies  | 310  |
| 105 Other orders   | 313  |
| 106 What Courts to hear appeals  | 316  |
| GENERAL PROVISIONS RELATING TO APPEALS   |      |
| 107 Powers of Appellate Court  | 316  |
| 108 Procedure in appeal from appellate decrees and orders  | 317  |
| APPEALS TO THE KING IN COUNCIL   |      |
| 109 When appeals lie to King in Council  | 317  |
| 110 Value of subject matter  | 323  |
| 111 Bar of certain appeals   | 335  |
| 112 Savings  | 336  |
| PART VIII  |      |
| REFERENCE, PEEVIEW AND REVISION  |      |
| 113 Reference to High Court  | 337  |
| 114 PEEVIEW  | 337  |
| 115 Revision   | 337  |
| PART IX  |      |
| SPECIAL PROVISIONS RELATING TO THE CHARTERED HIGH COURTS   |      |
| 116 Part to apply only to certain High Courts  | 356  |
| 117 Application of Code to High Courts   | 356  |
| 118 Execution of decree before ascertainment of costs  | 356  |
| 119 Unauthorized persons not to address Court  | 356  |
| 120 Provisions not applicable to High Courts in original civil or insolvent jurisdiction               | 357  |
| PART X   |      |
| RULES  |      |
| 121 Effect of rules in First Schedule  | 358  |
| 122 Power of certain High Courts to make rules   | 358  |
| 123 Constitution of Rule Committees in certain provinces   | 359  |
| 124 Committee to report to High Court  | 360  |
| 125 Power of other High Courts to make rules   | 360  |

| SECTIONS  | PAGE |
|---|------|
| 100 Rules subject to sanction   | 301  |
| 101 Indication of rules   | 301  |
| 102 Matters for which rules may provide   | 301  |
| 103 Lower of Charter and High Courts to make rules as to their original civil procedure | 302  |
| 104 Lower of either High Courts to make rules as to matters other than procedure        | 302  |
| 105 Indication of rules   | 302  |

## PART XI

### MISCELLANEOUS

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| 132 Exemption of certain persons from personal appearance                                    | 304 |
| 133 Exemption of other persons   | 304 |
| 134 Arrest other than in execution of decree   | 304 |
| 135 Exemption from arrest under civil process  | 305 |
| 136 Exemption of members of legislative bodies from arrest and detention under civil process | 305 |
| 137 Procedure where person to be arrested or property to be attached is outside district     | 305 |
| 138 <i>Latras v. East India Company</i>  | 305 |
| 139 Lower of Local Government to require evidence to be recorded in English                  | 305 |
| 140 Oath on affidavit by witness to be administered  | 305 |
| 141 Assessors in cases of jury verdict   | 305 |
| 142 Miscellaneous proceedings  | 305 |
| 143 Orders and notices to be in writing  | 305 |
| 144 Parties  | 305 |
| 145 Application for restitution  | 305 |
| 146 Indorsement of liability of surety   | 305 |
| 147 Proceedings by or against representatives  | 305 |
| 148 Consent or agreement by persons under disability   | 305 |
| 149 Enlargement of time  | 305 |
| 150 Power to make up deficiency of court fees  | 305 |
| 151 Transfer of business   | 305 |
| 152 Saving of inherent powers of Court   | 305 |
| 153 Amendments of judgments and decrees and orders   | 305 |
| 154 General power to amend   | 305 |
| 155 Saving of present right of appeal  | 305 |
| 156 Amendment of certain Acts  | 305 |
| 157 Repeals  | 305 |
| 158 Continuance of orders under repealed enactments  | 305 |
| 159 Reference to Code of Civil Procedure and other repealed enactments                       | 305 |

## THE FIRST SCHEDULE

### ORDER I

#### *Parties to Suits*

#### RULES.

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| 1 Who may be joined as plaintiffs                                     | 404 |
| 2 Lower of Court to order separate trials                             | 410 |
| 2 Who may be joined as defendants                                     | 410 |
| 4 Court may give judgment for or against one or more of joint parties | 410 |

RULES

|   | PAGE |
|---|------|
| 5 Defendant need not be interested in all the relief claimed        | 416  |
| 6 Joinder of parties liable on same contract                        | 416  |
| " When plaintiff in doubt from whom redress is to be sought         | 418  |
| 8 One person may sue or defend on behalf of all in same interest    | 418  |
| 9 Misjoinder and non joinder  | 425  |
| 10 Suit in name of wrong plaintiff                                  | 425  |
| Court may strike out or add parties                                 | 426  |
| Where defendant is added plants to be amended                       | 426  |
| 11 Conduct of suit  | 434  |
| 12 Appearance of one of several plaintiffs or defendants for others | 434  |
| 13 Objections as to non joinder or mis joinder                      | 434  |

ORDER II

*Frame of Suit*

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| 1 Frame of suit   | 435 |
| " Suit to include the whole claim                                     | 435 |
| Relinquishment of part of claim                                       | 435 |
| Omission to sue for one of several reliefs                            | 438 |
| 3 Joinder of causes of action   | 446 |
| 4 Only certain claims to be joined for recovery of immovable property | 454 |
| 5 Claims by or against executor administrator or heir                 | 455 |
| 6 Power of Court to order separate trials                             | 458 |
| " Objections as to mis joinder  | 458 |

ORDER III

*Recognised Agents and Pleadings*

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| 1 Appearance etc may be in person by recognized agent or by pleader | 459 |
| 2 Recognized agents   | 460 |
| 3 Service of process on recognized agent                            | 460 |
| 4 Appointment of pleader  | 460 |
| 5 Service of process on pleader                                     | 463 |
| 6 Agent to accept service   | 463 |
| Appointment to be in writing and to be filed in Court               | 463 |

ORDER IV

*Institution of Suits*

|                                  |     |
|----------------------------------|-----|
| 1 Suit to be commenced by plaint | 463 |
| 2 Register of suits              | 464 |

ORDER V

*Issue and Service of Summons*

*Issue of Summons*

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| 1 Summons  | 464 |
| 2 Copy or statement annexed to summons   | 465 |
| 3 Court may order defendant or plaintiff to appear in person                       | 465 |
| 4 No party to be ordered to appear in person unless resident within certain limits | 465 |
| 5 Summons to be either to settle issues or for final disposal                      | 465 |
| 6 Fixing day for appearance of defendants  | 466 |



| RULES  | PAGE |
|--|------|
| 7 Summons to order defendant to produce documents relied on by him                         | 466  |
| 8 On issue of summons for final disposal defendant to be directed to produce his witnesses | 466  |
| <i>Service of Summons</i>  |      |
| 9 Delivery or transmission of summons for service  | 466  |
| 10 Mode of service   | 466  |
| 11 Service on several defendants   | 467  |
| 12 Service to be on defendant in person when practicable or on his agent                   | 467  |
| 13 Service on agent by whom defendant carried on business                                  | 467  |
| 14 Service on agent in charge in suits for immovable property                              | 467  |
| 15 Where service may be on male member of defendant's family                               | 467  |
| 16 Person served to sign acknowledgment  | 468  |
| 17 Procedure when defendant refuses to accept service or cannot be found                   | 468  |
| 18 Endorsement of time and manner of service   | 470  |
| 19 Examinations of serving officer   | 470  |
| 20 Substituted service   | 471  |
| Effect of substituted service  | 471  |
| Where service substituted time for appearance to be fixed                                  | 471  |
| 21 Service of summons where defendant resides within jurisdiction of another Court         | 471  |
| 2 Service within Presidency towns and Rangoon of summons issued by Courts outside          | 472  |
| 3 Duty of Court to which summons is sent   | 472  |
| 4 Service on defendant in person   | 473  |
| 5 Service where defendant resides out of British India and has no agent                    | 473  |
| 6 Service in foreign territory through Political Agent or Court                            | 473  |
| 7 Service on civil public officer or on servant of railway company or local authority      | 474  |
| 8 Service on soldiers  | 474  |
| 9 Duty of persons to whom summons is delivered or sent for service                         | 475  |
| 10 Substitution of letter for summons  | 475  |

## ORDER VI

### *Pleadings generally*

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| 1 Pleading  | 475 |
| 2 Pleading to state material facts and not evidence | 475 |
| 3 Forms of pleading                                 | 476 |
| 4 Particulars to be given where necessary           | 482 |
| 5 Further and better statement of particulars       | 482 |
| 6 Condition precedent                               | 487 |
| 7 Departure   | 488 |
| 8 Denial of contract                                | 490 |
| 9 Effect of document to be stated                   | 490 |
| 10 Malice knowledge etc                             | 491 |
| 11 Notice   | 491 |
| 12 Implied contract or relation                     | 492 |
| 13 Presumptions of law                              | 492 |
| 14 Pleading to be signed                            | 492 |
| 15 Verifications of pleadings                       | 493 |
| 16 Striking out pleadings                           | 493 |

**RULES**

|    |                              |     |
|----|------------------------------|-----|
| 17 | Amendment of pleadings       | 496 |
| 18 | Failure to amend after order | 506 |

**ORDER VII**

*Plaint*

|    |  |     |
|----|--|-----|
| 1  | Particulars to be contained in plaint                                    | 506 |
| 2  | In money suits   | 507 |
| 3  | Where the subject matter of the suit is immovable property               | 507 |
| 4  | When plaintiff sues as representative                                    | 507 |
| 5  | Defendant's interest and liability to be shown                           | 509 |
| 6  | Grounds of exemption from limitation law                                 | 509 |
| 7  | Relief to be specifically stated   | 510 |
| 8  | Relief founded on separate grounds                                       | 512 |
| 9  | Procedure on admitting plaint  | 513 |
|    | Concise statements   | 513 |
| 10 | Return of plaint   | 513 |
|    | Procedure on returning plaint  | 513 |
| 11 | Rejection of plaint  | 514 |
| 12 | Procedure on rejecting plaint  | 518 |
| 13 | Where rejection of plaint does not preclude presentation of fresh plaint | 518 |
| 14 | Production of document on which plaintiff sues                           | 518 |
|    | List of other documents  | 518 |
| 15 | Statement in case of documents not in his possession or power            | 518 |
| 16 | Suits on lost negotiable instruments                                     | 519 |
| 17 | Production of shop book  | 519 |
|    | Original entry to be marked and returned                                 | 519 |
| 18 | Inadmissibility of document not produced when plaint filed               | 519 |

**ORDER VIII**

*Written Statement and Set off*

|    |   |     |
|----|---|-----|
| 1  | Written statement   | 520 |
| 2  | New facts must be specially pleaded   | 520 |
| 3  | Denial to be specific   | 521 |
| 4  | Expressive denial   | 521 |
| 5  | Specific denial   | 522 |
| 6  | Particulars of set off to be given in written statement                     | 524 |
|    | Effect of set off   | 524 |
| 7  | Defence or set off founded on separate ground                               | 531 |
| 8  | New ground of defence   | 531 |
| 9  | Subsequent pleadings  | 531 |
| 10 | Procedure when party fails to present written statement called for by Court | 532 |

**ORDER IX.**

*Appearance of Parties and Consequence of Non appearance*

|   |  |     |
|---|--|-----|
| 1 | Parties to appear on day fixed in summons for defendant to appear and answer                 | 532 |
| 2 | Dismissal of suit where summons not served in consequence of plaintiffs failure to pay costs | 532 |
| 3 | Where neither party appears suit to be dismissed   | 533 |

| RULE  | PAGE |
|---|------|
| 4 Plaintiff may bring fresh suit or Court may restore suit to file  | 533  |
| 5 Dismissal of suit where plaintiff after summons returned unserved fails for three months to apply for fresh summons | 534  |
| 6 Procedure when only plaintiff appears   | 535  |
| When summons duly served  | 535  |
| When summons not duly served  | 535  |
| When summons served but not in due time   | 535  |
| 7 Procedure where defendant appears on day of adjourned hearing and a signed good cause for previous non appearance   | 536  |
| 8 Procedure where defendant only appears  | 536  |
| 9 Decree against plaintiff by default bars fresh suit   | 537  |
| 10 Procedure in case of non attendance of one or more of several plaintiffs   | 543  |
| 11 Procedure in case of non attendance of one or more of several defendants   | 544  |
| 12 Consequence of non attendance without sufficient cause shown or party ordered to appear in person                  | 544  |
| <i>Setting aside Decrees ex parte</i>   |      |
| 13 Setting aside decree ex parte against defendant  | 544  |
| 14 No decree to be set aside without notice to opposite party   | 544  |
| ORDER X   |      |
| <i>Examination of Parties by the Court</i>  |      |
| 1 Ascertainment whether allegations in pleadings are admitted or denied   | 554  |
| 2 Oral examination of party or companion of party   | 554  |
| 3 Substance of examination to be written  | 554  |
| 4 Consequence of refusal or inability of pleader to answer  | 555  |
| ORDER XI  |      |
| <i>Discovery and Inspection</i>   |      |
| 1 Discovery by interrogatories  | 55   |
| 2 Particular interrogatories to be submitted  | 559  |
| 3 Costs of interrogatories  | 560  |
| 4 Form of interrogatories   | 560  |
| 5 Corporations  | 560  |
| 6 Objections to interrogatories by answer   | 560  |
| Setting aside and striking out interrogatories  | 561  |
| 7 Affidavit in answer filing  | 562  |
| 8 Form of affidavit in answer   | 563  |
| 9 No exception to be taken  | 563  |
| 10 Order to answer or answer further  | 563  |
| 11 Application for discovery of documents   | 563  |
| 12 Affidavit of documents   | 564  |
| 13 Introduction of documents  | 564  |
| 14 Inspection of documents referred to in pleadings or affidavits   | 564  |
| 15 Notice to produce  | 572  |
| 16 Time for inspection when notice given  | -    |
| 17 Order for inspection   | 572  |
| 18 Verified copies  | 573  |
| 19 Premature discovery  | 574  |
| 20 Non compliance with order for discovery  | 575  |
| 21 Using answers to interrogatories at trial  | 575  |
| 22 Order to apply to minors   | 576  |

ORDER VII

*Admissions*

| RULES                         | PAGE |
|-------------------------------|------|
| 1 Notice of admission of case | 576  |
| 2 Notice to admit documents   | 576  |
| 3 Form of Notice              | 577  |
| 4 Notice to admit facts       | 577  |
| 5 Form of admissions          | 577  |
| 6 Judgment on admissions      | 577  |
| 7 Affidavit of signature      | 581  |
| 8 Notice to produce documents | 581  |
| 9 Costs                       | 581  |

ORDER VIII

*Production Impounding and Return of Documents*

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| 1 Documentary evidence to be produced at first hearing                    | 581 |
| 2 Effect of non production of documents                                   | 582 |
| 3 Rejection of irrelevant or inadmissible documents                       | 582 |
| 4 Endorsements on documents admitted in evidence                          | 583 |
| 5 Endorsement on copies of admitted entries in books accounts and records | 583 |
| 6 Endorsements on documents rejected as inadmissible in evidence          | 584 |
| 7 Recording of admitted and return of rejected documents                  | 584 |
| 8 Court may order any document to be impounded                            | 585 |
| 9 Return of admitted documents  | 585 |
| 10 Court may send for papers from its own records or from other Courts    | 585 |
| 11 Provisions as to documents applied to material objects                 | 586 |

ORDER IX

*Settlement of Issues and Determination of Suit on Issues of Law or on Issues agreed upon*

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| 1 Framing of issues   | 586 |
| 2 Issues of law and of fact   | 589 |
| 3 Materials from which issues may be framed   | 589 |
| 4 Court may examine witnesses or documents before framing issues                      | 590 |
| 5 Power to amend and strike out issues  | 590 |
| 6 Questions of fact or law may by agreement be stated in form of issues               | 591 |
| 7 Court if satisfied that agreement was executed in good faith may pronounce judgment | 591 |

ORDER X

*Disposal of the Suit at the first hearing*

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| 1 Parties not at issue                   | 592 |
| 2 One of several defendants not at issue | 592 |
| 3 Parties at issue                       | 592 |
| 4 Failure to produce evidence            | 593 |

ORDER XVI

*Summoning and Attendance of Witnesses*

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| 1 Summons to attend to give evidence or produce documents             | 593 |
| 2 Expenses of witnesses to be paid into Court on applying for summons | 594 |

| RULES   | PAGE |
|---|------|
| Experts   | 594  |
| Scale of Expenses   | 594  |
| 3 Tender of expenses to witness   | 595  |
| 4 Procedure where insufficient sum paid in  | 595  |
| Expenses of witness <i>as detained more than one day</i>                              | 595  |
| 5 Time place and purpose of attendance to be specified in summons                     | 596  |
| 6 Summons to produce document   | 596  |
| 7 Power to require persons present in Court to give evidence or produce document      | 596  |
| 8 Summons how served  | 596  |
| 9 Time for serving summons  | 596  |
| 10 Procedure where witness fails to comply with summons                               | 597  |
| 11 If witness appears attachment may be withdrawn                                     | 597  |
| 12 Procedure if witness fails to appear   | 598  |
| 13 Mode of attachment   | 598  |
| 14 Court may of its own accord summon as witness strangers to suit                    | 599  |
| 15 Duty of persons summoned to give evidence or produce document                      | 599  |
| 16 When they may depart   | 599  |
| 17 Application of rules 10 to 13  | 599  |
| 18 Procedure where witness apprehended cannot give evidence or produce document       | 599  |
| 19 No witness to be ordered to attend in person unless resident within certain limits | 600  |
| 20 Consequences of refusal of party to give evidence when called on by Court          | 600  |
| 21 Rules as to witnesses to apply to parties summoned                                 | 600  |

## ORDER XVII

*Adjournments*

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| 1 Court may grant time and adjourn hearing                                     | 601 |
| Costs of adjournment   | 601 |
| 2 Procedure if parties fail to appear on day fixed                             | 601 |
| 3 Court may proceed notwithstanding either party fails to produce evidence etc | 603 |

## ORDER XVIII

*Hearing of the Suit and Examination of Witnesses*

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| 1 Right to begin   | 604 |
| 2 Statement and production of evidence                                     | 605 |
| 3 Evidence where several issues  | 606 |
| 4 Witnesses to be examined in open Court                                   | 606 |
| How evidence shall be taken in appealable cases                            | 607 |
| 6 When deposition to be interpreted  | 608 |
| 7 Evidence under section 138   | 608 |
| 8 Memorandum when evidence not taken down by Judge                         | 608 |
| 9 When evidence may be taken in English                                    | 608 |
| 10 Any particular question and answer may be taken down                    | 609 |
| 11 Questions objected to and allowed by Court                              | 609 |
| 12 Remarks on demeanour of witnesses                                       | 609 |
| 13 Memorandum of evidence in unappealable case                             | 609 |
| 14 Judge unable to make such memorandum to record reasons of his inability | 609 |

| RULES   | PAGE |
|---|------|
| 15 Power to deal with evidence taken before another Judge | 610  |
| 16 Power to examine witness immediately                   | 610  |
| 17 Court may recall and examine witness                   | 611  |
| 18 Power of Court to inspect                              | 611  |

## ORDER XX

### *Affidavits*

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| 1 Power to order any point to be proved by affidavit          | 611 |
| 2 Power to order attendance of deponent for cross examination | 611 |
| 3 Matters to which affidavits shall be confined               | 612 |

## ORDER XX

### *Judgment and Decree*

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| 1 Judgment when pronounced  | 612 |
| 2 Power to pronounce judgment written by Judge or predecessor                         | 613 |
| 3 Judgment to be signed   | 613 |
| 4 Judgment of Small Cause Courts  | 614 |
| Judgments of other Courts   | 614 |
| 5 Court to state its decision on each issue   | 614 |
| 6 Contents of decree  | 615 |
| 7 Date of decree  | 615 |
| 8 Procedure where Judge had vacated office before signing decree                      | 615 |
| 9 Decree for recovery of immovable property   | 616 |
| 10 Decree for delivery of movable property  | 616 |
| 11 Decree may direct payment by instalments   | 616 |
| Order after decree for payment by instalments   | 616 |
| 12 Decree for possession and mesne profits  | 618 |
| 13 Decree in administration suit  | 623 |
| 14 Decree in pre-emption suit   | 625 |
| 15 Decree in suit for dissolution of partnership                                      | 627 |
| 16 Decree in suit for account between principal and agent                             | 628 |
| 17 Special directions as to accounts  | 628 |
| 18 Decree in suit for partition of property or separate possession of a share therein | 629 |
| 19 Decree when set off is allowed   | 629 |
| Appeal from decree relating to set off  | 630 |
| 20 Certified copies of judgment and decree to be furnished                            | 630 |

## ORDER XXI

### *Execution of Decrees and Orders*

#### *Payment under Decree*

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| 1 Modes of paying money under decree             | 634 |
| 2 Payment out of Court to decree holder          | 635 |
| Agreement to give time to judgment debtor        | 635 |
| Agreement for the satisfaction for judgment debt | 635 |

#### *Courts executing Decrees*

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| 3 Lands situate in more than one jurisdiction | 645 |
| 4 Transfer to Court of Small Causes           | 645 |

| ARTICLE   | PAGE |
|---|------|
| Exemptions  | 594  |
| Scale of Expenses   | 594  |
| 1 Time of expenses to witnesses   | 595  |
| 2 For which witness must be paid  | 595  |
| 3 Expenses of witnesses allowed more than one day                                 | 595  |
| 4 Time taken and purpose of attendance to be specified in summons                 | 596  |
| 5 Summons to attend as witness  | 596  |
| 6 Power to require persons present in Court to give evidence or produce documents | 596  |
| 7 Committal writs   | 596  |
| 8 Time for service of summons   | 596  |
| 9 For which persons may be served   | 596  |
| 10 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 11 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 12 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 13 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 14 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 15 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 16 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 17 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 18 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 19 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 20 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 21 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 22 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 23 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 24 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 25 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 26 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 27 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 28 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 29 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 30 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 31 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 32 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 33 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 34 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 35 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 36 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 37 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 38 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 39 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 40 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 41 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 42 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 43 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 44 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 45 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 46 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 47 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 48 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 49 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 50 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 51 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 52 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 53 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 54 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 55 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 56 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 57 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 58 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 59 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 60 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 61 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 62 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 63 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 64 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 65 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 66 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 67 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 68 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 69 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 70 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 71 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 72 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 73 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 74 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 75 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 76 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 77 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 78 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 79 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 80 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 81 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 82 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 83 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 84 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 85 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 86 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 87 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 88 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 89 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 90 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 91 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 92 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 93 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 94 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 95 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 96 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 97 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 98 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 99 For which persons may be served  | 596  |
| 100 For which persons may be served   | 596  |

## ORDER XVII

### Of Summons.

|                                     |     |
|-------------------------------------|-----|
| 1 Court may make rules and orders   | 601 |
| 2 Court may make rules and orders   | 601 |
| 3 For which persons may be served   | 601 |
| 4 Court may make rules and orders   | 601 |
| 5 For which persons may be served   | 601 |
| 6 Court may make rules and orders   | 601 |
| 7 For which persons may be served   | 601 |
| 8 Court may make rules and orders   | 601 |
| 9 For which persons may be served   | 601 |
| 10 Court may make rules and orders  | 601 |
| 11 For which persons may be served  | 601 |
| 12 Court may make rules and orders  | 601 |
| 13 For which persons may be served  | 601 |
| 14 Court may make rules and orders  | 601 |
| 15 For which persons may be served  | 601 |
| 16 Court may make rules and orders  | 601 |
| 17 For which persons may be served  | 601 |
| 18 Court may make rules and orders  | 601 |
| 19 For which persons may be served  | 601 |
| 20 Court may make rules and orders  | 601 |
| 21 For which persons may be served  | 601 |
| 22 Court may make rules and orders  | 601 |
| 23 For which persons may be served  | 601 |
| 24 Court may make rules and orders  | 601 |
| 25 For which persons may be served  | 601 |
| 26 Court may make rules and orders  | 601 |
| 27 For which persons may be served  | 601 |
| 28 Court may make rules and orders  | 601 |
| 29 For which persons may be served  | 601 |
| 30 Court may make rules and orders  | 601 |
| 31 For which persons may be served  | 601 |
| 32 Court may make rules and orders  | 601 |
| 33 For which persons may be served  | 601 |
| 34 Court may make rules and orders  | 601 |
| 35 For which persons may be served  | 601 |
| 36 Court may make rules and orders  | 601 |
| 37 For which persons may be served  | 601 |
| 38 Court may make rules and orders  | 601 |
| 39 For which persons may be served  | 601 |
| 40 Court may make rules and orders  | 601 |
| 41 For which persons may be served  | 601 |
| 42 Court may make rules and orders  | 601 |
| 43 For which persons may be served  | 601 |
| 44 Court may make rules and orders  | 601 |
| 45 For which persons may be served  | 601 |
| 46 Court may make rules and orders  | 601 |
| 47 For which persons may be served  | 601 |
| 48 Court may make rules and orders  | 601 |
| 49 For which persons may be served  | 601 |
| 50 Court may make rules and orders  | 601 |
| 51 For which persons may be served  | 601 |
| 52 Court may make rules and orders  | 601 |
| 53 For which persons may be served  | 601 |
| 54 Court may make rules and orders  | 601 |
| 55 For which persons may be served  | 601 |
| 56 Court may make rules and orders  | 601 |
| 57 For which persons may be served  | 601 |
| 58 Court may make rules and orders  | 601 |
| 59 For which persons may be served  | 601 |
| 60 Court may make rules and orders  | 601 |
| 61 For which persons may be served  | 601 |
| 62 Court may make rules and orders  | 601 |
| 63 For which persons may be served  | 601 |
| 64 Court may make rules and orders  | 601 |
| 65 For which persons may be served  | 601 |
| 66 Court may make rules and orders  | 601 |
| 67 For which persons may be served  | 601 |
| 68 Court may make rules and orders  | 601 |
| 69 For which persons may be served  | 601 |
| 70 Court may make rules and orders  | 601 |
| 71 For which persons may be served  | 601 |
| 72 Court may make rules and orders  | 601 |
| 73 For which persons may be served  | 601 |
| 74 Court may make rules and orders  | 601 |
| 75 For which persons may be served  | 601 |
| 76 Court may make rules and orders  | 601 |
| 77 For which persons may be served  | 601 |
| 78 Court may make rules and orders  | 601 |
| 79 For which persons may be served  | 601 |
| 80 Court may make rules and orders  | 601 |
| 81 For which persons may be served  | 601 |
| 82 Court may make rules and orders  | 601 |
| 83 For which persons may be served  | 601 |
| 84 Court may make rules and orders  | 601 |
| 85 For which persons may be served  | 601 |
| 86 Court may make rules and orders  | 601 |
| 87 For which persons may be served  | 601 |
| 88 Court may make rules and orders  | 601 |
| 89 For which persons may be served  | 601 |
| 90 Court may make rules and orders  | 601 |
| 91 For which persons may be served  | 601 |
| 92 Court may make rules and orders  | 601 |
| 93 For which persons may be served  | 601 |
| 94 Court may make rules and orders  | 601 |
| 95 For which persons may be served  | 601 |
| 96 Court may make rules and orders  | 601 |
| 97 For which persons may be served  | 601 |
| 98 Court may make rules and orders  | 601 |
| 99 For which persons may be served  | 601 |
| 100 Court may make rules and orders | 601 |

## ORDER XVIII

### Of the Evidence of Witnesses.

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| 1 Evidence to be given  | 605 |
| 2 Statements and production of evidence                               | 605 |
| 3 Evidence when several issues  | 605 |
| 4 Witnesses to be examined in open Court                              | 605 |
| 5 How evidence shall be taken in exceptional cases                    | 605 |
| 6 When deposition to be taken   | 605 |
| 7 Evidence may be taken in Court                                      | 605 |
| 8 Memorandum when evidence not taken down by Judge                    | 605 |
| 9 When evidence may be taken in England                               | 605 |
| 10 Any particular question and answer may be taken down               | 605 |
| 11 Questions objected to and allowed by Court                         | 605 |
| 12 Evidence on demurrer or verdict                                    | 605 |
| 13 Memorandum of evidence in non-verbal cases                         | 605 |
| 14 Jurors may be asked such questions as to facts as may be necessary | 605 |

| RULES   | PAGE |
|---|------|
| 15 Power to deal with evidence taken before another Judge | 610  |
| 16 Power to examine witness immediately                   | 610  |
| 17 Court may recall and examine witness                   | 611  |
| 18 Power of Court to inspect                              | 611  |

## ORDER XIX

*Affidavits*

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| 1 Power to order any point to be proved by affidavit          | 611 |
| 2 Power to order attendance of deponent for cross examination | 611 |
| 3 Matters to which affidavits shall be confined               | 612 |

## ORDER XX

*Judgment and Decree*

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| 1 Judgment when pronounced  | 612 |
| 2 Power to pronounce judgment written by Judge's predecessor                          | 613 |
| 3 Judgment to be signed   | 613 |
| 4 Judgment of Small Cause Courts  | 614 |
| Judgments of other Courts   | 614 |
| 5 Court to state its decision on each issue   | 614 |
| 6 Contents of decree  | 615 |
| 7 Date of decree  | 615 |
| 8 Procedure where Judge had vacated office before signing decree                      | 615 |
| 9 Decree for recovery of immovable property   | 616 |
| 10 Decree for delivery of movable property  | 616 |
| 11 Decree may direct payment by instalments   | 616 |
| Order after decree for payment by instalments   | 616 |
| 12 Decree for possession and mesne profits  | 618 |
| 13 Decree in administration suit  | 623 |
| 14 Decree in pre-emption suit   | 625 |
| 15 Decree in suit for dissolution of partnership                                      | 627 |
| 16 Decree in suit for account between principal and agent                             | 628 |
| 17 Special directions as to accounts  | 628 |
| 18 Decree in suit for partition of property or separate possession of a share therein | 629 |
| 19 Decree when set off is allowed   | 629 |
| Appeal from decree relating to set off  | 630 |
| 20 Certified copies of judgment and decree to be furnished                            | 630 |

## ORDER XXI

*Execution of Decrees and Orders**Payment under Decree*

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| 1 Modes of paying money under decree             | 634 |
| 2 Payment out of Court to decree holder          | 635 |
| Agreement to give time to judgment debtor        | 635 |
| Agreement for the satisfaction for judgment debt | 635 |

*Courts executing Decrees*

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| 3 Lands situate in more than one jurisdiction | 645 |
| 4 Transfer to Court of Small Causes           | 645 |



| RULES  | PAGE |
|--|------|
| Experts  | 594  |
| Scale of Expenses  | 594  |
| 3 Tender of expenses to witness  | 595  |
| 4 Procedure where insufficient sum paid in<br>Expenses of witnesses detained more than one day | 595  |
| 5 Time place and purpose of attendance to be specified in summons                              | 596  |
| 6 Summons to produce document  | 596  |
| 7 Power to require persons present in Court to give evidence or produce<br>document            | 596  |
| 8 Summons how served   | 596  |
| 9 Time for serving summons   | 596  |
| 10 Procedure where witness fails to comply with summons  | 597  |
| 11 If witness appears attachment may be withdrawn  | 597  |
| 12 Procedure if witness fails to appear  | 598  |
| 13 Mode of attachment  | 598  |
| 14 Court may of its own accord summon as witnesses strangers to suit                           | 599  |
| 15 Duty of persons summoned to give evidence or produce document                               | 599  |
| 16 When they may depart  | 599  |
| 17 Application of rules 10 to 13   | 599  |
| 18 Procedure where witnesses apprehended cannot give evidence or produce<br>document           | 599  |
| 19 No witness to be ordered to attend in person unless resident within<br>certain limits       | 600  |
| 20 Consequence of refusal of party to give evidence when called on by Court                    | 600  |
| 21 Rules as to witnesses to apply to parties summoned  | 600  |

## ORDER XVII

*Adjournments*

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| 1 Court may grant time and adjourn hearing  | 601 |
| Costs of adjournment  | 601 |
| 2 Procedure if parties fail to appear on day fixed                                  | 601 |
| 3 Court may proceed notwithstanding either party fails to produce evi-<br>dence etc | 603 |

## ORDER XVIII

*Hearing of the Suit and Examination of Witnesses*

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| 1 Right to begin   | 603 |
| 2 Statement and production of evidence                                     | 603 |
| 3 Evidence where several issues  | 606 |
| 4 Witnesses to be examined in open Court                                   | 606 |
| 5 How evidence shall be taken in appealable cases                          | 607 |
| 6 When deposition to be interpreted  | 608 |
| 7 Evidence under section 135   | 608 |
| 8 Memorandum when evidence not taken down by Judge                         | 608 |
| 9 When evidence may be taken in English                                    | 608 |
| 10 Any particular question and answer may be taken down                    | 609 |
| 11 Questions objected to and allowed by Court                              | 609 |
| 12 Remarks on demeanour of witnesses                                       | 609 |
| 13 Memorandum of evidence in unappealable cases                            | 609 |
| 14 Judge unable to make such memorandum to record reasons of his inability | 609 |

| RULES   | PAGE |
|---|------|
| 15 Power to deal with evidence taken before another Judge | 610  |
| 16 Power to examine witness immediately                   | 610  |
| 17 Court may recall and examine witness                   | 611  |
| 18 Power of Court to inspect                              | 611  |

## ORDER XIX

### *Affidavits*

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| 1 Power to order any point to be proved by affidavit          | 611 |
| 2 Power to order attendance of deponent for cross examination | 611 |
| 3 Matters to which affidavits shall be confined               | 612 |

## ORDER XX

### *Judgment and Decree*

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| 1 Judgment when pronounced  | 612 |
| 2 Power to pronounce judgment written by Judge's predecessor                          | 613 |
| 3 Judgment to be signed   | 613 |
| 4 Judgment of Small Cause Courts  | 614 |
| Judgments of other Courts   | 614 |
| 5 Court to state its decision on each issue   | 614 |
| 6 Contents of decree  | 615 |
| 7 Date of decree  | 615 |
| 8 Procedure where Judge had vacated office before signing decree                      | 615 |
| 9 Decree for recovery of immovable property   | 616 |
| 10 Decree for delivery of movable property  | 616 |
| 11 Decree may direct payment by instalments   | 616 |
| Order after decree for payment by instalments   | 616 |
| 12 Decree for possession and mesne profits  | 618 |
| 13 Decree in administration suit  | 623 |
| 14 Decree in pre-emption suit   | 625 |
| 15 Decree in suit for dissolution of partnership                                      | 627 |
| 16 Decree in suit for account between principal and agent                             | 628 |
| 17 Special directions as to accounts  | 628 |
| 18 Decree in suit for partition of property or separate possession of a share therein | 629 |
| 19 Decree when set off is allowed   | 629 |
| Appeal from decree relating to set off  | 630 |
| 20 Certified copies of judgment and decree to be furnished                            | 630 |

## ORDER XXI

### *Execution of Decrees and Orders*

#### *Payment under Decree*

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| 1 Modes of paying money under decree             | 634 |
| 2 Payment out of Court to decree holder          | 635 |
| Agreement to give time to judgment debtor        | 635 |
| Agreement for the satisfaction for Judgment debt | 635 |

#### *Courts executing Decrees*

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| 3 Lands situate in more than one jurisdiction | 645 |
| 4 Transfer to Court of Small Causes           | 645 |

| RULES  | PAGE |
|--|------|
| 5 Mode of transfer   | 645  |
| 6 Procedure where Court desires that its own decree shall be executed by another Court | 646  |
| 7 Court receiving copies of decree etc. to file same without proof                     | 646  |
| 8 Execution of decree or order by Court to which it is sent                            | 647  |
| 9 Execution by High Court of decree transferred by other Court                         | 647  |

*Application for execution*

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| 10 Application for execution  | 647 |
| 11 Oral application   | 647 |
| Written application   | 648 |
| Power to direct immediate execution of decree for money not exceeding Rs 1 000        | 649 |
| 12 Application for attachment of movable property not in judgment debtor's possession | 650 |
| 13 Application for attachment of immovable property to contain certain particulars    | 650 |
| 14 Power to require certified extract from Collector's register in certain cases      | 651 |
| 15 Application for execution by joint decree holder                                   | 651 |
| 16 Application for execution by transferee of decree                                  | 654 |
| 17 Procedure on receiving application for execution of decree                         | 662 |
| 18 Execution in case of cross decrees   | 664 |
| 19 Execution in case of cross claims under same decrees                               | 667 |
| 20 Cross decrees and cross claims in mortgage suits                                   | 667 |
| 21 Simultaneous execution   | 668 |
| 22 Notice to show cause against execution in certain cases                            | 668 |
| 23 Procedure after issue of notice  | 672 |
| 24 Process for execution  | 672 |
| 25 Endorsement on process   | 673 |

*Stay of execution*

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| 26 When Court may stay execution  | 673 |
| Power to require security from or impose conditions upon judgment debtor                        | 673 |
| 27 Liability of judgment debtor discharged  | 674 |
| 28 Order of Court which passed decree or of Appellate Court to be binding upon Court applied to | 674 |
| 29 Stay of execution pending suit between decree holder and judgment debtor                     | 674 |

*Mode of execution*

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| 30 Decree for payment of money   | 675 |
| 31 Decree for specific movable property  | 675 |
| 32 Decree for specific performance for restitution of conjugal rights or for an injunction | 676 |
| 33 Discretion of Court in executing decrees for restitution of conjugal rights             | 679 |

## RULES

## PAGE

|    |  |     |
|----|--|-----|
| 34 | Decree for execution of document or endorsement of negotiable instrument | 680 |
| 35 | Decree for immovable property  | 681 |
| 36 | Decree for delivery of immovable property when in occupancy of tenant    | 684 |

*Arrest and detention in the civil prison*

|    |   |     |
|----|---|-----|
| 37 | Discretionary power to permit judgment debtor to show cause against detention in prison | 685 |
| 38 | Warrant for arrest to direct judgment debtor to be brought up                           | 686 |
| 39 | Subsistence allowance   | 686 |
| 40 | Proceedings on appearance of judgment debtor in obedience to notice or after arrest     | 687 |

*Attachment of Property*

|    |  |     |
|----|--|-----|
| 41 | Examination of judgment debtor as to his property  | 688 |
| 42 | Attachment in case of decree for rent or mesne profits or other matter amount of which to be subsequently determined | 689 |
| 43 | Attachment of movable property other than agricultural produce in possession of judgment debtor                      | 689 |
| 44 | Attachment of agricultural produce   | 690 |
| 45 | Provisions as to agricultural produce under attachment   | 691 |
| 46 | Attachment of debt share and other property not in possession of judgment debtor                                     | 692 |
| 47 | Attachment of share in movables  | 695 |
| 48 | Attachment of salary or allowances of public officer or servant of railway company or local authority                | 696 |
| 49 | Attachment of partnership property   | 697 |
| 50 | Execution of decree against firm   | 698 |
| 51 | Attachment of negotiable instruments   | 702 |
| 52 | Attachment of property in custody of Court or public officer   | 702 |
| 53 | Attachment of decrees  | 704 |
| 54 | Attachment of immovable property   | 708 |
| 55 | Removal of attachment after satisfaction of decree   | 709 |
| 56 | Order for payment of coin or currency notes to party entitled under decree   | 709 |
| 57 | Determination of attachment  | 709 |

*Investigation of claims and objections*

|    |  |     |
|----|--|-----|
| 58 | Investigation of claims to and objections to attachment of attached property | 711 |
|    | Postponement of sale   | 711 |
| 59 | Evidence to be adduced by claimant   | 713 |
| 60 | Release of property from attachment  | 714 |
| 61 | Disallowance of claim to property attached                                   | 716 |
| 62 | Continuance of attachment subject to claim of encumbrancer                   | 716 |
| 63 | Saving of suits to establish right to attached property                      | 717 |

*Sale generally*

|    |  |     |
|----|--|-----|
| 64 | Power to order property attached to be sold and proceeds to be paid to person entitled | 724 |
|----|--|-----|

| RULES  | PAGE |
|--|------|
| 65 Sales by whom conducted and how made  | 704  |
| 66 Proclamation of sales by public auction   | 720  |
| 67 Mode of making proclamation   | 729  |
| 68 Time of sale  | 730  |
| 69 Adjournment or stoppage of sale   | 730  |
| 70 Saving of certain sales   | 731  |
| 71 Defaulting purchaser answerable for loss on re sale   | 731  |
| 72 Decree holder not to bid for or buy property without permission<br>Where decree holder purchases amount of decree may be taken as payment | 733  |
| 73 Restriction on bidding or purchase by officer   | 735  |
| <i>Sale of movable property</i>  |      |
| 74 Sale of agricultural produce  | 735  |
| 75 Special provisions relating to growing crops  | 736  |
| 76 Negotiable instruments and shares in corporations   | 736  |
| 77 Sale by public auction  | 737  |
| 78 Irregularity not to vitiate sale but any person injured may sue   | 737  |
| 79 Delivery of movable property debts and shares   | 738  |
| 80 Transfer of negotiable instruments and shares   | 738  |
| 81 Vesting order in case of other property   | 739  |
| <i>Sale of immovable property</i>  |      |
| 82 What Courts may order sales   | 739  |
| 83 Postponement of sale to enable judgment debtor to raise amount of decree  | 750  |
| 84 Deposits by purchaser and re sale on default  | 741  |
| 85 Time for payment in full of purchase money  | 741  |
| 86 Procedure in default of payment   | 742  |
| 87 Notification on re sale   | 742  |
| 88 Bid of co sharer to have preference   | 742  |
| 89 Application to set aside sale on deposit  | 743  |
| 90 Application to set aside sale on ground of irregularity or fraud  | 749  |
| 91 Application by purchaser to set aside sale on ground of judgment debtor having no saleable interest                                       | 762  |
| 92 Sale when to become absolute or be set aside  | 763  |
| 93 Return of purchase money in certain cases   | 765  |
| 94 Certificate to purchaser  | 768  |
| 95 Delivery of property in occupancy of judgment debtor  | 771  |
| 96 Delivery of property in occupancy of tenant   | 772  |
| <i>Resistance to delivery of possession to decree holder or purchaser</i>  |      |
| 97 Persistence or obstruction to possession of immovable property  | 772  |
| 98 Persistence or obstruction by judgment debtor   | 773  |
| 99 Resistance or obstruction by bona fide claimant   | 774  |
| 100 Dispossession by decree holder or purchaser  | 775  |
| 101 Bona fide claimant to be restored to possession  | 776  |
| 102 Rules not applicable to transferee pendente lite   | 777  |
| 103 Orders conclusive subject to regular suit  | 777  |

## ORDER XXII

*Death Marriage and Insolvency of Parties*

| PAGES |  | PAGE |
|-------|--|------|
| 1     | No abatement by party's death if right to sue survives                                 | 778  |
| 2     | Procedure where one of several plaintiffs or defendants dies and right to sue survives | 781  |
| 3     | Procedure in case of death of one of several plaintiffs or of sole plaintiff           | 781  |
| 4     | Procedure in case of death of one of several defendants or of sole defendant           | 788  |
| 5     | Determination of question as to legal representative                                   | 795  |
| 6     | No abatement by reason of death after hearing  | 796  |
| 7     | Suit not abated by marriage of female party  | 797  |
| 8     | When plaintiff's insolvency bars suit  | 797  |
|       | Procedure where a signee fails to continue suit or give security                       | 797  |
| 9     | Effect of abatement or dismissal   | 799  |
| 10    | Procedure in case of assignment before final order in suit                             | 802  |
| 11    | Application of Order to appeals  | 806  |
| 12    | Application of Order to proceedings  | 806  |

## ORDER XXIII

*Withdrawal and Adjustment of Suits*

|   |  |     |
|---|--|-----|
| 1 | Withdrawal of suit or abandonment of part of claim | 807 |
| 2 | Limitation law not affected by first suit          | 818 |
| 3 | Compromise of suit                                 | 818 |
| 4 | Proceedings in execution of decrees not affected   | 828 |

## ORDER XXIV

*Payment into Court*

|   |   |     |
|---|---|-----|
| 1 | Deposit by defendant of amount in satisfaction of claim           | 828 |
| 2 | Notice of deposit   | 829 |
| 3 | Interest on deposit not allowed to plaintiff after notice         | 830 |
| 4 | Procedure where plaintiff accepts deposit as satisfaction in part | 830 |
|   | Procedure where he accepts it as satisfaction in full             | 830 |

## ORDER XXV

*Security for costs*

|   |  |     |
|---|--|-----|
| 1 | When security for costs may be required from plaintiff | 831 |
|   | Residence out of British India                         | 831 |
| 2 | Effect of failure to furnish security                  | 834 |

## — ORDER XXVI.

*Commissions**Commissions to examine witnesses*

|   |   |     |
|---|---|-----|
| 1 | Cases in which Court may issue commission to examine witness      | 835 |
| 2 | Order for commission  | 836 |
| 3 | Where witness resides within Court's jurisdiction                 | 836 |
| 4 | Persons for whose examination commission may issue                | 837 |
| 5 | Commission or request to examine witness not within British India | 838 |
| 6 | Court to examine witness pursuant to commission                   | 838 |

| RULES  | PAGE |
|--|------|
| 7 Return of commission with deposition of witnesses                    | 839  |
| 8 When depositions may be read in evidence                             | 839  |
| <i>Commissions for local investigations</i>                            |      |
| 9 Commissions to make local investigation                              | 840  |
| 10 Procedure of Commissioner   | 841  |
| Report and deposition to be evidence in suits                          | 841  |
| Commissioner may be examined in person                                 | 841  |
| <i>Commissions to examine accounts</i>                                 |      |
| 11 Commission to examine or adjust accounts                            | 842  |
| 12 Court to give Commissioner necessary instructions                   | 842  |
| Proceedings and report to be evidence Court may direct further inquiry | 842  |
| <i>Commissions to make partitions</i>                                  |      |
| 13 Commission to make partition of immovable property                  | 842  |
| 14 Procedure of Commissioner   | 843  |
| <i>General provisions</i>  |      |
| 15 Expenses of commission to be paid into Court                        | 844  |
| 16 Powers of Commissioners   | 844  |
| 17 Attendance and examination of witnesses before Commissioner         | 844  |
| 18 Parties to appear before Commissioner                               | 845  |

## ORDER XXVII

*Suits by or against the Government or Public Officers in their official capacity*

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| 1 Suits by or against Government  | 845 |
| 2 Persons authorized to act for Government  | 845 |
| 3 Plaints in suits by or against Government   | 846 |
| 4 Agent for Government to receive process   | 846 |
| 5 Fixing of day for appearance on behalf of Government                              | 846 |
| 6 Attendance of person able to answer questions relating to suit against Government | 846 |
| 7 Extension of time to enable public officer to make reference to Government        | 846 |
| 8 Procedure in suits against public officer   | 847 |

## ORDER XXVIII

*Suits by or against Military Men or Airmen*

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| 1 Officers or soldiers who cannot obtain leave may authorize any person to sue or defend for them | 847 |
| 2 Person so authorized may act personally or appoint pleader                                      | 848 |
| 3 Service on person so authorized or on his pleader to be good service                            | 848 |

## ORDER XXIX

*Suits by or against Corporations*

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| 1 Subscription and verification of pleading                      | 848 |
| 2 Service on corporation   | 849 |
| 3 Power to require personal attendance of officer of corporation | 850 |

## ORDER XXX

*Suits by or against Firms and Persons carrying on business in names other than their own.*

|    |   |     |
|----|---|-----|
| 1  | Suing of partners in name of firm                                   | 850 |
| 2  | Dis closure of partners names                                       | 853 |
| 3  | Service   | 853 |
| 4  | Right of suit on death of partner                                   | 855 |
| 5  | Notice in what capacity served                                      | 856 |
| 6  | Appearance of partners  | 857 |
| 7  | No appearance except by partners                                    | 858 |
| 8  | Appearance under protest  | 859 |
| 9  | Suits between co partners   | 859 |
| 10 | Suit against person carrying on business in name other than his own | 860 |

## ORDER XXXI

*Suits by or against Trustees Executors and Administrators*

|   |   |     |
|---|---|-----|
| 1 | Representation of beneficiaries in suits concerning property vested in trustees etc | 861 |
| 2 | Joinder of trustees executors and administrators                                    | 861 |
| 3 | Husband of married executrix not to join  | 862 |

## ORDER XXXII

*Suits by or against Minors and Persons of Unsound Mind*

|    |  |     |
|----|--|-----|
| 1  | Minor to sue by next friend  | 862 |
| 2  | Where suit is instituted without next friend plaint to be taken off the file       | 864 |
| 3  | Guardian for the suit to be appointed by Court for minor defendant                 | 865 |
| 4  | Who may act as next friend or be appointed guardian for the suit                   | 869 |
| 5  | Representation of minor by next friend or guardian for the suit                    | 872 |
| 6  | Receipt by next friend or guardian for the suit of property under decree for minor | 872 |
| 7  | Agreement or compromise by next friend or guardian for the suit                    | 873 |
| 8  | Retirement of next friend  | 878 |
| 9  | Removal of next friend   | 878 |
| 10 | Stay of proceedings on removal etc of next friend                                  | 879 |
| 11 | Retirement removal or death of guardian for the suit                               | 879 |
| 12 | Course to be followed by minor plaintiff or applicant on attaining majority        | 880 |
| 13 | Where minor co plaintiff attaining majority desires to repudiate suit              | 880 |
| 14 | Unreasonable or improper suit  | 881 |
| 15 | Application of rules to persons of unsound mind                                    | 881 |
| 16 | Saving for Princes and Chiefs  | 882 |

## ORDER XXXIII.

*Suits by paupers*

|   |  |     |
|---|--|-----|
| 1 | Suits may be instituted in forma pauperis                                    | 882 |
| 2 | Contents of application  | 884 |
| 3 | Presentation of application  | 885 |
| 4 | Examination of applicant   | 885 |
|   | If presented by agent Court may order applicant to be examined by commission | 885 |



| RULES   | PAGE |
|---|------|
| 5 Rejection of application  | 886  |
| 6 Notice of day for receiving evidence of applicant's pauperism                             | 888  |
| 7 Procedure at hearing  | 888  |
| 8 Procedure if application admitted   | 890  |
| 9 Dispaupering  | 890  |
| 10 Costs where pauper succeeds  | 891  |
| 11 Procedure where prayer fails   | 893  |
| 12 Government may apply for payment of Court fees   | 895  |
| 13 Government to be deemed a party  | 895  |
| 14 Copy of decree to be sent to Collector   | 895  |
| 15 Refusal to allow applicant to sue as pauper to bar subsequent application of like nature | 895  |
| 16 Costs  | 896  |

## ORDER XXXIV

*Suits relating to Mortgages of Immovable Property*

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| 1 Parties to suits for foreclosure sale and redemption                    | 896 |
| 2 Preliminary decree in foreclosure suit                                  | 900 |
| 3 Final decree in foreclosure suit  | 911 |
| Power to enlarge time   | 912 |
| Discharge of debt   | 912 |
| 4 Preliminary decree in suit for sale                                     | 915 |
| Power to decree sale in foreclosure suit                                  | 915 |
| 5 Final decree in suit for sale   | 918 |
| 6 Recovery of balance due on mortgage in suit for sale                    | 922 |
| 7 Preliminary decree in redemption suit                                   | 925 |
| 8 Final decree in redemption suit   | 928 |
| 8a Recovery of balance due on mortgage in suit for redemption             | 930 |
| 9 Decree where nothing is found due or where mortgagee has been over paid | 931 |
| 10 Costs of mortgagee subsequent to decree                                | 931 |
| 11 Payment of interest  | 932 |
| 12 Sale of property subject to prior mortgage                             | 933 |
| 13 Application of proceeds  | 935 |
| 14 Suit for sale necessary for bringing mortgaged property to sale        | 938 |
| 15 Mortgages by the deposit of title deeds and charges                    | 940 |

## ORDER XXXV

*Interpleader*

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| 1 Plaint in interpleader suit                             | 941 |
| 2 Payment of thing claimed into Court                     | 941 |
| 3 Procedure where defendant is suing plaintiff            | 941 |
| 4 Procedure at first hearing                              | 942 |
| 5 Agents and tenants may not institute interpleader suits | 942 |
| 6 Charge for plaintiff's costs                            | 943 |

## ORDER XXXVI

*Special Case*

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| 1 Power to state case for Court's opinion      | 943 |
| 2 Where value of subject matter must be stated | 944 |

# CONTENTS

viii

| RULES   | PAGE |
|---|------|
| 3 Agreement to be filed and registered as suit  | 944  |
| 4 Parties to be subject to Court's jurisdiction | 944  |
| 5 Hearing and disposal of case                  | 944  |

## ORDER XXXVII

### *Summary Jurisdiction on Negotiable Instruments*

|   |   |     |
|---|---|-----|
| 1 | Application of Order  | 945 |
| 2 | Institution of summary suit upon bills of exchange etc                | 946 |
| 3 | Defendant showing defence on merits to have leave to appear           | 949 |
| 4 | Power to set aside decree   | 950 |
| 5 | Power to order bill etc to be deposited with officer of Court         | 950 |
| 6 | Recovery of cost of noting non-acceptance of dishonoured bill or note | 950 |
| 7 | Procedure in suits  | 950 |

## ORDER XXXVIII

### *Arrest and Attachment before Judgment*

#### *Arrest before Judgment*

|   |  |     |
|---|--|-----|
| 1 | Where defendant may be called upon to furnish security for appearance      | 950 |
| 2 | Security   | 952 |
| 3 | Procedure on application by surety to be discharged                        | 953 |
| 4 | Procedure where defendant fails to furnish security or find fresh security | 953 |

#### *Attachment before Judgment*

|    |   |     |
|----|---|-----|
| 5  | Where defendant may be called upon to furnish security for production of property                         | 953 |
| 6  | Attachment where cause not shown or security not furnished  | 953 |
| 7  | Mode of making attachment   | 956 |
| 8  | Investigation of claim to property attached before judgment   | 956 |
| 9  | Removal of attachment when security furnished or suit dismissed   | 956 |
| 10 | Attachment before judgment not to affect rights of strangers nor bar decree holder from applying for sale | 957 |
| 11 | Property attached before judgment not to be re-attached in execution of decree                            | 958 |
| 12 | Agricultural produce not attachable before judgment   | 959 |
| 13 | Small Cause Court not to attach immovable property  | 959 |

## ORDER XXXIX

### *Temporary Injunctions and Interlocutory Orders*

#### *Temporary Injunctions*

|   |   |     |
|---|---|-----|
| 1 | Cases in which temporary injunction may be granted                  | 959 |
| 2 | Injunction to restrain repetition or continuance of breach          | 964 |
| 3 | Before granting injunction Court to direct notice to opposite party | 967 |
| 4 | Order for injunction may be discharged varied or set aside          | 968 |
| 5 | Injunction to corporation binding on its officers                   | 968 |

#### *Interlocutory Orders*

|    |  |     |
|----|--|-----|
| 6  | Power to order interim sale  | 968 |
| 7  | Detention preservation inspection etc of subject matter of suit                  | 968 |
| 8  | Application for such orders to be after notice                                   | 969 |
| 9  | When party may be put in immediate possession of land the subject matter of suit | 969 |
| 10 | Deposit of money etc in Court  | 969 |

| RULES   | PAGE |
|---|------|
| 5 Rejection of application  | 886  |
| 6 Notice of day for receiving evidence of applicant a pauperism                             | 888  |
| 7 Procedure at hearing  | 888  |
| 8 Procedure if application admitted   | 890  |
| 9 Dispaupering  | 890  |
| 10 Costs where pauper succeeds  | 891  |
| 11 Procedure where pauper fails   | 893  |
| 12 Government may apply for payment of Court fees   | 895  |
| 13 Government to be deemed a party  | 895  |
| 14 Copy of decree to be sent to Collector   | 895  |
| 15 Refusal to allow applicant to sue as pauper to bar subsequent application of like nature | 895  |
| 16 Costs  | 896  |

## ORDER XXXII

*Suits relating to Mortgages of Immovable Property*

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| 1 Parties to suits for foreclosure sale and redemption                    | 896 |
| 2 Preliminary decree in foreclosure suit                                  | 905 |
| 3 Final decree in foreclosure suit  | 911 |
| Power to enlarge time   | 912 |
| Discharge of debt   | 912 |
| 4 Preliminary decree in suit for sale                                     | 915 |
| Power to decree sale in foreclosure suit                                  | 915 |
| 5 Final decree in suit for sale   | 917 |
| 6 Recovery of balance due on mortgage in suit for sale                    | 922 |
| 7 Preliminary decree in redemption suit                                   | 925 |
| 8 Final decree in redemption suit   | 928 |
| 8A Recovery of balance due on mortgage in suit for redemption             | 930 |
| 9 Decree where nothing is found due or where mortgages has been over paid | 931 |
| 10 Costs of mortgages subsequent to decree                                | 931 |
| 11 Payment of interest  | 932 |
| 12 Sale of property subject to prior mortgage                             | 935 |
| 13 Application of proceeds  | 935 |
| 14 Suit for sale necessary for bringing mortgaged property to sale        | 936 |
| 15 Mortgages by the deposit of title deeds and charges                    | 940 |

## ORDER XXXV

*Interpleader*

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| 1 Plaint in interpleader suit                             | 941 |
| 2 Payment of thing claimed into Court                     | 941 |
| 3 Procedure where defendant is suing plaintiff            | 941 |
| 4 Procedure at first hearing                              | 942 |
| 5 Agents and tenants may not institute interpleader suits | 942 |
| 6 Charge for plaintiff's costs                            | 943 |

## ORDER XXXVI

*Special Case.*

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| 1 Power to state case for Court's opinion      | 943 |
| 2 Where value of subject matter must be stated | 944 |

# CONTENTS

XXVI

| RULES   | PAGE |
|---|------|
| 3 Agreement to be filed and registered as suit  | 944  |
| 4 Parties to be subject to Court's jurisdiction | 944  |
| 5 Hearing and disposal of case                  | 944  |

## ORDER XXXVII

### *Summary Procedure on Negotiable Instruments*

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| 1 Application of Order  | 945 |
| 2 Institution of summary suits upon bills of exchange etc               | 946 |
| 3 Defendant showing defence on merits to have leave to appear           | 949 |
| 4 Power to set aside decree   | 950 |
| 5 Power to order bill etc to be deposited with officer of Court         | 950 |
| 6 Recovery of cost of noting non acceptance of dishonoured bill or note | 950 |
| 7 Procedure in suits  | 950 |

## ORDER XXXVIII

### *Arrest and Attachment before Judgment*

#### *Arrest before Judgment*

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| 1 Where defendant may be called upon to furnish security for appearance      | 950 |
| 2 Security   | 952 |
| 3 Procedure on application by security to be discharged                      | 955 |
| 4 Procedure where defendant fails to furnish security or find fresh security | 953 |

#### *Attachment before Judgment*

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| 5 Where defendant may be called upon to furnish security for production of property                          | 953 |
| 6 Attachment where cause not shown or security not furnished   | 955 |
| 7 Mode of making attachment  | 956 |
| 8 Investigation of claim to property attached before judgment  | 956 |
| 9 Removal of attachment when security furnished or suit dismissed  | 956 |
| 10 Attachment before judgment not to affect rights of strangers nor bar decree holder from applying for sale | 957 |
| 11 Property attached before judgment not to be re attached in execution of decree                            | 958 |
| 12 Agricultural produce not attachable before judgment   | 959 |
| 13 Small Cause Court not to attach immovable property  | 959 |

## ORDER XXXIX

### *Temporary Injunctions and Interlocutory Orders*

#### *Temporary Injunctions*

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| 1 Cases in which temporary injunction may be granted                  | 959 |
| 2 Injunction to restrain repetition or continuance of breach          | 964 |
| 3 Before granting injunction Court to direct notice to opposite party | 967 |
| 4 Order for injunction may be discharged varied or set aside          | 968 |
| 5 Injunction to corporation binding on its officers                   | 968 |

#### *Interlocutory Orders*

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| 6 Power to order interim sale  | 968 |
| 7 Detention preservation inspection etc of subject matter of suit                  | 968 |
| 8 Application for such orders to be after notice                                   | 969 |
| 9 When party may be put in immediate possession of land the subject matter of suit | 969 |
| 10 Deposit of money etc in Court   | 969 |

## ORDER XL

| RULES | <i>Appointment of Receivers</i>          | PAGE |
|-------|--|------|
| 1     | Appointment of receivers                 | 970  |
| 2     | Remuneration                             | 981  |
| 3     | Duties                                   | 981  |
| 4     | Enforcement of receiver's duties         | 982  |
| 5     | When Collector may be appointed receiver | 983  |

## ORDER XLI

*Appeals from Original Decrees*

|   |   |     |
|---|---|-----|
| 1 | Form of appeal What to accompany memorandum   | 983 |
|   | Contents of memorandum  | 983 |
| 2 | Grounds which may be taken in appeal  | 983 |
| 3 | Rejection or amendment of memorandum  | 987 |
| 4 | One of several plaintiffs or defendants may obtain reversal of whole decree where it proceeds on ground common to all | 987 |

*Stay of proceedings and of execution*

|   |   |     |
|---|---|-----|
| 5 | Stay by appellate Court   | 989 |
|   | Stay by Court which passed the decree   | 989 |
| 6 | Security in case of order for execution of decree appealed from                     | 993 |
| 7 | No security to be required from the Government or a public officer in certain cases | 994 |
| 8 | Exercise of powers in appeal from order made in execution of decrees                | 994 |

*Procedure on admission of appeal*

|    |   |      |
|----|---|------|
| 9  | Registry of memorandum of appeal                                    | 994  |
|    | Register of appeals   | 994  |
| 10 | Appellate Court may require appellant to furnish security for costs | 995  |
|    | Where an appellant resides out of British India                     | 995  |
| 11 | Power to dismiss appeal without sending notice to lower Court       | 997  |
| 12 | Day for hearing appeal  | 999  |
| 13 | Appellate Court to give notice to Court whose decree appealed from  | 999  |
|    | Transmission of papers to appellate Court                           | 999  |
|    | Copies of exhibits in Court whose decree appealed from              | 999  |
| 14 | Publication and service of notice of day for hearing of appeal      | 1000 |
|    | Appellate Court may itself cause notice to be served                | 1000 |
| 15 | Contents of notice  | 1000 |

*Procedure on hearing*

|    |  |      |
|----|--|------|
| 16 | Right to begin   | 1000 |
| 17 | Dismissal of appeal for appellant's default  | 1001 |
|    | Hearing appeal <i>ex parte</i>   | 1001 |
| 18 | Dismissal of appeal where notice not served in consequence of appellant's failure to deposit costs | 1001 |
| 19 | Re admission of appeal dismissed for default   | 1002 |
| 20 | Power to adjourn hearing and direct persons appearing interested to be made respondents            | 1003 |
| 21 | Re hearing on application of respondent against whom <i>ex parte</i> decree made                   | 1004 |

| RULES  | PAGE |
|--|------|
| 2. Upon hearing respondent may object to decree as if he had preferred separate appeal                 | 1004 |
| Form of objection and provisions applicable thereto  | 1004 |
| 23 Remand of case by appellate Court   | 1008 |
| 24 Where evidence on record sufficient appellate Court may determine case finally                      | 1014 |
| 25 Where appellate Court may frame issues and refer them for trial to Court whose decree appealed from | 1014 |
| 26 Findings and evidence to be put on record Objections to finding                                     | 1015 |
| Determination of appeal  | 1015 |
| 27 Production of additional evidence in appellate Court  | 1016 |
| 28 Mode of taking additional evidence  | 1020 |
| 29 Points to be defined and recorded   | 1020 |

*Judgment in Appeal*

|  |      |
|--|------|
| 30 Judgment when and where pronounced      | 1020 |
| 31 Contents date and signature of judgment | 1021 |
| 32 What judgment may direct                | 1023 |
| 33 Power of Court of Appeal                | 1023 |
| 34 Dissent to be recorded                  | 1020 |

*Decree in Appeal*

|  |      |
|--|------|
| 35 Date and contents of decree   | 1020 |
| Judge dissenting from judgment need not sign decree                        | 1026 |
| 36 Copies of judgment and decree to be furnished to parties                | 1027 |
| 37 Certified copy of decree to be sent to Court whose decree appealed from | 1027 |

ORDER XLII

*Appeals from Appellate Decrees*

|             |      |
|-------------|------|
| 1 Procedure | 1027 |
|-------------|------|

ORDER XLIII

*Appeals from Orders*

|                       |      |
|-----------------------|------|
| 1 Appeals from orders | 1028 |
| 2 Procedure           | 1030 |

ORDER XLIV

*Pauper Appeals*

|  |      |
|--|------|
| 1 Who may appeal as pauper                       | 1030 |
| Procedure on application for admission of appeal | 1030 |
| 2 Inquiry into pauperism                         | 1032 |

ORDER XLV

*Appeals to the King in Council*

|  |      |
|--|------|
| 1 Decree defined                                   | 1032 |
| 2 Application to Court whose decree complained of  | 1032 |
| 3 Certificate as to value or fitness               | 1033 |
| 4 Consolidation of suits                           | 1034 |
| 5 Permission of dispute to Court of first instance | 1035 |

| RULES  | PAGE |
|--|------|
| 6 Effect of refusal of certificate                             | 1036 |
| 7 Security and deposit required on grant of certificate        | 1036 |
| 8 Admission of appeal and procedure thereon                    | 1038 |
| 9 Revocation of acceptance of security                         | 1038 |
| 9 A Power to dispense with notices in case of deceased parties | 1038 |
| 10 Power to order further security or payment                  | 1039 |
| 11 Effect of failure to comply with order                      | 1039 |
| 12 Refund of balance deposited                                 | 1039 |
| 13 Powers of Court pending appeal                              | 1039 |
| 14 Increase of security found inadequate                       | 1041 |
| 15 Procedure to enforce orders of King in Council              | 1042 |
| 16 Appeal from order relating to execution                     | 1042 |

## ORDER XLVI

*Reference*

|   |      |
|---|------|
| 1 Reference of question to High Court   | 1045 |
| 2 Court may pass decree contingent upon decision of High Court  | 1047 |
| 3 Judgment of High Court to be transmitted and case disposed of accordingly                                       | 1047 |
| 4 Costs of reference to High Court  | 1047 |
| 5 Power to alter etc. decree of Court making reference  | 1047 |
| 6 Power to refer to High Court questions as to jurisdiction in small causes                                       | 1047 |
| 7 Power to District Court to submit for revision proceedings had under mistake as to jurisdiction in small causes | 1048 |

## ORDER XLVII

*Review*

|  |      |
|--|------|
| 1 Application for review of judgment   | 1050 |
| 2 To whom applications for review may be made                                | 1050 |
| 3 Form of applications for review  | 1057 |
| 4 Application where rejected   | 107  |
| Application where granted  | 107  |
| 5 Application for review in Court consisting of two or more Judges           | 1059 |
| 6 Application where rejected   | 1059 |
| 7 Order of rejection not appealable Objections to order granting application | 1059 |
| 8 Registry of application granted and order for rehearing                    | 1062 |
| 9 Bar of certain applications  | 106  |

## ORDER XLVIII

*Miscellaneous*

|   |      |
|---|------|
| 1 Process to be served at expenses of party issuing | 1062 |
| Costs of service                                    | 1062 |
| 2 Orders and notices how served                     | 1062 |
| 3 Use of forms in appendices                        | 1062 |

## ORDER XLIX

*Chartered High Courts*

|  |      |
|--|------|
| 1 Who may serve processes of High Court      | 1063 |
| 2 Saving in respect of Chartered High Courts | 1063 |
| 3 Application of rules                       | 1063 |

# CONTENTS

XXXV

| RULES | PAGE |
|-------|------|
|-------|------|

## ORDER L

### *Provincial Small Cause Courts*

|                                 |      |
|---------------------------------|------|
| 1 Provincial Small Cause Courts | 1064 |
|---------------------------------|------|

## ORDER LI

### *Presidency Small Cause Courts*

|                                 |      |
|---------------------------------|------|
| 1 Presidency Small Cause Courts | 1064 |
|---------------------------------|------|

## APPENDICES TO THE FIRST SCHEDULE

### FORMS

|  |      |
|--|------|
| A—PLEADINGS                                  | 1065 |
| 1 Titles of suits                            | 1065 |
| 2 Description of parties in particular cases | 1065 |
| 3 Plaints                                    | 1066 |
| 4 Written statements                         | 1085 |
| B—PROCESS                                    | 1090 |
| C—DISCOVERY, INSPECTION AND ADMISSION        | 1099 |
| D—DECREES                                    | 1103 |
| E—EXECUTION                                  | 1130 |
| F—SUPPLEMENTAL PROCEEDINGS                   | 1147 |
| G—APPEAL, REFERENCE AND REVIEW               | 1152 |
| H—MISCELLANEOUS                              | 1157 |

## THE SECOND SCHEDULE

|                |      |
|----------------|------|
| ARBITRATION    | 1164 |
| APPENDIX—FORMS | 1190 |

## THE THIRD SCHEDULE

|                                    |      |
|------------------------------------|------|
| EXECUTION OF DECREES BY COLLECTORS | 1201 |
|------------------------------------|------|

## THE FOURTH SCHEDULE

|                    |      |
|--------------------|------|
| ENACTMENTS AMENDED | 1209 |
|--------------------|------|

## MISCELLANEOUS

|  |      |
|--|------|
| APPENDIX I—High Courts Act 1861  | 1210 |
| Government of India Act 1915   | 1215 |
| Despatch from the Secretary of State for India dated the 14th May 1862 | 1225 |



|  | PAGE |
|--|------|
| APPENDIX II —Letters Patent—Calcutta Bombay and Madras             | 1234 |
| —Allahabad   | 1276 |
| —Patna   | 1281 |
| —Lahore  | 1292 |
| —Rangoon   | 1300 |
| RULES  |      |
| APPENDIX III —Rules made by the High Court of Calcutta under s 122 | 1311 |
| APPENDIX IV —Rules made by the High Court of Bombay under s 122    | 1317 |
| APPENDIX V —Rules made by the High Court of Allahabad under s 122  | 1372 |
| APPENDIX VI —Rules made by the High Court of Madras under s 122    | 1348 |
| APPENDIX VII —Rules made by the High Court of Lahore under s 122   | 1390 |
| APPENDIX VIII —Rules made by the High Court of Patna under s 122   | 1388 |
| GENERAL INDEX  | 1303 |

---

# TABLE OF CASES

## A

- Ab v Dhunlu Bai 177  
 Abbe v Kumbamma 11  
 Abbas v Fakhruddin 20 25  
 Aba Khan v Nitarani Dec 13  
 Abay v Nanthu 589  
 Abey v Andrews 170  
 Abey Matheson 488  
 Abutaker v Mulin 116  
 Aba Begam v Muzaffar 14 141  
 Abu v Ashmed 317  
 Abu v Amar 201  
 Abdul v Chukhun 157  
 Abdul v Chunty 397  
 Abdul v Dautre 17  
 Abdul v Fagar 818  
 Abdul v Ganapati 96  
 Abdul v Mahomed 100  
 Abdul v Matiyar 44 46  
 Abdul v Mitri 188  
 Abdul v Muhammad 71  
 Abdul v Shahana 13  
 Abdul v Vaman 101  
 Abdul Alim Abd v Amir Jan Bibi 20  
 Abdul Ali v Makhani 57  
 Abdul Aziz v Abdul Rahim 100  
 Abdul Aziz v Appayasami 69 70  
 Abdul Aziz v Basdeo Singh 79 79  
 Abdul Aziz v Chanda 36 119  
 Abdul Aziz v Ibrahim 81  
 Abdul Aziz v Punjab National Bank Ltd 463 41  
 Abdul Aziz v Tafazuddin 70  
 Abdul Basit v Ashfaq 77  
 Abdul Caffar v Official Assignee 878  
 Abdul Cufur v Albyn 606  
 Abdul Cufur v Alimah 429  
 Abdul Cani v Dunne 51  
 Abdul Ghafur v Gulam 742  
 Abdul Chani v Din Dival 1171  
 Abdul Chani v Muhammad 1007  
 Abdul Hakim v Hem Chandra 1059  
 Abdul Hakim v Karan Singh 441  
 Abdul Hakim v Mahomed Burramudin 1 273 133  
 v Haji Ismail & Co v Rabiabai 702  
 Abdul Hamid v Muhammad 219 1178  
 Abdul Hamid v Riazuddin 1166  
 Abdul Haq v Sheo Ram 361  
 Abdul Hassan v Zohra 528  
 Abdul Hossain v Kasi Sahu 7 816  
 Abdul Hossain v Turner 483 03  
 Abdul Hussain v Mahomed Ali 1244  
 Abdul Hussain v D F Mistry & Co 781  
 Abdul Jubbair v Sita Ram 77  
 Abdul Kader v Ali Msa 723  
 Abdul Kader v Dharma 23  
 Abdul Kader v Dollmalila 49 70  
 Abdul Kader v Hurrea 786  
 Abdul Kader v Somasundaram 721  
 Abdul Karim v Abdul Subhan 278  
 Abdul Karim v Allah Bakhsh 1036  
 Abdul Karim v Badruddeen 146  
 Abdul Karim v Bulla 62  
 Abdul Karim v Islamun Nissa Bibi, 100 101  
 Abdul Karim v Lakshmanawami 607  
 Abdul Karim v Muhammad 439  
 Abdul Karim v Thakordis 201 201  
 Abdul Kader v The Official Assignee of Madras 1261  
 Abdul Khader v Ahmad 174  
 Abdul Lateef v Dautre 191  
 Abdul Latif v Bathula 610  
 Abdul Majid v Bedyadhar 1030  
 Abdul Majid v Jawahur 7 136 914 1015  
 Abdul Majid v Jew Naram 36  
 Abdul Nasar v Lalita 747  
 Abdul Ohad v Amdah 147  
 Abdul Rafikhan v Maula 650  
 Abdul Rahim v Abdul Rahman 219 70  
 Abdul Rahim v Ojamshee 72  
 Abdul Rahman v Mahomed 11 61 81  
 Abdul Rahman v Amin 977  
 Abdul Rahman v Amir Ali 433

|  | PAGE |
|--|------|
| APPENDIX II —Letters Patent—Calcutta Bombay and Madras             | 1234 |
| —Allahabad   | 1246 |
| —Patna   | 1281 |
| —Lahore  | 1292 |
| —Rangoon   | 1300 |
| RULES  |      |
| APPENDIX III —Rules made by the High Court of Calcutta under s 122 | 1311 |
| APPENDIX IV —Rules made by the High Court of Bombay under s 122    | 1317 |
| APPENDIX V —Rules made by the High Court of Allahabad under s 122  | 1372 |
| APPENDIX VI —Rules made by the High Court of Madras under s 122    | 1348 |
| APPENDIX VII —Rules made by the High Court of Lahore under s 122   | 1380 |
| APPENDIX VIII —Rules made by the High Court of Patna under s 122   | 1390 |
| GENERAL INDEX  | 1393 |

# TABLE OF CASES

## A

Aba v Dhondu Bai 177  
 Abbakke v Kanhamma 11  
 Abbas v Fasih ud din 620 621  
 Abbas Khan v Niharam Dass 130  
 Abbas v Nanhi 889  
 Abbot v Andrews 130  
 Abbas v Matheson 458  
 Abbubaker v Mohudin 416  
 Abda Begam v Muzaffar 140 146  
 Abdu v Mahomed 547  
 Abdul v Amar 294  
 Abdul v Chukhun 607  
 Abdul v Chuma 397  
 Abdul v Doutre 17  
 Abdul v Eggar 808  
 Abdul v Ganapathi 94  
 Abdul v Mahomed 166  
 Abdul v Mativar 744 746  
 Abdul v Mitr 185  
 Abdul v Muhammad 712  
 Abdul v Shahana 543  
 Abdul v Vaman 104  
 Abdul Alim Abed v Abir Jan Bibi 270  
 Abdul Ali v Shakhani 7  
 Abdul Aziz v Abdul Rahim 100  
 Abdul Aziz v Appayyaiah 769 770  
 Abdul Aziz v Basdeo Singh 790 792  
 Abdul Aziz v Chandu 36 1197  
 Abdul Aziz v Ebrahim 812  
 Abdul Azi v Punjab National Bank Ltd 463 541  
 Abdul Aziz v Tafazuddin 750  
 Abdul Basit v Ashfaq 37  
 Abdul Gaffar v Official Assignee 838  
 Abdul Gafur v Albyn 696  
 Abdul Gafur v Alimah 429  
 Abdul Gani v Dunne 751  
 Abdul Ghafur v Gulam 742  
 Abdul Ghani v Din Dayal 1171  
 Abdul Ghani v Muhammad 1007  
 Abdul Hakim v Hem Chandra 1088  
 Abdul Hakim v Karan Singh 444

Abdul Hakim v Mahomed Burramudin 71 73 339  
 A Hapi Ismail & Co v Pabrabat 702  
 Abdul Hamid v Muhammad 219 1178  
 Abdul Hamid v Riaz ud din 1166  
 Abdul Haq v Sheo Ram 304  
 Abdul Hasan v Zohra 628  
 Abdul Hossein v Kasi Sahu 816  
 Abdul Hossein v Turner 483 803  
 Abdul Husain v Mahomed Ally 1244  
 Abdul Hussein v D J Mistry & Co 344  
 Abdul Jubbar v Sita Parn 732  
 Abdul Kadir v Ali Mia 723  
 Abdul Kadir v Dharma 23  
 Abdul Kadir v Dollanbibi 69 70  
 Abdul Kadir v Hurree 386  
 Abdul Kadir v Somasundaram 721  
 Abdul Karim v Abdul Sobhan 278  
 Abdul Karim v Allah Bakhsh 1030  
 Abdul Karim v Badruddeen 1240  
 Abdul Karim v Bullen 672  
 Abdul Karim v Islamun Nissa Bibi, 152 104  
 Abdul Karim v Lakshmanaswami 663  
 Abdul Karim v Muhammad 439  
 Abdul Karim v Thakordas 204 200  
 Abdul Khader v The Official Assignee of Madras 1261  
 Abdul Khadir v Ahammed 174  
 Abdul Lateef v Doutre 194  
 Abdul Latif v Bathula 640  
 Abdul Majid v Bedyadhar 1000  
 Abdul Majid v Jawahir 7 135 014 1045  
 Abdul Majid v Jew Narain 36  
 Abdul Nayar v Lalita 747  
 Abdul Ohad v Amdali 547  
 Abdul Rafikhan v Maula 60  
 Abdul Rahim v Abdul Rahman 219 250  
 Abdul Rahim v Ojamshee 72  
 Abdul Rahuman v Mahomed 11 61 80  
 Abdul Rahman v Amin 907  
 Abdul Rahman v Amir Ali 433

Abdul Rahman v Fatch Naram 214  
 Abdul Rahman v Shahab ud Din 78  
 1173  
 Abdul Pahman v Shahana 3  
 Abdul Rashid *In re* 1239  
 Abdul Rashid v Gappo Lal 208  
 Abdul Rehman v Cassum 269  
 Abdul Salim v Veerabhadra 231  
 Abdul Satar v Chi Doe Rhi 100  
 Abdul Sattar v Special Deputy Collec-  
 tor 34, 1221  
 Abdul Shaker v Abdul Pahman 9  
 Abdul Shakur v Muhammad Natadin  
 1201  
 A T K P L M Muthu v Lakshmi  
 narayan 1000 1008  
 Abdul Sidiq v Abdul Aziz 1052 1060  
 Abdul Wahid v Sheikh Ali 50  
 Abdulla v Muhammad 794  
 Abdulla Sahib v Oosman Sahib 239  
 Abdullah v Admr Genl of Bengal 3-1  
 Abdullah v Ganesh Das 73  
 Abdullah v Salaru 1220 1221  
 Abdullah Khan v Banke Lal 961  
 Abdullah Khan v Muhammad 1009  
 Abdullakhan v Khanmia 72  
 Abdur Rahim v Abu Mahomed 278  
 Abdur Rahim v Mahomed Barkat  
 Ali 27 274 276 491 423  
 Abdur Rahman v Abdur Rahman 1021  
 Abdur Rahman v Shankar 177  
 Abdur Rashid v Qudrat un nissa 411  
 Abdur Rashid v The Sizing Materials  
 Co 104  
 Abbaidat v Ragho 438  
 Abinas Chandra v Pratul Chandra 224  
 Abinash v Ananda 673  
 Abinash v Bhuban 763  
 Abinash Chandra v Dasarath 1004  
 Ablakk v Bhagirathi 11  
 Abraham v Donald 352  
 Abraham & Co v Ebrahim 078  
 Abrahams & Co v Dunlop Pneumatic  
 Tyre Co 802 803  
 Abraham v Abraham 1013  
 Abu Muhammad v Mukut Iertap 388  
 Achaya v Ratnavelu 1060  
 Achharbar v Hargobind 57  
 Achharbar v Tapasi 200  
 Achul v Rajun 510  
 Achut v Nagappa 390 391 1016 1031  
 Achuta v Achutan 810  
 Achuthayya v Thummayya 315 1180

Achyut v Ramchandra 127  
 Achyut v Tapiba 1001 1008  
 Adakkala v Imperial Bank 368  
 Adam v Townsend 858  
 Adams v Great North of Scotland Ry  
 Co 1180  
 Adamson v Arumugam 419  
 Adarji v Manekji 880 1050  
 Adenna v Chinna 746  
 Adhar v Pulin 386  
 Adhar Chandra v Lal Mohun 705  
 Adipuranam v Gopala am 917  
 Adit Prasad v Ramharakh 392 517  
 1004  
 Aditya Prasad v Ram Narayan 670  
 Aditya Prasad v Hargovind Singh 925  
 Adiveppa v Praggi 503 858  
 Administrator General v Aghore 769  
 Administrator General of Bengal v Lalit  
 Mohan Roy 000  
 Administrator General of Bengal v The  
 Land Acquisition Collector 345  
 Administrator General v Chettyar 343  
 Administrator General v Premial 2 3  
 971 979  
 Administrator General v Sultanah 066  
 Advocate *In re* (1906 4 Cal LJ 009)  
 1239  
 Advocate *In re* (44 Cal 741) 1240  
 Advocate *In the matter of* (1923 46  
 Mad 903) 1239  
 Advocate General v Adamji 569  
 Advocate General v Punjabai 267  
 Advocate General of Bombay v Gangji  
 960  
 Advocate General of Bombay v  
 Yusufali 24 272  
 Advocates *In the matter of* certain first  
 Grade (1 Rang 142) 1302  
 Adwaita v The Chittagong Co 381 605  
 666  
 Adya Saran v Jagannath 1220  
 Aetnsselskabet Dampskib Hercules  
 v Grand Trunk Pacific Railway 819  
 Aftab Begam v Hap Abdul 1175  
 Afzal v Akbari 816  
 Afzal Shah v Lachmi Narain 453 809  
 Aga Gulam Husain v Sassoon 472  
 Aga Khan v Times Publishing Co 484  
 Aga Mahomed v Cohen 18  
 Aga Mahomed v Syed Mahomed 13  
 Agabeg v Sundari 080  
 Agent Bengal Nagpur Railway v  
 Behari Lal 433

- Agha Husain v Qaim Ali 217 764  
 Agha Sultan v Mohabbatkhan 717  
 Aghore v Prem Chund 60  
 Aghore Nath v Kamini Debi 23  
 Agilul v Dino Nath 100  
 Ahad Shah v Aijhan 118  
 Ahamad v Basava 34 349  
 Ahud v Mahendra Lal 104 1061  
 Ah Kwar v Administrator General 125  
 Ahmad v Alul Rehman 91  
 Ahmad v Nihal ud din 6  
 Ahmad Ali v Waris Husain 98 102  
 Ahmad Baksh v Lalit 53  
 Ahmad Din v Atlas Trading Co 347 118  
 Ahmad Husain v Golind 716 30 321  
 Ahmad Hussain v Muhammad Qaim 693  
 Ahmad Noor Khan v Abdur Rahman 1149  
 Ahmad Shah v Fauzdar 1 1  
 Ahmad Yar v Bore 97 705  
 Ahmaduddin v Majlis Pasi 19  
 Ahmad ud-din v Sikandar 45 45  
 Ahmed v Ayesha Bai 73 125  
 Ahmed v A. L. A. R. Chettiar Firm 628  
 Ahmed v Fakir 443  
 Ahmed v Hashim 294  
 Ahmed v Moidin 70  
 Ahmed v Shaikh Faza 926  
 Ahmed Ali v Abdul Majid 4  
 Ahmed Asmal v Bai Bibi 97  
 Ahmed Husain v Hardial 34 549  
 Ahmedabad Advance Co v Lakshmi Shanker 29  
 Ahmedbhai v Petit 13  
 Ahmedbhai v Balkrishna 419  
 Ahmedbhai v Vallcebhoy 575  
 Ahsanulla v Hari Charan 994  
 Ai Bai v Kahan 723  
 Ainsworth v Widding 4 93 397  
 Aishabai v Essaji 1179  
 Aishan v Muhammad 47 51  
 Aitamma v Naraina 52a  
 Aithala v Subbanna 308  
 Aiyar v Gopanna 811 816 817  
 Aiyasamier v Venkatchela 172 923  
 Aiyathurai v Muhamed Meera 415 450  
 Aiyavu v Vellaya 418  
 Ajaub Nath v Mathura 627  
 Ajitsing v Grunning 80  
 Ajnabi Kuar v Suraj Prasad 678  
 Ajo Koer v Gorak Nath 109  
 Ajodhya v Musammat Phul Koer 372 542 543 554  
 Ajodhya Pershad v Sheo Pershad 50  
 Ajodhya Roy v Hardwar Roy 106  
 Ajodhya v Mahadeo 159  
 Ajudhya v Inayat Ullah 52  
 Ajudhya Prasad v Bular ul Husain 116 1186  
 Ajudhya Prasad v Balmukund 2  
 Ajudhya Prasad v Copi Nath 72  
 Ajudhya Prasad v Nand Lal 700  
 Akari v Aji 49  
 Akbar Khan v Muhammad 346 107  
 Akbari v Vilayat Ali 101  
 Akhoo v Ahmed 380  
 Akhoy v Surendra 606 661 806  
 Akkummi v Rap Lal 837  
 Akshya v Govindarajulu 761  
 Akula v Dhelli 978  
 Ala Singh v Wawa 154  
 Alagappa v Annamalai 102  
 Alagappa v Chockalingam 1006 107  
 Alagappa v Muthukumara 377  
 Alagappa v Nachiappan 772 227  
 Alagurami v Lakshmanan 901  
 Alagurami v Pamanathan 7  
 Alagurami v Sundareswara 4  
 Alagu v Mayilappa 826  
 Alam Singh v Gokal Singh 99  
 Alamelu v Rama 1004  
 Alcock Ashdown & Co v Chief 100  
 Authority 321 1219  
 Aldam v Brown 293  
 Alden v Beckley 800  
 Aldridge v Barrow 406 41  
 Aldwell v Ilaiah Baksh 29  
 Ali Afzal v Purna 80 84  
 Ali Ahmad v Saud Nian 102  
 Ali Ahmad Khan v Bai 100  
 Ali Akbar v Khurshed 1  
 Ali Bahadur v Rafiullah 102  
 Ali Baksh v Shaikh 61  
 Ali Gauhar v Banaraj 1  
 Ali Husain v Mohammad 100  
 Ali Hussein v Afzal Husain 100  
 Ali Jan v Marian Bibi 102  
 Ali Kader v Gobind 100  
 Ali Khan Bahadur v Lal 100  
 Ali Moidin v Komba 100  
 Ali Muhammad v Hak 100  
 Ali Saheb v Shabji 100  
 Ali Serang v Beado 100

Ali Sher Khan v Ahmed 1015  
 Alice Mary Hill v Clarke 490  
 Alim v Jhalo 863  
 Aliman v Hasiba 329  
 Alimunnissa v Shama Charan 54 52b  
 Alkama Bibi v Syed Istak 974  
 Ali Ditta v Shankar Das 108  
 Alla Bakhsh v Madho Ram 94  
 Alla Ditta v Abdul Qadir 97  
 Allahabad Bank v Motilal Barman 931  
 Allahakhs v Jehangir 1196  
 Allen Brothers v Arun 31 514 849  
 Allen Brothers & Co v Bando & Co 121  
 Allenborough v St Katharine's Docks 9  
 Alhusen v Labouchere 5 9 561  
 Alliance Bank v Mohan Lal 529  
 Aliott v Smith 563  
 Allport v Securities Co Ltd 967  
 Alluni v Kunjusha 47  
 Aloo v Gagubha 12  
 Altaf Ali v Lalji Mal 620  
 Altap Ali v Jamsur Ali 11 908  
 Alwar v Seshammal 11 602  
 Aman Singh v Narain 873  
 Amanat Bibi v Imdad Husain 3 436 1109  
 Amar Chandra v Sebal Chand 151 183  
 Amar Chandra v Shoshu Bhushan 329 1034  
 Amar Chundra v Guru Prasanno 146 606 609  
 Amar Singh v Ram Desi 643  
 Amara v Annamala 234 906  
 Amarchand v Banwari Lal 821  
 Amarendra v S Banerjee & Co 694  
 Amarsangji v Deepangji 68  
 Amarsangji v Desai 801  
 Amarsangji v Desai Umed 948 1024  
 Amba v Sriniva 1033  
 Amba Prasad v Mushtaq 309 1012  
 Ambaji v Hanmantrao 883  
 Ambalal v Narayan 938 939  
 Ambalam v Bartle 42  
 Ambalavana v The Advocate General 268  
 Ambli v Srideri 196  
 Ambli v Valla 930  
 Ambica v Nadyar 118  
 Ambica v Ram Prasad 77 778  
 Ambika v Manikganj Loan Office 140  
 Ambika Das v Ram Udit 404

Ambika Prasad v Jhinal Singh 784  
 Ambika Prasad v Pardip Singh 988  
 Ambu v Kethilamma 719  
 Ambubai v Shankarsa 813  
 Ambuja v Appadurai 1018  
 Amdoo Miyan v Muhammad 372  
 Ameer In the matter of 922  
 Ameer Ali v Inderjeet 289  
 Amer v Nathu 51  
 American and Mexican Co In re 74  
 American Trading Co v Bird & Co 128  
 Anuchand v Collector of Sholapur 860  
 Amina v Ram 92  
 Amina Bibi v K M Moideen 303  
 Aminabi v Sidu 913  
 Aminuddin v Atarmani 39  
 Amir v Mahadeo 384 385  
 Amir v Mohan 390  
 Amir v Prashad 120  
 Amir Ali v Harish Chandra 172  
 Amir Baksha v Venkatchala 732  
 Amir Beg v Ghulam Nabi 532  
 Amir Begam v Badruddin 1178 1179 1196  
 Amir Begam v Bank of Upper India 741  
 Amir Chand v Dishi 151  
 Amir Dulhan v Administrator General of Bengal 961  
 Amir Hasan v Ahmad Ali 990 993 1002  
 Amir Hassan Khar v Sheo Baksh Singh 3 3 31  
 Amir Kazim v Barbary 116  
 Amir Nath v Dhunput 335  
 Amirthan v Ali 886 889  
 Amrui Hassan v Khairunnesa 133  
 Amjad Ali v Ali Husain 341 1270  
 Amlook Chaud v Sarsa Chunder 914 1003  
 Ammuluttu v Manavikraman 973  
 Amolak v Lohani 142  
 Am Lal Shih v Charan Das 117  
 Amrit Lal v Madho Das 1002  
 Amrit Lal v Muridhar 141  
 Amrit Pam v Daxrat Pam 119  
 Amrit Poam v Daxrat Pam 119  
 Amrita v Andithrao 869  
 Amrita Lal v Anul 213  
 Amrita Lal v Rakkhal 798  
 Amrita Lal In the goods of 869  
 Amriteswari v Secretary of State 40  
 Amrith Nath v Dhunput 937  
 Amritam v Rampi 270 272

- Amritsar v Balkrishna, 111 347  
 Amritsar National Banking Co. Ltd v  
   Fazl Habi 49 531  
 Amritsaria v Gamun 513  
 Amtul v Mahammad 830  
 Amulya v Banku 671  
 Anand Lal v Empress 673  
 Anand Rao v Ramdas 67 67  
 Ananda v Promotha 633  
 Ananda Copal v Nafar Chandra 320  
 Ananda Pal v Maha Bai 1022  
 Ananda Pao v Appa Rao 61  
 Anandi Kunwar v Ram Narajana Das  
   22  
 Anandi Kunwari v Ajudhia Nath 163  
   49  
 Anandibai v Rajaram 200  
 Anandrao v Budra, 519  
 Anandrai v Shankar 25  
 Anagamanjari v Tripura Sundari 304  
   531  
 Anant v Mangal 333 1002  
 Anant v Nagappa 639 660  
 Anant v Ramchandra 1033  
 Anant Das v Uda; Bhan 36  
 Anant Potdar v Mangal Potdar 1002  
 Anant Ram v Damodar Das 718  
 Anant Ram v Gurditta 1170  
 Anant Singh v Durga Singh 303 304  
 Ananta v Damodhar 43  
 Anantlal v Surjimal 333  
 Anantnaravana v Savithri 437  
 Anantha v Kunnachand 745  
 Anantharaman v I masami 240 251  
 Anatharama v Vettath 160  
 Andanapa v Bhimrao 740  
 Andaniswami v Totadswami 24  
 Anderson v Halagarla 443  
 Anderson v Periasami 321  
 Anderson v Walter 495  
 Andipappa v Muthukumara 1018  
 Andrews v The Patriotic Assurance Co  
   of Ireland 578  
 Andrews v Salmon 410  
 Anglo Baltic and Mediterranean Bank  
   v Barber & Co 693  
 Angullia & Co v Sassoon & Co 497  
 Anilabala v Rajendranath 559  
 Anjaneyalu v Sri Venugopala 195  
 Anjelina v Joseph 253  
 Annabattula v Annabatulla 657  
 Annada v Upendra 871  
 Annaji v Chandrabai 194  
 Annaji v Narayan 271  
 Annaji v Ragubai 126  
 Annaji v Thakubai 1009  
 Annamalai v Murugasa 102 110 860  
   1247  
 Annamalai v Murugappa 432  
 Annamalai v Palamalai 208 209 210  
   211  
 Annamalai v Pamsier 65 639  
 Annamalai v Subramanyam 307  
 Annamalai v Pitchu 984 988  
 Annammal v Sambasiva 114 115  
 Annanda v Atul 667  
 Annapurnabai v Ruprao 331  
 Annasami Pillai v Pamakrishna Mada  
   har 251  
 Anonymous Case 102  
 Ansari v Bhim Sankar 762  
 Anstey v North and South Woolwich  
   Subway Co 363  
 Anstice Re 483  
 Anthappa Chetty v Ramanathan Chetty  
   1011  
 Anthaya v Manjaya 713  
 Anthony v Dupont 344  
 Antonio v Mahadev 308  
 Antu v Ghulam 29  
 Anund Lall v Julodhur 208  
 Anundmoyee v Sheeb Chunder 523 984  
 Anwar Ali v Ameer Ali 36  
 Anwar Ali v Jaffer Ali 306  
 Anwar ul Haq v Nazar Abbas 151  
 Apaji v Apa 587  
 Appa v Vithoba 1018  
 Appa Rao v Inre 1031  
 Appa Rao v Curraju 66  
 Appa Rao v Krishna 141  
 Appa Pao v Sobhanadri 89  
 Appadu v Appadu 1260  
 Appana v Tangamma, 197  
 Appandai v Sribari 18  
 Appanna v Narasinga 276 279  
 Appasami v Ramasami 444  
 Appasami v Scot 693  
 Appasami v Somasundra 888 1032  
 Appasami v Varadachari 820  
 Appasamy v Govinen, 366  
 Appaswami v Balakrishna 714  
 Appavu v Seen 1190  
 Appaya v Collector of Vizagapatam  
   891  
 Appaya v Lakhamgowda 330  
 Appaya v Padappa 23



Ali Sher Khan v Ahmed 1015  
 Alice Mary Hill v Clarke 490  
 Alim v Jhal 863  
 Aliman v Hasiba 329  
 Alimunnabi v Shama Charan 52a 52b  
 Alkama Bibi v Syed Istak 974  
 All Ditta v Shankar Das 109  
 Alla Bakhsh v Madho Ram 794  
 Alla Ditta v Abdul Qadir 97  
 Allahabad Bank v Motilal Barman 931  
 Allarakha v Jehangir 1196  
 Allen Brothers v Arun 315 514 849  
 Allen Brothers & Co v Bando & Co 1a 1  
 Allenborough v St Katharine's Dock 29  
 Allu en v Labouchere 59 61  
 Alliance Bank v Mohan Lal 9  
 Allott v Smith 63  
 Allport v Securitics Co Ltd 967  
 Alluri v Kunjusha 47  
 Aloo v Gagubha 12  
 Altaf Ali v Lalji Mal 890  
 Altap Ali v Jamsur Ali 11 998  
 Alwar v Seshammal 11 60  
 Aman Singh v Narain 873  
 Amanat Bibi v Imdad Hussain 43 436 439  
 Amar Chandra v Sebak Chand 151 183  
 Amar Chandra v Shosha Bhushan 329 1034  
 Amar Chundra v Curu Prosunno 146 858 859  
 Amar Singh v Ram Dei 643  
 Amara v Annamala 234 956  
 Amarchand v Banwari Lal 821  
 Amarendra v Banerjee & Co 694  
 Amarsangji v Deep sangji 68  
 Amarsangji v Dasi 801  
 Amarsangji v Dasi Umed 998 1025  
 Amba v Gopinatha 1033  
 Amba Prasad v Mushtaq 309 1012  
 Ambaji v Hanumantrao 993  
 Ambalal v Narayan 938 939  
 Ambalam v Bartle 4 2  
 Ambalavana v The Advocate General 269  
 Amba v Sridevi 120  
 Amba v Valla 930  
 Ambica v Nadar 118  
 Ambica v Ram Prasad 775 778  
 Ambika v Manikganj Loan Office 140  
 Ambika Datt v Ram Udit 4 1

Ambika Prasad v Jhinal Singh 784  
 Ambika Prasad v Jarpur Singh 988  
 Ambu v Kethilamma 719  
 Ambubai v Shankarsa 813  
 Ambuja v Appadurai 1018  
 Amdoo Mijan v Muhammad 372  
 Ameer In the matter of 9-2  
 Ameer Ali v Inderjeet 289  
 Amer v Nathu 51  
 American and Mexican Co In re 74  
 American Trading Co v Bird & Co 128  
 Amuchand v Collector of Sholapur 86  
 Amina v Ram 922  
 Amma Bibi v K M Moideen 353  
 Ammanah v Saju 913  
 Aminuddin v Atarmani 332  
 Amir v Mahadeo 394 385  
 Amir v Mohan 390  
 Amir v Prahlad 120  
 Amir Ali v Harish Chandra 172  
 Amir Baksha v Venkatachala 732  
 Amir Beg v Ghulam Nabi 627  
 Amir Begam v Badruddin 1178 1179 1190  
 Amir Begam v Band or Upper India 741  
 Amir Chand v Balhi 101  
 Amir Dutt v Administrator General of Bengal 961  
 Amir Hasan v Ahmad Ali 990 993 1052  
 Amir Hassan Khan v Sheik Baksh Singh 350 31  
 Amir Hazim v Marbati 210  
 Amir Nath v Dhunput 35  
 Anurthra Ali 886 899  
 Anurul Khan v Khairunnessa 133  
 Anjad Ali v Ali Hussain 341 1220  
 Anlool Chard v Sara Chunder 914 1003  
 Anand Dutt v Mutayikraman 973  
 Anolak v Lachmi 142  
 Anolak Shih v Charan Das 1170  
 Anril Lal v Madho Das 1052  
 Anril Lal v Murlidhar 141  
 Anril Ram v Darsat Ram 1195  
 Anril Soam v Darsat Ram 1190  
 Anrita v Anilthrao 869  
 Anrita Lal v Anukul 213  
 Anrita Lal v Pakhal 798  
 Anrita Lal In the goods of 869  
 Anritemari v Secretary of State 40  
 Anril Nath v Dhunpat 837  
 Anrilam v Ramji 270 272

Amritsar v Balkrishna, 111 347  
 Amritsar National Banking Co Ltd v  
     Fazl Hahi 49 531  
 Amritsaria v Gamun 563  
 Amtul v Mahammad 830  
 Amulya v Banku 671  
 Anand Lal v Empress 673  
 Anand Rao v Ramdas 26 52  
 Ananda v Promotha 655  
 Ananda Copal v Nafar Chandra 3 0  
 Ananda Lal v Maha Bai 102  
 Ananda Rao v Appa Rao 61  
 Anandi Kunwar v Pam Nitanyana Das  
     52  
 Anandi Kunwar v Ajudhis Nath 163  
     49  
 Anandibai v Rajaram 200  
 Anandrao v Budra 549  
 Anandrao v Shankar 25  
 Anangamanjari v Tripura Sundari 304  
     334  
 Anant v Mangal 373 1002  
 Anant v Nagappa 650 660  
 Anant v Ramchandra 1035  
 Anant Das v Lda Bhan 36  
 Anant Potdar v Mangal Potdar 1002  
 Anant Lam v Damodar Das 718  
 Anant Lam v Gurditta 115  
 Anant Singh v Durga Singh 302 304  
 Ananta v Damodhar 43  
 Anantlal v Surjimull 733  
 Anantanarayana v Savithri 437  
 Anantha v Kunnachand 745  
 Anantharaman v Pamasami 249 251  
 Anatharama v Vettath 160  
 Andanapa v Bhumsao 740  
 Andaniswami v Totadswami 24  
 Anderson v Kalagarla 443  
 Anderson v Periasami 321  
 Anderson v Walter 495  
 Andipappa v Muthukumara 1018  
 Andrews v The Patriotic Assurance Co  
     of Ireland 578  
 Andrews v Salmon 419  
 Anglo Baltic and Mediterranean Bank  
     v Barber & Co 695  
 Angullia & Co v Sassoon & Co 497  
 Anilabala v Jayendranath 559  
 Anjaneyalu v Sri Venugopala 193  
 Anjelina v Joseph 253  
 Annabattula v Annabatulla 657  
 Annada v Upendra 871  
 Annaji v Chandrabai 194

Annaji v Narayan 271  
 Annaji v Ragubai 126  
 Annaji v Thakubai 1009  
 Annamalai v Murugasa 102 110 860  
     124  
 Annamalai v Murugappa 432  
 Annamalai v Palamalai 208 209 210  
     211  
 Annamalai v Pamaier 655 6 9  
 Annamalai v Subramanyan 307  
 Annamalai v Pitchu 984 988  
 Annammal v Sambasiva 114 115  
 Annanda v Atul 66  
 Annapurnabai v Ruprao 331  
 Annasami Pillai v Pamakrishna Mada  
     har 291  
 Anonymous Case 102  
 Ansrari v Bhim Sankar 762  
 Anstey v North and South Woolwich  
     Sub way Co 503  
 Anstice Re 483  
 Anthappa Chetty v Ramanathan Chetty  
     1011  
 Anthaya v Manjaya 715  
 Anthony v Dupont 344  
 Antone v Mahadev 308  
 Antu v Ghulam 29  
 Anund Loll v Julodhur 208  
 Anundmoyee v Sheeb Chunder 523 984  
 Anwar Ali v Ameer Ali 35  
 Anwar Ali v Jaffer Ali 306  
 Anwar ul Haq v Nazar Abbas 151  
 Apaji v Apa 587  
 Appa v Vithoba 1018  
 Appa Rao In re 1051  
 Appa Rao v Gurraju 66  
 Appa Rao v Krishna 141  
 Appa Rao v Sobhanadri 89  
 Appadu v Appadu 1260  
 Appana v Tangamma 197  
 Appandai v Srihari 18  
 Appanna v Narasinga 276 279  
 Appasami v Ramasami 441  
 Appasami v Scot 693  
 Appasami v Somasundra 888 1032  
 Appasami v Varadachari 820  
 Appasamy v Govanen 366  
 Appaswami v Balakrishna 714  
 Appavu v Seem 1190  
 Appaya v Collector of Vizagapatam  
     891  
 Appaya v Lakhamgowda 330  
 Appaya v Padappa 23

- Appia v Kuthuvava 776  
 Apte v Tirmal 173  
 Apurba v Shrama 60  
 Aran Sardar v Hara Sundar 12 0  
 Arasayre v Sokkalanga 163  
 Aravamudu v Samiyappa 634  
 Arbutnot & Indu triels Ltd v Muthu Chettiar 177  
 Ardaseer v Perozeboye 1967 1268  
 Ardeshir v Airmat 262  
 Ardeshirji v Kalvan Das 366  
 Ardesir v Hirabai 861  
 Ariativdra v Dorasami 183  
 Arjun v King Emperor 678  
 Arjun v Musammatt Parbati 379  
 Arjun v Shankar 1018  
 Arjuna v Official Assignee 1255  
 Armitage v Parson 536  
 Arnison v Smith 410  
 Arnavbhella v Venkatasami 41  
 Arogya v Appachi 19 141  
 Aromalla v Arimanda 283  
 Arsamma v Moidin 21  
 Arumagam v Kanappa 979 980 1206  
 Arumuga v Namasivaya 769  
 Arumuga v Periananjappa 395 867  
 Arumugam v Arunachalam 1169  
 Arunachala v Katha 539  
 Arunachala v Louis Dreyfus 198  
 Arunachala v Subbaramiah 341  
 Arunachalam v Meyappa 875  
 Arunachalam v Ieriasami 906  
 Arunachalla v Mathial 94  
 Arunachallam v Murugappa 815  
 Arunachellam v Maung San Ngwe 108  
 Arunachelam v David 250  
 Arunachella v Orr 433  
 Arunachellam v Arunachellam 403 457  
 107 759 1014  
 Arunachellam v Haji Sheek Meera 241  
 934  
 Arunachellam v Mahomed 85  
 Arunachellam v Pamandaban 643 875  
 Arunmoyi v Mohendra Nath 65  
 Arura v Bur Singh 73  
 Asa I am v Bakshi 104  
 Asad Ali v Haidar Ali 201 607 977  
 Asadali v Mahomed 372 971 940  
 Asad ul lah v Karamchand 767  
 Asad ul lah v Muhammad 1168  
 Asgar v Troil Lya 603  
 Asghar v Mahomed 5  
 Ashabai v Haji Tyeb 457 438  
 Ashanullah v Karoonamoyi 1041  
 Asharfi Lal v Deputy Commissioner of Bara Banki 304  
 Ashfaq Husain v Gauri Sahai 550  
 Ashghar Reza v Hyder Ieza 311  
 Ashiq Ali v Imtiaz Begam 348  
 Ashna Bibi v Awaljadi Bibi 7-0  
 Ashraf v Ali Ahmad 66  
 Ashruffunissa v Lehareaux 545  
 Ashutosh v Behari Lal 160 937  
 Ashworth v Lord 910  
 Asia the 1.66  
 Asimaddi v Sundari 749  
 Asiruddin v Ram Sahai 346  
 Askaran v E I Ry Co 15  
 Askaran v Pagunath 161  
 A kari Hussan v Jahangira Mal 918  
 900  
 Aslatt v Corporation of Southampton 974  
 A mabibi v Ahmad Husain 135 309  
 Asman Singh v Tulsi Singh 184  
 Asmatulla v Gamir 48  
 Asmutunissa Begum v Ashruff Ali 50  
 Asrafannessa v Hemchandra 60  
 Assan v Pathumma J 516  
 Assan ul lah v Hafiz 1021  
 As ardas v Mast Thakurbai 971  
 Assenoola v Abdool 5 5  
 Assi tant Collector Sal ette v Damodar das 127 132  
 Assur v Ratanbai 966  
 Atchayya v Sri Seetharamachandra 353  
 Athamsa v Canesan 314  
 Athappa v Ramakrishna 752  
 Atherton & Co v Habib 701  
 Atma Ram v Balkrishen 1024  
 Atmaram v Bhula 876  
 Atmaram v Collector of Nagpore 330  
 Atmaram v Narayan 4.1  
 Atmaram v Parashram 76  
 Attar Singh v Karm Chand 1001  
 Attila v Parasuram 583  
 Attorney In the matter of (190 Cal W N 99) 569  
 Attorney In the matter of (41 Cal 113) 1239  
 Attorney In the matter of (1914 41 Col 734) 1.71  
 Attorney In re (6 Bom L R 887) 1239

Attorney *In re* (52 Cal 730) 1-39  
 Attorney General v Action Local Board 264  
 Attorney General v Cambridge Gas Consumers Co 263  
 Attorney General v Cokermonth Local Board, 63  
 Attorney General v Colney Lunatic Asylum 64  
 Attorney General v Corporation of Manchester 64  
 Attorney General v Emerson 66  
 Attorney General v Caskall 66  
 Attorney General v Logan 63-63  
 Attorney General v Mayor of Newcastle upon Tyne 66  
 Attorney General v Newcastle upon Tyne Corporation 66  
 Attorney General v Pontypool Water works Co 66  
 Attorney General v Proprietor of the Bradford Canal 66  
 Attorney General v Sheffield Gas Consumers Co 63  
 Attorney General v Shrewsbury Bridge Co 64  
 Attorney General v Simpson, 1024  
 Attorney General v Thompson 66  
 Attorney General v Wright 253  
 Atul Chander v Lakshman 463  
 Atul Chandra v Paja Peara 890 896  
 Aubhoy v Bissesswari 889  
 Aubhoy Churn v Shamont 1060  
 Aubhoja Dassi v Pudmo Lochun 701  
 Aubhoyesury v Gouri Sunkur 939  
 Augustinus v Nerinoks 484  
 Aulad Ali v Abdul 749  
 Aurnachellam v Polu 983  
 Aushootosh v Tara 293  
 Australasian Automatic Weighing Machine Co v Walter 389  
 Australian Steam Nav Co v Smith and Sons 401 490  
 Austrian Lloyd Steamship Co v Greatham Life Assurance Society 184  
 Authimulam v Secretary of State 604  
 Avdal v Krishnan, 807  
 Avala v Kuppup 70  
 Avanas v Nachammal 69  
 Awadh v Fahman 548  
 Ayatunnessa v Kulfu 275  
 Ayetonnassa Bibi v Amjad Ali 52a

Ayscough v Bullar 496 498  
 Ayya Mudali v Vicerayee 787  
 Ayyagiri v Koorur 825  
 Ayanna v Nagabhooshanam 10 987  
 Aytannamma v Pannaswami 821  
 Ayyasami Mudaliar v Appandai 1173  
 Ayyasayyar v Shastram 374  
 Ayyasayyar v Virasami 197 200  
 Aziz v Kudooy 344  
 Aziz Bakhsh v Kaniz 211 710  
 Aziz Bakhsh v Sultan Singh 140  
 Azizan v Matuk Lal 151 103 637  
 Azizuddin v Pamanugra 160

## B

Baba v Purushothama 688  
 Baba v Webb 640  
 Bababhat v Naraharbbhat 81 82  
 Babaji v Collector of Salt Revenue 989  
 Babaji v Vasudev 588  
 Babajirao v Laxmandas 62  
 Babanna v Parava 530  
 Baboo v Lekraj 736  
 Babu v Parvati 4  
 Babu v Thukra 24  
 Baboo Gunesb Dutt v Mugneeram 30  
 Babu Lal v Hari Bakhsh 71  
 Babu Lal v Ishri Prasad 75  
 Babu Lal v Janak 164  
 Babu Madhav v Venkatesh 1021  
 Babu Pam v Munna Lal 347  
 Babu Sahai Singh v Gopal 319  
 Babu v Alakhdeo 371 542  
 Babu v Secretary of State 891  
 Babu Ram v Banke 315  
 Babu Ram v Immanuel 730 702 759  
 Baburam v Dokhna 223  
 Bachan v Raghunath 399  
 Bachchan Lal v Banarsi Das 527  
 Bachchu v Secretary of State 217 250 251 517  
 Bachchu Singh v Jafer Beg 249  
 Bachoo v Nagindas 1245  
 Bachubai v Ibrahim 352 554  
 Bada Kristam v Durvada 67  
 Badai v Sheikh Manowar 1009  
 Badal Chandra v Shrikrishna 120  
 Badal Singh v Debi Saran 924  
 Badam v Imrat 1013

Badam v Nathu 604 1010  
 Badami Kuar v Dinu Rai 346 351 7.3  
 Badar Bee v Habib Merican Noordin 77  
 Bideley v Consolidated Bank 692  
 Badi v Sami 934  
 Badnar v Sarada 7.1  
 Badri Das v Hoshnar 1019  
 Badri Das v Inayat Khan 923 934  
 Badri Gope v King Emperor 672  
 Badri Narain v Sheekoer 996  
 Badri Narayan v East Indian Railway 1003  
 Badri Narayan v Jai Kishen 10 156 164 661  
 Badri Prasad v Gopal 8.4  
 Badri Prasad v Tej Singh 998  
 Badri Prasad v Choke Lal 9.4  
 Badri Singh v Tulsi Pam 742  
 Badruddin v Sitaram 1259  
 Badrun Nissa v Shankar 92  
 Bagal Chunder v Rameshur 730 7.3  
 Bagga v Salihon 1037  
 Bagot v Easton 481 511  
 Bahadur v Shankar 14  
 Bahadur Singh v Negi Purn Singh 1183 119  
 Bahv v Ajanmai 64.  
 Bai Amthi v Madhav 227  
 Bai Atran v Deepsing 340  
 Bai Balagavri v Motilal 883  
 Bai Bhicaji v Perojshaw 409  
 Bai Dahi v Hargovan 613  
 Bai Divali v Hiralsal 881  
 Bai Ditali v Shah Vishnav 7 289  
 Bai Divali v Lmedbhai 51  
 Bai Full v Adessang 790 791  
 Bai Full v Desai Manorbhai 1031  
 Bai Ganga v Rajaram 937  
 Bai Jannabai In re 372 971  
 Bai Kahi v Alarakh 593  
 Bai Karimabibi v Abderehman 11  
 Bai Kashibai v Shidapa 811 817  
 Bai Kunta v Mohananda 141  
 Bai Laxmi v Harjivan 833  
 Bai Mani v Ranchodlal 163 346 76  
 Bai Meherbai v Maganchand 59  
 Bai Monghibai v Bai Pambhalaxmi 8.4  
 Bai Nathi v Nara 71  
 Bai Nematbu v Bai Nematullahu 1061  
 Bai Noorjan v Hansraj 938

Bai Parwati v Ghanchi 680  
 Bai Porebai v Devji 833 834  
 Bai Ram v Jaga 341  
 Bai Shri Majirajba v Maganlal 502  
 Bai Shri Vaktuba v Agarsanji 11 399  
 Baigrani Lal v Mahabir 922  
 Baij Lal v Durga 161  
 Baij Nath v Chhowaro 410 448  
 Baij Nath v Narain 821 1174  
 Baij Nath v Padmanand 52a  
 Baij Nath v Panna Lal 642  
 Baij Nath v Ram Bharos 171 173 6.6  
 Baij Nath v Sohan Bibi 320  
 Baijnath v Baban 817  
 Baijnath v Balmakund 381  
 Baijnath v Doolarey 1259  
 Baijnath v Dulari 363  
 Baijnath v Moheep 731  
 Baijnath v Raghunath 5.6 557  
 Baijnath v Ram Bharos 661 806  
 Baijnath v Ravaneshwar 153  
 Baijnath Das v Bishen 222  
 Baijulal v Bulaklal 59 409  
 Baikanta Nath v Sita Nath 339 118. 1186  
 Baikuntha Nath v Mohananda 290  
 Baikuntha Nath v Nawab Salimulla 514 1013  
 Baikuntha Nath v Prosannamoyi 374 377  
 Baikunti v Narinda 768  
 Bailie v Goodwin & Co 8.7  
 Badur v Lakshmana 720  
 Bain v Central Vermont Ry Co 985  
 Bairagulu v Bappanna 153 637  
 Baisnah v Bank of Bengal 854 856  
 Baisnath v Ramadoss 241  
 Baij Lal v Nawal Singh 1004  
 Bajit Lal v Maharajadhiraj 537  
 Bakar v Udit Narain 142 650  
 Bakhten Mt v Ghulam Hassan 1060.  
 Bakhtawar v Sheo Prasad 841  
 Bakshi v Nizamuddin 42  
 Bal Gangadhar Tilak v Shrinivas Pandit 483  
 Bal Kishen v Jasoda Kuar 309  
 Bal Krishna Das v Hira Lal 415  
 Bal Mukunda v Bengal Nagpur Rly 616.  
 Bala v Bhiva 1061  
 Bala v Seetharama 1192  
 Bala Krishnudu v Narayanasawmy 508  
 Bala Ram v Kanhai 914

- Balabai v Canesh 700  
 Balaji *Inter* 119  
 Balaji v Cangadhar 483  
 Balaji v Merwanji, 344  
 Balaji v Ramchandra 940  
 Balaji v Sakham 18  
 Balak v Kau il 1000  
 Balak Puri v Durga 779  
 Balakrishna v Inanananda 836  
 Balakrishna v Khugnu 128  
 Balakrishna v Jagannada 96  
 Balakrishna v Janyathammal 348  
 Balakrishna v Pangan 740  
 Balakrishna v Vasudeva 344 345 346  
 Balakrishna Chettiar v Krishnamurthi  
 Aiyar 272  
 Balamani v Rama 893  
 Balamba v Krishnavva 196  
 Balambhat v Narayanbhat 33  
 Balamoney v Rama 335 336  
 Balaram v Mangta Dass 946  
 Balaram v Maruti 169 173  
 Balaram v Naktu 223  
 Balaram v Pamchandra 96 141 1245  
 Balaram v Shyama Charan 303  
 Balasubramania v Swarnammal 371  
 446  
 Balbhadar v Ram Lal 51  
 Baldeo v Bur Gir 422  
 Baldeo v Gopalji 270  
 Baldeo v Ramchandra 693  
 Baldeodas v Subkarandas 469  
 Balgobind v Ram Sarup 1007  
 Balgobind v Sheo Kumar 548  
 Baljepalli v Baljepalli, 66  
 Balram v Seth Narsingdas 752  
 Baljit v Mahapit 63  
 Balkaran v Gaya 499  
 Balkaran Rai v Gobind Nath 390  
 Balkrishna v Krishan Lal 32 41 43 73  
 Balkrishna v Raghubar 540  
 Balkrishna v Bedmati 657  
 Balkrishna v Krishan Lal 36  
 Balkrishna Sahu v Khugnu 990  
 Balkrishna v Sohan Singh 1184  
 Balkrissen v Luchmiput 133  
 Balkrishna v Bapu 3 634  
 Balkrishna v Collector Bombay 344  
 345, 349 1221  
 Balkrishna v Dattatraya 29  
 Balkrishna v Govind 300  
 Balkrishna v Jagannada 271  
 Balkrishna v Masuma 771  
 Ballu v Hardawari 344  
 Ballu Ram v Raghubar 204  
 Balmakund v Basanta Kumari 381, 396  
 Balmakund v Dalu 502 587  
 Balmakund v Sheo Jatun 355  
 Balmakunda v Bengal Nagpur Railway  
 Co Ltd 676  
 Balmer Lawrie & Co v Jadunath 241,  
 243  
 Balmokund v Wazir 1002  
 Balmukund v Biasendoyal 362  
 Balmukund v Paneham 626  
 Balraj Kunwar v Jagatpal Singh 3  
 Balubhai v Nanalal 780  
 Balunki Rout v Sri Kunja Behari Deb  
 300  
 Baluram v Bai Pannabai 472  
 Baluswami Aiyar v Lakshmana Aiyar  
 1003  
 Balvant v Babaji 773  
 Balvant v Bala 767  
 Balvant v Baldeo 302  
 Balvant v Hirachand 769 770  
 Balvantrav v Sadrudin 374 375 380  
 Balwant Singh v Daulat Singh 997  
 Balwant Singh v Ram Kishori 1218  
 Balwant Singh v Sarabjit 63 66  
 Bama Charan v Gadadhar 315  
 Bamanathan v Arunachelam 425  
 Banarsi Das v Maharani 652 659 660  
 Banarsi Das v Ramzan 172  
 Banarsi Prasad v Kashi Krishna 322  
 323 330 1033  
 Banarsi Prasad v Ram Narain 878  
 Bande Ali v Gokul Misir 440  
 Bandey v Romesh 78  
 Bandhan v Solhu 456  
 Bandhu v Laku 119  
 Bandhu v Shah Muhammad 820  
 Bindi v Madalpalhi 1014  
 Banduram v Purna Chandra 303  
 Bandoo v Narsingrao 139  
 Banerjee v Manzar Ali 494  
 Banerjee v Subwardy 549  
 Bangali Mal v Ganga Ram 105  
 Bangaru v Vajayamachu 42  
 Bangarusami v Balasubramanian 86  
 Banh Bal v Manni Lal 940  
 Bank of Bengal v Curie & Co, 464  
 Bank of Bengal v Lucas 1017  
 Bank of Bengal v Sarat Chandra 110  
 143 694

Badam v Nathu 604 1010  
 Badami Kuar v Dinu Rai 346 351 353  
 Badar Bee v Habib Merican Noordin 77  
 Badeley v Consolidated Bank 692  
 Badri v Sami 934  
 Badriar v Sarada 701  
 Badri Das v Hoshur 1019  
 Badri Das v Inayat Khan 923 924  
 Badri Gope v King Emperor 672  
 Badri Narain v Sheekoer 936  
 Badri Narayan v East Indian Railway 1003  
 Badri Narayan v Jai Krishen 10 156 164 661  
 Badri Prasad v Gopal 874  
 Badri Prasad v Tej Singh 999  
 Badri Prasad v Choke Lal 904  
 Badri Singh v Tulsi Ram 742  
 Badruddin v Sitaram 1209  
 Badrun Nissa v Shankar 82  
 Bagal Chunder v Pameshur 730 703  
 Bagga v Salhoon 1037  
 Bagot v Easton 481 511  
 Bahadur v Shankar 14  
 Bahadur Singh v Negi Kuran Singh 1183 1197  
 Bahy v Aijanmai 642  
 Bai Amthi v Madhav 227  
 Bai Atrani v Deepsing 340  
 Bai Balagavri v Motilal 883  
 Bai Bhicaji v Perojshaw 409  
 Bai Dahi v Hargovan 613  
 Bai Divali v Hiralal 881  
 Bai Divali v Shah Vishnav 7 289  
 Bai Divali v Umedbhai 51  
 Bai Full v Adesav 700 701  
 Bai Full v Desai Manorbhai 1031  
 Bai Ganga v Itajaram 937  
 Bai Jamnabai *In re* 372 971  
 Bai Kali v Alarakh 593  
 Bai Karimabibi v Abderehman 11  
 Bai Kashiba v Shidapa 811 817  
 Bai Kunta v Mohananda 141  
 Bai Laxmi v Harjivan 833  
 Bai Mani v Ranchodlal 163 346 706  
 Bai Meherbai v Maganchand 59  
 Bai Monghibai v Bai Iambhalaxmi 84  
 Bai Nathi v Narsi 71  
 Bai Nematbu v Bai Nematullahu 1061  
 Bai Noorjan v Mansraj 938

Bai Parwati v Ghanchi 680  
 Bai Porebai v Devji 833 834  
 Bai Pami v Jaga 341  
 Bai Shri Majurajba v Maganlal 502  
 Bai Shri Vaktubi v Agarsanj 11 399  
 Baigrani Lal v Mahabir 922  
 Baij Lal v Durga 161  
 Baij Nath v Chhowaro 410 448  
 Baij Nath v Narain 821 1174  
 Baij Nath v Padmanand 52a  
 Baij Nath v Panna Lal 642  
 Baij Nath v Ram Bharos 171 173 606  
 Baij Nath v Sohan Bibi 320  
 Baijnath v Baban 817  
 Baijnath v Balmakund 381  
 Baijnath v Doolarey 1259  
 Baijnath v Dulari 361  
 Baijnath v Moheep 731  
 Baijnath v Raghunath 506 557  
 Baijnath v Ram Bharos 661 806  
 Baijnath v Ravaneshwar 153  
 Baijnath Das v Bishen 222  
 Baijulal v Bulaklal 59 409  
 Baikanta Nath v Sita Nath 339 1180 1186  
 Baikuntha Nath v Mohananda 290  
 Baikuntha Nath v Nawab Salimulla 614 1013  
 Baikuntha Nath v Prosannamoyi 3 4 377  
 Baikunti v Narinda 768  
 Bailie v Goodwin & Co 852  
 Bailer v Lakshmana 720  
 Bain v Central Vermont Ry Co 980  
 Bairagulu v Rappanna 153 637  
 Baisnah v Bank of Bengal 854 856  
 Baiznath v Ramadoss 241  
 Baji Lal v Nawal Singh 1004  
 Bajit Lal v Maharajadhiraj 537  
 Baker v Udit Narain 142 600  
 Bakhtan Mit v Ghulam Hassan 1060  
 Bakhtawar v Sheo Prasad 841  
 Balahi v Nizamuddin 42  
 Bal Gangadhar Tilak v Shrinivas Iandri 483  
 Bal Krishen v Jasoda Kuar 309  
 Bal Krishna Das v Hira Lal 415  
 Bal Mukunda v Bengal Nagpur Rly 616  
 Bala v Dhiva 1061  
 Bala v Seetharama 1190  
 Bala Krishnudu v Narayanasaawmy 608  
 Bala Pam v Kanhai 914

Balakrishna v Gane h 794  
 Balaji In re 119  
 Balaji v Gangadhar 483  
 Balaji v Merwanji 344  
 Balaji v Ramchandra 940  
 Balaji v Sakharani 18  
 Balak v Kausil 1003  
 Balak Puri v Durga 779  
 Balakrishna v Jnanananda 836  
 Balakrishna v Kibucnu 64  
 Balakrishna v Jazannada 91  
 Balakrishna v Parvathammal 388  
 Balakrishna v Pungan 710  
 Balakrishna v Veudera 344 345 346  
 Balakrishna Chettiar v Krishnamurthi  
 Aiyar 27  
 Balamani v Rama 893  
 Balamba v Krishnappa 196  
 Balambhat v Narayanbhat 3  
 Balamoney v Ramasami 36 37  
 Balaram v Mangta Dass 946  
 Balaram v Maruti 169 173  
 Balaram v Naktu 23  
 Balaram v Ramchandra 96 1241 1242  
 Balaram v Shyama Charan 303  
 Balasubramania v Svarnammal 371  
 446  
 Balbhaddar v Pam Lal 51  
 Baldeo v Bir Gir 422  
 Baldeo v Gopalji 270  
 Baldeo v Ramchandra 693  
 Baldeodas v Subkarandis 469  
 Balgobind v Ram Sarup 1007  
 Balgobind v Sheo Kumar 548  
 Balijepalli v Balijepalli 66  
 Baliram v Seth Narsingdas 752  
 Baljit v Mahapit 63  
 Balkaran v Gaja 499  
 Balkaran Rai v Gobind Nath 390  
 Balkrishna v Krishan Lal 32 41 43 73  
 Balkrishna v Paghobar 540  
 Balkrishna v Bedmati 637  
 Balkrishna v Krishan Lal 36  
 Balkrishna Sahu v Khugnu 990  
 Balkrishna v Sohan Singh 1184  
 Balkissen v Luchmiput 133  
 Balkrishna v Bapu 3 634  
 Balkrishna v Collector Bombay 344  
 345 349 1221  
 Balkrishna v Dattatraya 29  
 Balkrishna v Govind 300  
 Balkrishna v Jazannada 271

Balkrishna v Masuma 771  
 Ballu v Hardawari 344  
 Ballu Ram v Raghubar 204  
 Balmakund v Basanta Kumari 381 390  
 Balmakund v Dalu 502 587  
 Balmakund v Sheo Jatun 355  
 Balmakunda v Bengal Nagpur Railway  
 Co Ltd 676  
 Balmer Lawrie & Co v Jadunath 241  
 243  
 Balmokund v Wazir 1002  
 Balmukund v Bessendoyal 362  
 Balmukund v Paneham 676  
 Balraj Kunwar v Jagatpal Singh 3  
 Balubhai v Nanalal 780  
 Balukhi Rout v Sri Kunja Behari Deb  
 300  
 Baluram v Bai Pannabai 472  
 Baluswami Aiyar v Lakshmana Aiyar  
 1003  
 Balvant v Babaji 773  
 Balvant v Bala 767  
 Balvant v Baldeo 302  
 Balvant v Hirachand 769 770  
 Balvantrav v Sadrudin 374 375 390  
 Balwant Sing v Daulat Singh 907  
 Balwant Singh v Rani Kishori 1218  
 Balwant Singh v Sarabjit 63 60  
 Bama Charan v Gadadhar 315  
 Bamanathan v Arunachalam 425  
 Banarsi Das v Maharani 652 659 660  
 Banarsi Das v Ramzan 172  
 Banarsi Prasad v Kashi Krishna 322  
 323 330 1033  
 Banarsi Prasad v Ram Narain 878  
 Bande Ali v Gokul Misir 440  
 Bandey v Romesh 78  
 Bandhan v Solhu 406  
 Bandhu v Lakhi 119  
 Bandhu v Shah Muhammad 821  
 Bandi v Madalpalli 1014  
 Bandiram v Purna Chandra 88  
 Bando v Narsingrao 139  
 Banerjee v Manzar Ali 491  
 Banerjee v Subrawardi 64  
 Bangali Mal v Ganga Lal 5  
 Bangaru v Vijayamallu 4  
 Bangarusami v Balasubramanian 4  
 Banh Bal v Manni Lal 42  
 Bank of Bengal v C. & L. 41  
 Bank of Bengal v L. & S. 11  
 Bank of Bengal v L. & S. 11  
 143, 694



- Bank of England v. Vagliano 2  
 Bank of New South Wales v. O'Connor 909  
 Bank of Upper India v. Fitzholmes 160 733  
 Banks v. Guru Das 767  
 Banka Behari v. Birendra Nath 339 1009 1030  
 Banke Behari Lal v. Pokhe Ram 104 109  
 Banke Lal v. Jagat Narain 210 331  
 Banka Behari v. Dutta 1013  
 Banky v. Ram Bahadur 341  
 Banku Behari v. Harendra Nath 973 981  
 Banku Behari v. Narain Das 143  
 Banna Mal v. Jamna Das 188  
 Banno Bibi v. Mehdi Husain 310 1037 104  
 Bansu Dhar v. Muhammad Suleman 809  
 Bansidhar v. Gulab Kuar 194 101 1204  
 Bansidhar v. Sita Pam 986  
 Bansilal v. Dhapo 69  
 Bansilal v. Ghulam 107  
 Banwari v. Samman 1010  
 Banwari Das v. Mohumad 813  
 Banwari Lal v. Kishen 813 818  
 Banwari Lal v. Mahesh 818  
 Banwari Lal v. Nand Ram 903  
 Bapu v. Bapu 1009  
 Bapu v. Bhawan 50  
 Bapu v. Dhond 93  
 Bapu v. Vajir 130 399  
 Bapuji v. Govindlal 278 279  
 Bapuji v. Umedbhai 306  
 Bapurao v. Sadhu 010  
 Bara Estate Ltd v. Anup Chandra 1015  
 Baroda Kanta Saha Poy v. Sheikh Moiguddi 21  
 Baranash v. Dhabadeb 172  
 Bardot v. The Augusta 1266  
 Barendra v. Emperor 1273  
 Barendra Nath v. Martin & Co 232 708  
 Barham v. Huntingfield 567  
 Barhamdeo v. Tara Chand 240 917  
 Barhma Din v. Baiji Lal 700 707  
 Barjorji v. Shripatprasadji 73  
 Barkat un nissa v. Abdul Aziz 977  
 Barker Re Hetherington v. Longrigg 090  
 Barker v. Purvis 395  
 Barnaby v. Tassell 945  
 Barnett Brothers v. Fowie 13 703  
 Baroda v. Chunder Kanta 759 861  
 Baroda Churn v. Gobind Prashad, 1061  
 Barracho v. Souza 1171  
 Barra v. Jackson 39  
 Barsati v. Chamru 28  
 Baru Mal v. Sunder Lal 66  
 Basangowda v. Churchingowda 394  
 Basangowda v. Irgowdatti 190  
 Basant v. Secretary of State 613  
 Basant Ram v. Kolahal 107  
 Basant Ram v. Muhammad 984  
 Basanta Coomar v. Kumudini 573  
 Ba anta Kumar v. Abhoy 1053 1062  
 Ba anta Kumar v. Khirode Chandra 61  
 Ba anta Kumar v. Kusum Kumari 1006  
 Basanta Kumar v. Radha Rani 136 913  
 Basanti v. Rajani 346  
 Basanti Lal v. Chhedo Singh 394  
 Ba appa v. Bhimgowda 156 804  
 Basaratulla v. Resazuddin 347 371 760 761  
 Basavana v. Dodda Lingappa 441  
 Basawa v. Kalkapa 302  
 Basayya v. Allayya 604  
 Basdeo v. Dwarika 805  
 Basdeo v. Sundt 493  
 Basdeo Mal v. Hanhaiya Lal 1171  
 Baser v. Fazle 1002  
 Bisharutulla v. Uma Churn 700  
 Ba heshar Nath v. Ram Kishen Das 1056  
 Bashir Pam v. Chinsot Municipality 937  
 Bashir ud din v. Jhori Singh 749  
 Basir Ali v. Hahz 768 978  
 Basiram v. Kattiyasani 908  
 Basiram Saka Roy v. Ram Ratan Roy 301  
 Basiruddi v. Kailas 937  
 Basist v. Modnath 780  
 Basiri Reddi v. Ramayya 719  
 Basingappa v. Dharmappa 29  
 Basrat Ali v. Maung Aung 1061  
 Basroovattil v. Ramchandra 606  
 Basti Ram v. Fattu 159 160  
 Basudev v. Bedeshi 1001  
 Basumati v. Taritbasani 1012  
 Bathe v. Abdul 1184 1186  
 Bateman v. Hunt 909  
 Batuk Nath v. Munni Dei 135 914 1040  
 Batul Kunwar v. Munni Lal 43  
 Bava Leuva v. Ammeenammal 1007  
 Bava Singh v. Lachman Singh 11  
 Bawan Das v. Mul Chand 199

- Bayyan Naidu v Suryanarayana 42 4  
 Bazlul v Latis 30  
 Beard v Egerton 199 200  
 Beaumont v Senior 131  
 Beebe Tokai v David 195  
 Bechansang v Naran Moti 120  
 Becharam v Purna 126  
 Beckett v Stiles 129  
 Bed Saran v Bhagat Deo 6  
 Beddow v Beddow 974  
 Bedford v Ellis 410 490  
 Bedford Charities *In re* 67  
 Beeny Pe 540  
 Beer Chunder v Ishan Chunder 10  
 Beer Chunder v Raj Kumar Nabodeep  
     Chunder 26 27  
 Beer Chunder v Tarine 55  
 Beerchunter v Mayman 146  
 Beg Mohammed v Khasaji 105  
 Begam Jan v Jamat Bibi 93  
 Begam Sultan v Sarai Begam 174  
 Begg Dunlop & Co v Jagannath 140  
     143 64  
 Legg Dunlop & Co v Satish Chandra  
     961  
 Behari v Daud 60  
 Behari v Majid 75  
 Behari Lal v Habiba Bibi 575  
 Behari Lal v Rodu Pam 448  
 Behari Lal v Majid Ali 75  
 Behari Lal v Mangolanath 1057  
 Behari Lal v Srimati Baran 444 814  
 Behari Singh v Mukat Singh 759  
 Bejoy v Hukum 231  
 Bejoy Gopal v Umesh Chandra 790  
 Bejoy Singh v Ashutosh 726  
 Bejoy Singh v Hukum Chand 750  
 Beli Pam v Pam Lal 961  
 Bellary Press Co v Venkata 119  
 Benaim & Co v Debono 104  
 Benbow v Low 556 557  
 Bengal and North Western Railway  
     Co v Sadaram 411  
 Bengal Coal Co v Apcar Collieries 828  
 Bengal Coal Co v Elgin Cotton Co  
     108  
 Bengal Nagpur Railway Agent v Behari  
     Lal 1010  
 Beni Madhab v Deb Narayan 252  
 Beni Madhab v Rai Charan 152  
 Beni Madhab v Sarbananda 42  
 Beni Madho v Gaya 528  
 Beni Madho v Indar Sahai 36 68  
 Beni Madho v Sanwardat 746  
 Beni Madhub v Jotendra 514  
 Beni Pershad v Chowbey 42  
 Beni Pershad v Dudhnath 15 16  
 Beni Prasad v Harnam Das 928  
 Beni Prasad v Lajja Pam 868  
 Beni Prasad v Mukhtesar 151 216  
 Beni Prasad v Nand Lal 1020  
 Beni Prasad v Sarju Prasad 355  
 Beni Raj v I am Lakhani 331  
 Beni Pam v Nanhu Mal 78  
 Beni Pam v I am Chandar 440  
 Beni I am Bhutt v Ram Lal 864 865  
 Beni Singh v Berhamdeo 914  
 Benjamin v Benjamin 1247  
 Benjamin v Storr 262  
 Bennett v Moore 540  
 Bennets & Co v McIlwraith 418  
 Benode v Brajendra 153  
 Benode v Harish 936  
 Benoy Krishna v Satish Chandra 319  
     974  
 Bent v Young 95  
 Bentley v Black 504  
 Bepin v Jogendra 32  
 Bepin Behari v Annoda 1171  
 Bepin Behari v Brejo Nath 55  
 Bepin Behari v Makunda Lal 910  
 Bepin Behari v Sasi Bhusan 177  
 Berdan v Greenwood 481 495 520  
 Beresford v Ramasubha 861  
 Berhamdeo Pershad v Tara Chan 908  
 Berry v Mullen 15  
 Besant v Advocate General of Madras  
     338  
 Besant v Narayanish 1249 1260  
 B st & Co Ltd v Collector of Madura  
     1219  
 Besterman v British Motor Car Co  
     Ltd 415  
 Beti v Collector of Etawah 693  
 Beti Jee v Sham Behari Lal 548  
 Beti Mahalakshmi v Badan Singh 385  
 Bhabani Charan v Pratab Chandra  
     144  
 Bhabatram v Durgesh 222  
 Bhadai v Shaikh Manowar 986  
 Bhag Bhari v Gujar Mal 440  
 Bhag Singh v Labh Singh 115  
 Bhagannulu v Seethurama wami 1165  
 Bhagat Darbari v Bhika 1185  
 Bhagat Singh v Jai Ram 331 334 933  
 Bhagat Singh v Nikka 303

Bhagawan Das v Kachwar Lal 120  
 Bhagbat v Bamdeb 526  
 Bhagbat v Boloram 834  
 Bhagchand v The Secretary of State  
 247 250 252  
 Bhagelu v Dharma 866  
 Bhagirath v Ram Ghulam 1181  
 Bhagirathi v Bilashwar 3  
 Bhagirathi v Chandra 497  
 Bhagoji v Babu 27  
 Bhagoji v Bapuji 1005  
 Bhagising v Lohhsingh 103  
 Bhagu v Bawasheb 174  
 Bhagvan v Kesur 1010  
 Bhagvandas v Abdul Hussain 694  
 Bhagvandas v Hathibhai 198  
 Bhagwan v Dattatraya 393 413  
 Bhagwan v Hira 60  
 Bhagwan v Khetter Mohi 713  
 Bhagwan v Param 668  
 Bhagwan v Iaram Sukh Das 390 866  
 867  
 Bhagwan v Ratan 667  
 Bhagwan v Ummat ul Hassan 374  
 378  
 Bhagwan Das v Allah Bakhsh 766  
 Bhagwan Das v Bhavani 930  
 Bhagwan Das v Haji Abu Mahomed  
 387  
 Bhagwan Das v Jugul Kishore 178  
 Bhagwan Das v Raj Nath 716  
 Bhagwan Das v Shiv Dial 1176  
 Bhagwan Das v Sukhdeo 677  
 Bhagwan Das v Suraj Prasad 227 760  
 Bhagwan Dut v Pam Dut 1050  
 Bhagwan Prasad v Sheo Shai 443  
 Bhagwan Singh v The Allahabad Bank  
 331 332  
 Bhagwan Singh v Jama 790  
 Bhagwana v Goru 626  
 Bhagwandas v Burjori 559 560  
 Bhagwandas In re 240  
 Bhagwant v Haji Mahomed 170  
 Bhagwant Ram v Niam Din 153  
 Bhagwanta v Zamir 1043  
 Bhagwantappa v Vishwanath 646  
 Bhagwat v Dahi 593 594  
 Bhagwat v Dwarka 663  
 Bhagwat v Sheo Golam 990  
 Bhagwati v Banwari Lal 100 101 163  
 749  
 Bhagwati v Jamna Prasad 378  
 Bhagwati v Larmesbar 510

Bhagwati Dayal v Dhan Kunwar 319,  
 Bhagwati Prasad v Bindeshri 449  
 Bhachand v Ranchhodas 937 938 939  
 Bhachand v Ranchhodas 160 165  
 Bhaidas v Bai Gulab 18 290 1269  
 Bhaiji v Administrator General of  
 Bombay 703 715  
 Bhamram v Ambica Charan 1000  
 Bhairab v Kali 1011 1018  
 Bhairab v Kalidhan 302  
 Bhairab v Nandiram 977  
 Bhairab Chandra v Kali Kumar 1012  
 Bhairabendra v Uday Nara n 430 833  
 Bhairon v Rama Autar 1027  
 Bhairon Rai v Saran Rai 681  
 Bhairshankar v Morari 74  
 Bhairshankar v Mulji 833  
 Bhajhari v Behari Lal 1193  
 Bhajan Lal v Cheda Lal 642  
 Bhaktwar Maj v Abdul Latif 200  
 Bhama v Bhimagaoda 7  
 Bhamboo v Pam Narain 87 106 110  
 112 113  
 Bhanaji v DeBrito 1016  
 Bhanu v Kashinath 427  
 Bhanudas v Krishnabai 870  
 Bharam Chand v Kanak 468  
 Bharati v Sarat Chunder 68  
 Bharat v Asghar 371 540  
 Bharat v Rameshwar 520  
 Bharat v Srinath 820  
 Bharat Chandra v Gauranga 207  
 Bharat Chandra v Insan 543 760  
 Bharat Chandra v Kiran Chandra 629  
 840  
 Bhargava & Co v Jagannath 340  
 Bhatu Ram v Fogul Ram 619 691  
 Bhatwar Mali v Abdul Latif 249  
 Bhat v Bapaji 1013  
 Bhat v Hari 446  
 Bhat v Nana 17 200 201  
 Bhausing v Chagiram, 303  
 Bhawan Singh v Narotam Singh 202  
 Bhawan v Harbins 312  
 Bhawan Prasad v Kallu 900  
 Bhawanishankar v Narainishankar 78  
 156  
 Bheeka v Bhuggoo 00  
 Bheema Charyulu v Kothakota 27  
 Bhicobai v Harila 421  
 Bhikabhai v Bai Dhuri 41  
 Bhikaji v Anant 811  
 Bhikaji v Bapu Saju 966

- Phikaji v Purshottam 72 75  
 Phikhalal v Acharat Lal 118 119  
 Phikhar v Surja Moni 73 75  
 Phikha v Birj Bahari 138 75  
 Phikumber v Becharan 70  
 Phin v Sarwan 71 73  
 Phimaji v Hunsin Sahib 81  
 Phimangauda v Hannant 18  
 Phimansa v Venugopal 100  
 Phiman v R. B. & C. 1 18 75  
 Phimraj v Laxman 73  
 Phimraj Rani v Imperor 1 1  
 Phim Singh v Sarwan 71  
 Phairam v Copu Kanth 10  
 Phiva v Vithra 29  
 Phivray v Sitaran 71 11  
 Phiva v Dechand 74  
 Phobonath v Jadhav Prasad 10  
 Phogaraju v Addepalli 10  
 Phodil v Chimanlal 117  
 Phogul v Dargah 80  
 Phogul v Jethalal 499  
 Phola Nath v Kanti Chandra 131 913  
 Phola Nath v Kishori 19  
 Phola Nath v Secretary of State 15  
 Phola Pershad v Ram Lal 900  
 Pholanath v Irfulla 79  
 Pholaram v Admittator General 17  
 Pholu v Ram Lal 371 74  
 Phometti v Umshar 466 470  
 Phodu Mal v Muhammad 91  
 Phobun Mohun v Nobin Chunder 678  
 Phovrub v Madhub Chunder 197 199  
 200  
 Phuban Mohan v Co-operative Bank  
 898 1007  
 Phubaneswari v Nilcomul 123  
 Phuben Mohun v Nunda Lal 166 733  
 706  
 Phudaneswar v Tilakdasi 413 776  
 Phugobati v Mahomed 128  
 Phugwan Das v Nikanta 802  
 Phugwanbutti v Forbes 60 68  
 Phuja Roy v Ram Kumar 771  
 Phujal v Nanheju 100 110  
 Phukhandas v Lallubhai 70  
 Phulu Beg v Jatindra Nath 683  
 Phundal v Pandol 343  
 Phup Indar v Bijal 130 136 600 603  
 Phup Kunwar In the matter of the peti-  
 tion of 304  
 Phupal v Kundan Lal 11
- Bhupati v Soudendra 919  
 Bhupendra v Kurput 3 9  
 Bhupendra Kumar v Purna Chandra  
 141 290  
 Bhupendra Nath v Minohar 970  
 Bhupendra Nath v Sassoon & Co 331  
 674  
 Bhupsing v Iremong 1011  
 Bhura Mal v Har Kishan Das 518 549  
 550 551 553  
 Bhuran v Norandra 986  
 Bhuran v Irfulla 745 761  
 Bhuta v Lakshu 297  
 Bhutnath v Tarachand 794 914  
 Bhuttracharya v Cawnpore Woollen Mills  
 104  
 Bhuvanagiri v Marudugula 820  
 Bhuro v Lakhirani 501  
 Budo Bibi v Ram Chandra 44  
 Bilec Solomon v Aldool Azeez 10 202  
 270  
 Bibi Jamila v Dissanand 761  
 Bibi Khosuma v Official Liquidator 801  
 Bibi Kulsamani v Ram Prasad 1012  
 Bibi Ladi v Bibi Raje 114  
 Bibi Muttu v Pula Begam 545 1001  
 Bibi Naba v Haj Bagnath 1037  
 Bibi Shrafat v Mahomed 388  
 Bibi Uma v Jussolin 42  
 Bibyan v Sachu 731 917  
 Bickerton v Walker 807  
 Bidd v Bridges 57  
 Bidhoo v Keshub 238  
 Bidhu v Kulidaprasad 513  
 Bidhyadhar v Manendra Nath 141 290  
 Bidyadhar v Manendra Nath 19  
 Bidyaprasad v Ashraf 974  
 Bihari v Sheobalak 66  
 Bihari Lal v Chundu Lal 1180  
 Bihari Lal v Shankar Das 97  
 Bihari Lal v Shiva 71 283  
 Bijal v Raghunath 710  
 Bikrama v Bir 4  
 Bikramjit v Durga Dyal 934  
 Bilas Kunwar v Deoraj 508  
 Bilasini v Soudendra 511 517  
 Bilarov Re 364  
 Bill In re 684  
 Binayakdas v Sast Bhuran 1167  
 Bindu Prasad v Kaghur 1033  
 Bindeshri Prasad v Badal Singh 164  
 378 767

Bhagawan Das v Keshwar Lal 120  
 Bhagbat v Bamdeb 6  
 Bhagbat v Boloram 884  
 Bhagchand v The Secretary of State  
 247 250 252  
 Bhagelu v Dharma 866  
 Bhagirath v Ram Ghulam 1181  
 Bhagirathi v Balishwar 35  
 Bhagirathi v Chandra 497  
 Bhagoji v Babu 27  
 Bhagoji v Bapuji 1005  
 Bhagasing v Labhsingh 108  
 Bhagu v Bawasheb 174  
 Bhagvan v Kesur 1015  
 Bhagvandas v Abdul Husain 694  
 Bhagvandas v Hathibhai 198  
 Bhagwan v Dattatrya 393 543  
 Bhagwan v Hira 602  
 Bhagwan v Khetter Moni 113  
 Bhagwan v Param 868  
 Bhagwan v Param Sukh Das 395 866  
 867  
 Bhagwan v Ratan 607  
 Bhagwan v Ummat ul Hasnain 374  
 375  
 Bhagwan Das v Allah Baksh 766  
 Bhagwan Das v Bhavani 935  
 Bhagwan Das v Haji Abu Mahomed  
 387  
 Bhagwan Das v Jugul Kishore 178  
 Bhagwan Das v Raj Nath 716  
 Bhagwan Das v Shiv Dial 1176  
 Bhagwan Das v Sukhdeo 677  
 Bhagwan Das v Suraj Prasad 227 760  
 Bhagwan Dut v Pam Dut 10 5  
 Bhagwan Prasad v Sheo Shai 258  
 Bhagwan Singh v The Allahabad Bank  
 331 33  
 Bhagwan Singh v Jamsi 700  
 Bhagwans v Goru 626  
 Bhagwandas v Burjori 59 565  
 Bhagwandas *In re* 40  
 Bhagwant v Haji Mahomed 175  
 Bhagwant Islam v Nizam Din 158  
 Bhagwanta v Zamir 1043  
 Bhagwantappa v Vishwanath 646  
 Bhagwat v Debi 593 594  
 Bhagwat v Dwarka 603  
 Bhagwat v Sheo Golsam 990  
 Bhagwati v Banwari Lal, *See* 161 163  
 748  
 Bhagwati v Jamna Prasad, 378  
 Bhagwati v Parmeshar 512

Bhagwati Dayal v Dhan Kunwar 319,  
 Bhagwati Prasad v Bindeshri 449  
 Bhaichand v Ranchhodas 937 938 939  
 Bhaichand v Ranchhodas 160 165  
 Bhaidas v Bai Gulab 18 296 1968  
 Bhai v Administrator General of  
 Bombay 703 715  
 Bhainram v Ambica Charan 1055  
 Bhairab v Kali 1011 1018  
 Bhairab v Kaldhan 352  
 Bhairab v Nandiram 977  
 Bhairab Chandra v Kali Kumar 1012  
 Bhairabendra v Uday Narayan 430 833  
 Bhairon v Rama Autar 1077  
 Bhairon Rai v Saran Rai 681  
 Bhairanankar v Morari 74  
 Bhairanankar v Mulji 833  
 Bhajahari v Behari Lal 1193  
 Bhajan Lal v Cheda Lal 642  
 Bhaktwar Mal v Abdul Latif 250  
 Bhama v Bhimavarda 7  
 Bhamboo v Iam Narain 87 106 110  
 112 113  
 Bhanaji v DeBrito 1016  
 Bhanu v Kashinath 427  
 Bhanudas v Krishnabai 875  
 Bharam Chand v Kanak 469  
 Bharasi v Sarat Chunder 68  
 Bharat v Asghar 371 542  
 Bharat v Rameshwar 525  
 Bharat v Srinath 875  
 Bharat Chandra v Gauranga 207  
 Bharat Chandra v Iasin 543 760  
 Bharat Chandra v Kiran Chandra 628  
 842  
 Bhargava & Co v Jagannath 310  
 Bhat Ram v Fogul Ram 619 621  
 Bhatwar Mall v Abdul Latif 249  
 Bhau v Bapaji 1013  
 Bhau v Hari 446  
 Bhau v Nana 17 250 251  
 Bhausing v Chaganuram 353  
 Bhawan Singh v Narotam Singh 262  
 Bhawan v Harbans 312  
 Bhawan Prasad v Kallu 900  
 Bhawanishankar v Narainishankar 78  
 156  
 Bheeka v Bhugoo 50  
 Bheema Charyulu v Kothakota 27  
 Bhiscoobai v Hariba 471  
 Bhikabhai v Bai Bhumi 41  
 Bhikaji v Anant 811  
 Bhikaji v Bapu Saju 966

- Bhikaji v Purshotam 782 785  
 Bhikhalal v Acharat Lal 1185 1186  
 Bhikhari v Surja Moni 730 732  
 Bhikha v Birji Bihari 108 770  
 Bhikumber v Becharam 30  
 Bhini v Sarwan 741 743  
 Bhimaji v Hu. an Sahab 871  
 Bhimangaada v Hanmant 180  
 Bhimanga v Venugopal 1000  
 Bhimji v B B & C I Rv 340  
 Bhimraj v Laxman 723  
 Bhimraj Rama v Emperor 1264  
 Bhim Singh v Sarwan 764  
 Bhairam v Gopi Kanth 100  
 Bhira v Vithya 29  
 Bhivrar v Sitaram 76 619  
 Bhiva v Devchand 579  
 Bhoobonath v Padma Prasad 936  
 Bhogaraju v Addepalli 60  
 Bhogilal v Chimanlal 1178  
 Bhogilal v Darasha 800  
 Bhogilal v Jethalal 499  
 Bhola Nath v Kanti Chandra 136 913  
 Bhola Nath v Kishori 198  
 Bhola Nath v Secretary of State 213  
 Bhola Pershad v Ram Lal 900  
 Bholanath v Prafulla 79  
 Bholaram v Administrator General 17  
 Bholu v Ram Lal 371 374  
 Bhomsetti v Umabai 466 470  
 Bhondu Mai v Muhammad 940  
 Bhobun Mohun v Robin Chunder 678  
 Bhojrub v Madhub Chunder 197 199 200  
 Bhuban Mohan v Co-operative Bank 893 1007  
 Bhubaneswari v Nilcomul 129  
 Bhubon Mohun v Kunda Lal 166 755 756  
 Bhudaneswar v Tilakdari 543 776  
 Bhugobati v Mahomed 128  
 Bhugwan Das v Nulkanta 802  
 Bhugwanbutti v Forbes 60 68  
 Bhujia Roy v Ram Kumar 771  
 Bhujbal v Nanheju 100 110  
 Bhukhandas v Lallubhai 70  
 Bhulu Beg v Jatindra Nath 683  
 Bhundel v Pandol 313  
 Bhup Indar v Bhai 135 136 622 623  
 Bhup Kunwar In the matter of the petition of 354  
 Bhupal v Kundan Lal 211  
 Bhupati v Sourendra 949  
 Bhupendra v Nurput 329  
 Bhupendra Kumar v Purna Chandra 141 290  
 Bhupendra Nath v Manohar 975  
 Bhupendra Nath v Sassoon & Co 531 674  
 Bhup Singh v Premsing 1011  
 Bhura Mal v Har Kishan Das 548 549 550 551 552 866  
 Bhuran v Norendra 986  
 Bhusan v Profulla 348 701  
 Bhuta v Lakadu 297  
 Bhutnath v Tarachand 704 914  
 Bhuttacharya v Cawnpore Woollen Mills 104  
 Bhuvanagiri v Maradugula 8 5  
 Bhyro v Lekhranee 501  
 Biado Bibi v Ram Chandra 442  
 Bibee Solomon v Abdool Azeez 15 292 870  
 Bibi Jamila v Dyanand 761  
 Bibi Khozama v Official Liquidator 801  
 Bibi Kulsumanissa v Ram Prasad 1012  
 Bibi Ladi v Bibi Raja 114  
 Bibi Mutto v Fahi Begam 540 1051  
 Bibi Nabi v Raj Baijnath 1037  
 Bibi Sharafan v Mahomed 388  
 Bibi Uma v Rasoolan 242  
 Bibyan v Sachu 731 917  
 Bickerton v Walker 909  
 Bidder v Bridges 557  
 Bidhu v Keshub 238  
 Bidhu v Kuladaprasad 513  
 Bidhyadhar v Manindra Nath 141 290  
 Bidvadhar v Manindra Nath 19  
 Bidyaprasad v Ashrafi 974  
 Bihari v Sheobalak 66  
 Bihari Lal v Chunni Lal 1180  
 Bihari Lal v Shankar Das 982  
 Bihari Lal v Shiva 271 283  
 Bhai v Raghunath 710  
 Bikrama v Bir 4  
 Bikramjit v Durga Dayal 934  
 Bilas Kunwar v Desraj 568  
 Bilasrai v Gursandas 541 542  
 Bilasroy Re 364  
 Bill In re 884  
 Binayakdas v Sasi Bhusan 1167  
 Bindu Prasad v Raghubir 1053  
 Bundeabri Prasad v Badal Singh 164 378 767

Boudetti Naik v Canga Saran Sahu 931  
 Boudrahan v C I P Ry Co 303  
 Bindulashini v Secretary of State 601  
 1004  
 Binodini v Kala Chand 836  
 Binoo Coram v Jaimurat 641 642  
 Bipin Behari v Abdul Barik 543  
 Bipin Behari Mitra v Jatindranath 703  
 Bipro Doss v Secretary of State for  
 India 566  
 Bir Kishor v King Emperor 1271  
 Biraj Mohini v Chintamani 42  
 Birdichand v Badesaheb 650  
 Birdichand v Badesaheb 180  
 Birehal v Birch Crisp & Co 509  
 Bireswar v Ambika Charan 642  
 Bireswar v Lanch House 509  
 Bir Singh v Nawal 409 431 899  
 Birinchi Singh v Narado Prasad 901  
 Birj Mohan v Rai Uma Nath 316 300  
 751 62  
 Birmingham and Midland Motor Omnibus  
 Co Ltd v London & North Wes-  
 tern Railway Company 566  
 Biru Mahata v Shyama Churn 152 162  
 Bishambar v Imdad Ali 199  
 Bishambar v Sukhdevi 904  
 Bishamber v Canga 801  
 Bishambhar v Muhammad 333  
 Bishan Dial v Ghazi ud din 21 2 3  
 Bishan v Bishan 33  
 Bishan Chand v Nadir Hossain 192  
 Bishan Dayal v Bank of Upper India  
 130  
 Bishanmun v Land Mortgage Bank 740  
 Bisheshar v Bijra 817  
 Bisheshar v Hanuman 691  
 Bisheshar v Raghuber 514  
 Bisheswar v Chandreshwar 377  
 Bisheswar v Hari Singh 344 700  
 Bisheswar Das v Ambika 9 8  
 Bisheswar Das v Ram Prasad 70 540  
 Bisheswar Nath In the matter of 493  
 Bisheswar Prasad v Paghuber 303  
 Bishoka v Ananti 1165  
 Bishonath v Huro 67  
 Bishun Churn v Jogendra 1007  
 Bishun Laya v Bhaba Sundari 522  
 Bismillah v Bhakir Ali 354  
 Bissau Mal v Kesar Singh 392 1602  
 Bissamal v Kesar Singh 1002  
 Bissessor v Cunpat 3  
 Bissessarwar v Jasola 3 169 174

Bissicks v Bath Colliery Co 238  
 Biswanath v Baidyanath 1022  
 Biswa Nath v Bim Kanta 293  
 Biswanath v Langaraj 717 720  
 Bithal Das v Sand Kishore 230  
 Blackie v Osmaston 484  
 Bodh Singh v Gunes Chunder 219  
 222  
 Bodhnarain v Omrao 609  
 Bodhu v Mohan Singh 68  
 Bogra v Emperor 602  
 Bohra Akhey Ram v Basant Lal 711  
 Boidya Nath v Makhan Lal 89 9 9  
 Boisagomoff v Nahapet Jute Co 839  
 Bolckow Vaughan & Co v Fisher 563  
 Boloram Dey v Ram Chandra Dey 293  
 Bolye Chund In the matter of 130  
 Bomanjee Cowasjee In re 1239  
 Bomanji v Nusserwanji 843  
 Bombay and Baroda Railway Co v  
 Sassoon 209  
 Bombay and Persia Steam Nav Co v  
 Zuari 1060  
 Bombay Burmah Trading Corporation v  
 Dorabji 127 330 372  
 Bombay Burmah Trading Corporation v  
 Smith 982  
 Bombay Cotton Manufacturing Co v  
 Motilal Shrivast 94  
 Bombay Persia Steam N Co v Shep-  
 hard 4 414  
 Bombay Sizing Co v Kumbhar 1017  
 Bombay Steam Navigation Co Ltd  
 v Vasudev 338  
 Bommanapati v Chintakunta 661  
 Bommarauze v Rangasamy 607  
 Bomonji v Nusserwanji 834  
 Bon Behari v Satish Kantha 706  
 Bonner v Great Western Ry Co 967  
 Bonomah v Prosunno 712  
 Bonney v Wordsworth 438  
 Bool Chand v Bhoop Singh 430  
 Borradaile v Hunter 480  
 Boseck v Mandleston 108  
 Boston & Ramsey Urban District Coun-  
 cil 129  
 Bowdens Patents Syndicate Ltd v  
 Herbert Smith & Co 502  
 Bowles v Bowles 12  
 Boynton v Boynton 799  
 Boyson v Altrincham Urban District  
 Council 318 319  
 Bozon v Bolland 299

- Brahmavva v Appavva 760 764  
 Brahmavva v Venkatasurvanarayana  
 murthy 271 273  
 Brahmomoni Das v Andi S. 16  
 Braja v Jagannath 1000  
 Braja Bhuyan v Sri Chandra 302 303  
 396 9 1220  
 Brajabala v Curudas 776  
 Brajabala v Manik 641 643 648  
 Brajeshware v Budhanuddin 909  
 Brajgopal Ray v Amar Shandra 1002  
 Brajlal v Atkinson 79 658  
 Branson v Appasami 864  
 Brendon v Sundarabai 60  
 Bridges & Co v Shamas Din & Co 802  
 807  
 Bright v Warner 490  
 Brij Bhukhan v Durga Dat 1209  
 Brij Coomaree v Pamrick Das 992  
 1700 1206  
 Brij Indar Singh v Kanhi Ram 794  
 800 1011  
 Brij Kishore v Madho Singh 901  
 Brij Kishore v Pratab 701  
 Brij Narain v Tejbal 130 399  
 Brij Paj v Ram Sarup 61 868  
 Brij Soondur v Kimoonnika 100  
 Brijbasi Lal v Salig Ram 106  
 Brijbhukhan v Tota Pam 399 390  
 Brijmohan v Deobhanjan 1011  
 Brijnath v Jagernath 031  
 Brijratan v Jaynarain 397  
 Brindaban v Damodar 1002 1004  
 Brinsmead v Harrison 414  
 British Association of Glass Bottle  
 Manufacturers v Nettleford 567  
 British India Steam Navigation Co v  
 Secretary of State 345  
 British India Steam Navigation Co v  
 Sharafally 349  
 British Land Association v Foster 490  
 British South Africa Co v Companhia  
 de Mocambique 90 1244  
 Brito v Brito 319 321  
 Briton Medical Life Association v Bri  
 tannia Fire Association 480  
 Brogden v Metropolitan Railway Co  
 492  
 Brohm Dutt v Dharmodas 864  
 Brojendra v Budge Budge Jute Mill Co  
 528  
 Brojendra v Mohim Chandra 310  
 Brojendra v Prosanna 1008  
 Brojendra v Rup Lal 901  
 Brojo Behari Mitter v Kedar Nath 56  
 57  
 Brojo Copal v Lakshimoni 1249  
 Brojo Kanta v Tufaan Das 4  
 Brojodurlabh v Ramanath 820  
 Brojolal v Budh Nath 802  
 Brojonath v Kelat Chunder 899 901  
 Broken Hill Proprietary Co v Broken  
 Hill Municipal Council 54  
 Brook v Brook 478  
 Brookings v Vaudslay 494 490 496  
 Broome v F. parte 916  
 Brown v Dean 1001  
 Brown v Pearson 080  
 Brown Janson & Co v Hutchinson &  
 Co 698  
 Browne v Pearce 000 007  
 Bu Ali Khan v Sujay 333  
 Buccleuch (Duke of) 409  
 Buchcha v Handrani 300  
 Budden v Wilkinson 000  
 Buddha Misir v Bhagirathi 161  
 Buddha Ram v Kalu Ram 462  
 Buddha Lal v Mewa Ram 340 349  
 344  
 Buddha Lal v Rekkhab 618  
 Budh Singh v Niradharan 270  
 Budhilal v Morari 870  
 Budhmal v Pama 899  
 Budh Singh v Niradharam 277 278  
 Budhu v Barkat Ram 211  
 Budhu Lal v Chattu 350 1203  
 Budhu Ram v Ramzan 315  
 Budree Das v Chooni Lal 267 270 271  
 273 274 275 276 277 278 280  
 Budruddin Sahib v Abdul Iahim 158  
 Budrudeen v Gulam 641 642  
 Buhuns v Lalla Buhoree 219  
 Buiju Lal v Balak Lal 421  
 Buyha Roy v Ram Kumar 166  
 Bulagi Das v Kesri 764  
 Bulagi Shah v Collector of Lahore 1259  
 Bulaki v Petricha 126  
 Bulaki Das v Kesri 162  
 Bulaki Das v Secretary of State 924  
 Bull v Chapman 490  
 Bulli Mal v Jhabba 409  
 Bullivant v Attorney General 566  
 Bullock In re 595  
 Bullock v London General Omnibus  
 Co 404 412 415  
 Bullov Bhattachary v Baburam 309



Bunko Behary v Nil Madhub 370 371  
 Bunwari Lal v Drup Nath 132 133  
 Bura v Teja 603  
 Burchard v Macfarlane 509  
 Burjor v Pllerman City Lines Ltd 84  
 Burjore v Bhagana 103  
 Burjerji v Dhunbai 121  
 Burla v Kalapalli 1102  
 Burnes v Eyre 837  
 Burrell v Nicholson 565  
 Bustroa v White 563  
 Buta v Municipal Committee of Lahore  
 1170 1175 1179 1196  
 Buzloor Ruheen v Shumsoonnis a 437  
 Rynnath v Graham 1034  
 Bykant Nath v Pajendra Narain 204  
 505  
 Byomkes v Bhutnath 1259  
 Byrd v Dunn 478

C

Calcutta Trades Association v Ryland  
 201  
 Calgary and Medicine Hat Land Com  
 pany Limited Re 423  
 Campbell & Co v Jeshraj 311 1258  
 C Cook v Enchmarch 45  
 C E Doople v M E Moolia 28  
 C I M A Chettivar v K R S v  
 Chettivar 241  
 Campion v Palmer 692  
 Cardigan v Curzon Home 861  
 Cargill v Bower 510  
 Carlisle in re Clegg v Clegg 1191  
 Carriage Supply Association In re 579  
 Carrison v Rodrigues 14 15  
 Carter v Pigby 409  
 Cartwright v Pettus 95  
 Carvalho v Nurbibi 195 128 617  
 Cashin v Cradock 495  
 Casperz v Kishori Lal 100  
 Cassomally v Carrimbhoy 35  
 Caton v Lewis 69  
 Cave v Torre 487  
 Lawley v Loole 512  
 Cecil Gray v The Cantonment Com  
 mittee of Poona 17 249 500 501  
 Central India Spg Co v G I I Ry Co  
 256

Chail Behari v Kadar Nath 777  
 Chairman Gurdit Municipality v Srish  
 Chandra 30  
 Chairman Municipality Chapra v Basdeo  
 30  
 Chairman of the Purnea Municipality v  
 Siva Shankar Ram 1181 1184  
 Chaitanya v Mohamed 331  
 Chajju v Umrao 50 988  
 Chajju Ram v Neki 538  
 Chajmal Das v Brij Bhukan Lal 934  
 Chajmal Lal v Dharam 665  
 Chakrapani v Dhanji 750  
 Chakrapani v Government of India 893  
 Chaladom v Kakkath 441  
 Chamanlal v Bapubhai 525 53  
 Chamatkar v Mohesh Chunder 836  
 Chambasappa v Holibasappa 707  
 Chambers v Vinson 15  
 Champion In the matter of the ship  
 1258  
 Champsey v Junna Flour Mills 907  
 Champsey Bhara & Co v Jewraj Balloo  
 1176  
 Chamria v Chamria 1166 1181  
 Chanbasappa v Mainaba 468  
 Chanda Pra ad v Muset Jumna 663  
 509  
 Chand Mull v Ban Behari 923  
 Chandmull v Dhanraj 571  
 Chand Hour v Partab Singh 70 103  
 440 540  
 Chandaba v Kurer 894  
 Chandar v Durga 373 553  
 Chandaram v Samagany 604  
 Chandarsang v Khimabhai 783 790  
 791 797 793  
 Chandt bai v Hasanbhai 306  
 Chander Pershad v Sham Koer 183  
 Chandi Prasad v Mahendra 41 43  
 Chandi Paj v Kirpal Ray 1250  
 Chandidat v Padmanan 1 974 975  
 Chandlen v Iarles 851  
 Chandmull v Rance 430  
 Chando Bibi In the matter of the peti  
 tion of 960  
 Chandra v Amir 533 921  
 Chandra Kishore v Irasanna Kumari  
 508  
 Chandan Krishna v Nanni Lal 276  
 Chandra Kumar v Kusum Kumari 137  
 Chandra Kumar v Sandhyamani 801  
 Chandra Kumar v Sadhansu 397 398

- Chandra Kunwar v Narpat Singh 587  
 Chandra Nath v Kalprasanna 1001  
 Chandra Wati v Jagan Nath 37- 373  
 Chandrabala v Prabodh 166  
 Chandramani v Baidoo 517  
 Chandramathi v Narayanasami 604  
 Chandrareka v Secretary of State 493  
 Chandrawati v Jagannath 971  
 Chandreshwar Prasad v Bisheshwar  
 971 979  
 Chandri v Firm Dina Nath 906  
 Chandrika Lal v Saminath 811  
 Chandrika Prasad v Hirala 904  
 Chandu v Kombi 89  
 Chandu Lal v Koka Mal 303  
 Chandulal v Awad bin Umar 206  
 Chandulal v Dagdu 448  
 Chandulal v Jeshanobhai 900  
 Chandulal v Lakmi Chand 1014  
 Chandulal v Naginda 874  
 Chandumal v Motilal 294  
 Channala Swami v Gangadharappa 7 8  
 Channmull v Lance Soondery 803  
 Chant v Brown 066  
 Chapman v Leach 008  
 Chappan v Mordin 31- 300 905  
 Charan Das v Amir Khan 499 1034  
 Charandas v Chhaganlal 1203 1250  
 Charles v Jones 909  
 Charles Bright & Co Ltd v Sellar 397  
 Cherry v Pohoomul 809  
 Chara Ram v Sajan Mal 1170  
 Charu Bala v Nihar Kumari 1024  
 Charu Chandra v Chand 543  
 Charu v Sambhu 820  
 Chatarbhu v Harnanand 882  
 Chatarbhu v Harnandan 390  
 Chatarbhu v Jaghubar 1167  
 Chathakelan v Govinda 177  
 Chathappan v Pydel 398  
 Chathoth v Sardinavide 608  
 Chatrapat v Kharag Singh 318  
 Chatrapat Singh v Dwarakanath 1041  
 Chattar Singh v Amir Singh 642  
 Chattar Singh v Kamal Singh, 171  
 Chattar Singh v Lekhraji 340  
 Chattarmal v Thakure 925  
 Chattarpal v Raja Ram 886 887  
 Chatter Singh v Tej Singh 871  
 Chatterjee v Tribedi 1221  
 Chatterput v Maharaj Bahadur 421  
 Chatterton v Watney 692  
 Chattu Lal v Marwari 1256  
 Chattu Singh v Rai Radha 69  
 Chaturbhai v Harbhamji 933  
 Chaturbhu v Baidoo 990  
 Chaturbhu v Canesh 1174  
 Chatur Singh v Musammat Rama 120  
 Chaudhri Pisal Singh v Balwant Singh  
 60 61  
 Chaudhri Satgur v Kishore Lal 301 302  
 333  
 Chaudhry Har Prasad v Brij Kishor Das  
 393 1030  
 Chaudhry Lameshwar v Chaudhry  
 Sureshwar 748  
 Chaudhary v Mithu Rai 1009 1012  
 Chaurasi v Bhagan 063 937  
 Cheda Lal v Badulla 1000  
 Chedi Lal v Kuarji 904  
 Chedi Lal v Saadat un Nissa 939  
 Chelmu v Subbamat 784  
 Chena v Ghelabhai 668  
 Chenbasappa v Lakshman 303  
 Chenbasappa v Baslingappa 821  
 Chengal v Venkatta 876  
 Chengalavala v Venkateshwar 73  
 Chenna Reddi v Peddaobi Reddi 1055  
 Chennanagouda v re 300  
 Chennappa v Raghunatha 528  
 Chennu v Krishnan 422  
 Chenvirappa v Puttappa 219  
 Cherry v Pohoomal 949  
 Chesum & Sons v Cordon 398  
 Chetan Singh v Sartaj Singh 903 r  
 Chetan v Balbhadra 150 797  
 Chettiar Firm v Teo Ee San 156  
 Chettiarattil v Kunhi Koru 136  
 Chettyar Firm v Kolin Gye 396 399  
 Chettyar v Ma Shwe Pon 504  
 Chetty Firm v Maung Tha Din 638  
 Cheyt Ram v Chowdree Nowbut Ram  
 334  
 Chhabar Singh v Radhu Ram 377  
 Chhabal Das v Massu 442  
 Chhabale Ram v Durga 282  
 Chhabraji v Ganga 303  
 Chhagan Lakshman 940  
 Chhagan Lal v Jayaram 915  
 Chhaganlal v B B & C I Ry 943  
 Chhaganlal v Bai Harkha 54  
 Chhaganlal v The Collector of Kaira  
 249 250  
 Chhaganlal v Jayaram 298  
 Chhagmull v Amanatulla 620

- Chhajju Ram v Neki 1002 1003  
 Chhajjua v Khyala Ram 816  
 Chhajju v Qutub Din 1007  
 Chhalkhan Lal v Kanhaiya Lal 340 391  
 Chhanga v Cirhi 548  
 Chhanulhai v Dahyabhai 816  
 Chhatrapat Singh v Kharag Singh 336  
 Chhattoo Lal v Narain Das 2 18 853  
 Chhotalal v Ambalal 541  
 Chhotalal v Nabibhai 240  
 Chhotay Lal v Puran Mull 146  
 Chhotu Lal v Vhandrabhan 60  
 Chhotey Lal v Lakshmi Chand 120  
 Chhoti v Jameswar 141  
 Chhottu v Jawahir 1049  
 Chhubu Mian v Harcharan Das 349 101  
 Chudambara v Krishnaswami 537  
 Chudambara v Ramasami (5 Mad 161) 404  
 Chudambara v Ramasami (7 Mad 6) 713  
 Chudambara v Subbarayar 660  
 Chudambara v Thirumani 30  
 Chudambara v Veerani 310  
 Chudambaram v Kadar Mohideen 885  
 Chudambaram v Kother 30 887  
 Chudambaram v Krishna 153 160  
 Chudambaram v Subramaniam 431  
 Chudambaram v Thayanan 79 727 729  
 Chudambaranatha v Vallasiva 420  
 Chief Commissioner of Income Tax v North Anantapur Gold Mines Ltd. 1019  
 Chilly v Stenning 415 490  
 Chilton v Corporation of London 509  
 Chimanbai v Keshavlal 1182  
 Chiman Lal v Hulchand 1190  
 Chimna v Sarla 904  
 Chinnaji v Dinkur 609  
 China v Lakshminarasamma 79  
 Chintha v Chhaganlal 210  
 Chinna v Krishnavanamma 185  
 Chinna v Venkatasami 820 1186  
 Chinnammal v Tulukannatammal 102  
 Chinnasami v Karuppa 514 1013  
 Chintamallaya v Thadi Pangoriddi 1190  
 Chintaman v Balshastri 170  
 Chintaman v Chintaman 154  
 Chintaman v Chunisahu 217 300  
 Chintaman v Diwondo 267 20  
 Chintaman v Gangabai 783 781  
 Chintaman v Madhavray 93  
 Chintaman v Ramchandra 65  
 Chintamani v Pyari 1002  
 Chintamanray v Vithabai 215 734  
 Chintamony v Raghoonath 314  
 Chintamoney Dutt v Mohesh Chandra 176  
 Chiragh Din v Bhagwan Das 403  
 Chiranj v Jawahir 204  
 Chiranj v Kandan 540  
 Chiranj Lal v Dharam Singh 136 913  
 Chiranj Lal v Syed Hias Ali 870  
 Chiranjilal v Tularam 1001 10 9 1061  
 Chisholm v Gopal Chunder 576  
 Chitambar v Krishnappa 753  
 Chitpal Singh v Bhairon 332  
 Chockalinga v Duraiswami 85  
 Chocklingam v Seethai 432  
 Choganlal v Truman 640  
 Chokalingam v Seethai 1003  
 Chokalingam v Singaram 1021  
 Chokkalunga v Veluyudha 114 115  
 Chokkalingam v Naung Tha O 74  
 Chokkalingam Chetty v Lakshmanan 101  
 Cholappa v Ramchandra 346  
 Chooney Money v Ram Kinkur 1186  
 Chotalal v Manohar 103  
 Chotey Lal v Chandra Bhan 1  
 Chotha Ram v Harmon Bai 161  
 Choti Narain v Mutt Kameshwar 103  
 Choudhary v Choudhary 760 428  
 Choudry Wahed v Mi Jumae 101  
 Chova v Isa 103  
 Chowdhry Kesri v Giani Roy 748  
 Chowdhry Parsoosh Ram v Kali 170  
 Chowdhry Shamanund v Rajnarain 780  
 Chowdhury v Srimati 660  
 Chowdhury v Mahesh 800 817 878  
 Chowdhury Jamun Nath v Midnapur Zemindary Co 32  
 Chowthnull v Cakutta Wheat & Seeds Association 990  
 Christian v Irasat 770  
 Christie v Christie 494 495 496  
 Christien v Delanney 87  
 Chubhu Bhan v Harcharan Das 312  
 Chudasama v Ishwargar 913  
 Chudasama v Partapwarg 419  
 Chuha Mal v Hari Ram 1180 1184  
 Chullile v Othenam 693  
 Chun Ram v Bhagwan Das 817  
 Chunder v Geroof 47

Chunder v Shibo 73  
 Chundi Charan v Banke Behary Lal  
     46 747  
 Chundi Dutt v Pudmanund 319 979  
 Chundra Nath v Burroda 937  
 Chunni v Lala Ram 1003  
 Chuni Lal v Abdul Ah 801  
 Chuni Lal v Abdul Ah Khan 804  
 Chuni Lal v Anantram 992  
 Chuni Lal v Hira Lal 14  
 Chunni Lal v Jugal Bishore 30  
 Chuni Lal v Omond 177  
 Chuni Lal v Ramkishore 30 4--  
 Chuni Lal v Bai Mani 13 142  
 Chuni Lal v Kala 800  
 Chuni Lal v Karamchand 10  
 Chuni Lal v Lira Miyaji --  
 Chuni Lal v Ram Kishan 246  
 Chuni Lal v Sombar 1002  
 Chuni Lal Panalal v Bomani 3  
 Chunnulal v Mahipatray 104  
 Chunu Dutt v Babu Nandan 27  
 Churamani v Baidya Nath 30  
 Churya v Baneshwar 782  
 Chutterpat Singh v Santa 143 671  
     1045  
 Civil Service Co-operative Society v  
     General Steam Navigation Co 129  
     130 132  
 Clarapade v Commercial Union Associa-  
     tion 487 496 505  
 Clark v Alexander 231  
 Clark v Mullick 471  
 Clark v Ruthnavaloo 26  
 Clark v Wray 456 501  
 Clegg v Clegg 1191  
 Clegg v Rowland 881  
 Clive Durant *In re* 494  
 Coch v Allcock 837  
 Cockburn v Edwards 128  
 Cockerell v Dickens 11  
 Cockledge v Metropolitan Coal Associa-  
     tion 457  
 Cohen v Nursing Dass 469  
 Cohen v Rothfield 967  
 Colborne v Stockdale 490  
 Cole v Eley 530  
 Cole v Harper 85  
 Coley v DaCosta 1167 1189  
 Collector of Ahmedabad v Lavji 374  
 Collector of Bijnor v Munuvar 17 219  
 Collector of Gorakhpur v Palakdhari  
     582

Collector of Jaunpur v Bithal Das 151  
 Collector of Kanara v Krishnappa 894  
 Collector of Kanara v Rambhat 893  
 Collector of Meerut v Kalka Prasad  
     376 379  
 Collector of Monghyr v Hurdai Narain  
     409  
 Collector of Muzaffernagar v Husaini  
     Begam 805  
 Collector of Poona v Bai Chanchalbai  
     78  
 Collector of Ratnagiri v Janardan 893  
     894  
 Collector of Shahjahanpur v Surjan 652  
 Collector of Trichinopoly v Sevarama  
     krishna 893  
 Collector of Vizagapatam v Abdul Ka-  
     rim 894  
 Collector of Vizagapatam v Patnaik 4  
 Collector v Hira Nand 247  
 Collette v Coode 499  
 Colonial Sugar Refining Company v  
     Irving 289  
 Colyer v Finch 95  
 Combo v Corp London 565  
 Commercial Bank of India v Sabju  
     Saheb 800  
 Commissioner of Income Tax v Massey  
     & Co Ltd 80  
 Compagnie Financiere v Peruvian Gua-  
     no Co 568  
 Companhia de Mocambique v British  
     South Africa Co 94  
 Compania Sansinena v Houlder Bro-  
     thers & Co 404 413 449  
 Compton v Preston 456  
 Conolan v Leyland 823  
 Conybeare v Lewis 424  
 Cook v Andrews 401  
 Cook v Gill 103  
 Cook v Hathway 798  
 Cooke v Equitable Coal Co 539  
 Cooke v Forbes 263  
 Cooke v Smith 563  
 Coomar Sattya v Raneo Golapmonee  
     982  
 Cooper v Blissett 624  
 Cooper v Whittingham 129 130  
 Cooper *In re* 344  
 Co-operative Hindustan Bank v Bhola  
     Nath 1173  
 Coorla Mills v Vallabhdas 432  
 Cooverji v Dewsey 776

Corporation of Calcutta v Bhupati 1209  
 Cottingham v Earl of Shrewsbury 56  
 County of Gloucester Bank v Rudry  
 Merthyr Co 978  
 Court of Wards v Maharajah Coomar  
 I amaput 179  
 Coventry v Tulo Iershad 79  
 Coya ji v Khandas 74  
 Cowell v Taylor 833  
 Crackhall v Janson 495  
 Crewdson v Ganesh 124 125  
 Crisp v Watson 94 95  
 Cropper v Smith 496  
 Cro v Howe 41  
 Cullianji v Iaghovji 30  
 Currimchoy v Moon 511 519  
 Curawandas v Lalka Vahu 61 611 669  
 679  
 Cursetji v Gangaram 379  
 Cursetji v W Crowder 1178 11 9

## D

Dada v Naresch 517  
 Dadathai v Dingo 105  
 Dauloba v Damodar 615  
 Daglu v Chandrabhan 995  
 Dagduca v Bhukan 1175  
 Dahmiller Das v Bakhshi 161  
 Daim v Hayat 944  
 Daimler Company Ltd v Continental  
 Tyre and Rubber Co Ltd 253  
 Daji v Dhurajram 866  
 Daji v Sukharam 1020  
 Dakeshur v Lewat 866  
 Dakhina v Sarda 10 1044  
 Dakhni Din v Syed Ali 36  
 Dakhina v Omar Chand 249 250  
 Dakhinamurthy v Vedamurthy 153  
 Dal bin v Hansidhar 747  
 Dalachan v Khema 52  
 Dalalch v Damodar 375 329  
 Dalgleish v Lowther 56  
 Dalichan v Baschirkor 652  
 Dalip Singh v Ishar 300  
 Dalip Singh v Kunjan Singh 514  
 Dalip Singh v Umrao Singh 330  
 Damber Singh v Kalyan Singh 79 141  
 922  
 Dame Janbai v Sale Mahomed 1040

Dammar Singh v Pirbhu Singh 870  
 Damodar Das v Benares Bank 107  
 Damodar v Govindji 249  
 Damodar v Ishwar 203  
 Damodar v Muler 620  
 Damodar v Panalal 954  
 Damodar v Purmanandas 503  
 Damodar v Iaghunath 315 1182  
 Damodar v Sara Chandra 546  
 Damodar v Sinaji 671  
 Damodar v Vinayak 704  
 Damodar v Vyanku 923  
 Damodar Bhatji v Bhat Bhogilal 211  
 Damodar Das v Birj Lal 1043  
 Damodar Das v Sheo Ram Das 37  
 Damodara v Kittappa 373 1046  
 Damodarbhat v Bhogilal 271  
 Damodhar Das v Sheo Ram Das 37  
 Dampnaboyina v Addalal 479  
 Dami Shah v Raha Mal 108  
 Damu v Yakya 61 533 666  
 Damua v Abdul Samad 304 305  
 Danaji v Fern Luran Mal 103  
 Dan Dayal v Munnalal 103  
 Dandekar v Dandekar 1196  
 Dantillier v Meyer 5  
 Darab Kuar v Counti Kuar 96  
 Darbari v Bhoti 1 v L 0  
 Darbari v Govind 434  
 Darbo v Kesho 334  
 Darbo v Keshora 440  
 Darbyshire v Leigh 430 491  
 Daroga v Mohideen 74  
 Daropda v Sada Kuar 13  
 Darrogh & Co v Lurchotam 106  
 Darshan Lal v Shriji 276  
 Daries v Jamudin 264  
 Dargat Bibi v Badri Rasad 1060  
 Da Silva v Govind 17  
 Das v Mir 6 0  
 Das v Karla appa 1058  
 Dasondhay v Muhammad 276 421  
 Dasaratulla v Herjuddin 513  
 Dasrath Lal v Sheo Din 349  
 Dato bhoy v Vallu 709  
 Dattaram v Gangaram 740  
 Dattatraya v Annappa 243  
 Dattatraya v Mahadaji 181 185  
 Dattatraya v Punlik 233 241 1201  
 Dattatraya v Lurchotam 212  
 Dattatraya v Radhabhai 7 9  
 Dattatraya v Venkatesh 903  
 Dattatraya v Wasudev 913

- Datto v Shan 914  
 D Cruz v D Silva 467  
 Doraiswami v Bala undaram 471  
 Daul Ali v Ram Prasad 212  
 Daudbhai v Daudbhai 909  
 Daudbhai v Davaram 71  
 Daulat Ram v Durga Prasad 133  
 Daulat Singh v Jugul Kishore 20, 226  
 Daulat Singh v Maharaj Raja Ramji 10  
 Daulat Singh v Ratna 119  
 Daulatia v Har Corind 306  
 Davey v Bentinck 484 487  
 Davis v Freeth 69  
 Davis v Hyman & Co 699  
 Davis v James 478  
 Davis & Son v Morris 602  
 David v Paramasani 8  
 Davy v Carret 480 481 494 49  
 Daw Toke v Maung Ba Han 161  
 Daw v U Bah 38  
 Dawan Singh v Mahip Singh 30  
 Dawoodjee v Municipality of Rangoon 1046  
 Dawudbhai *In re* 884  
 Day v Brownrigg 47 94  
 Daya Narain v Secretary of State 101 102 103  
 Daya Ram v Jatti 613  
 Daya Singh v Buta Singh 789 800  
 Dayabhai v Bapalal 179  
 Dayachand v Hemchand 712  
 Dayaram v Gordhandas 89 90  
 Dayaram v Govardhandas 712  
 D Epineuil *Re* 624  
 Deb v Chowdherry 144 146  
 Deb Narain v Chairman Banmipur 30  
 Deb Narain v Paja Jagadish 441  
 De Beers Consolidated Mines Ltd v Howe 109 110  
 De Bernales v New York Herald 860  
 De Hart v Stevenson 423  
 De Houghton v Money 40  
 De Silva v De Silva 329  
 De Silva v Govind 251  
 De Souza v Coles 100 1245 1247 1253 1254  
 De Souza v Iestany 298  
 Debendra v Narendra 1023  
 Debendra v Satya Charan 26  
 Debendra Kumar v Rup Lal 693  
 Debendra Narain v Narendra 430 1023  
 Debendra Narain v Ramtaran 902  
 Debendra Nath v Bibudhendra 288 33, 345 3  
 Debendra Nath v Prasanna Kumar 165 166  
 Debi Baksh v Habib Shah 395 537  
 Debi Chand v Parbhu Lal 808  
 Debi Charan v Sheikh Mehdi 1209  
 Debi Churn v Bipra 416 1169  
 Debi Das v Ejaz Hussain 343 344  
 Debi Das v Maharaj Rupchand 712 716 721  
 Debi Dyal v Bhan Pertap 511  
 Debi Prasad v Jai Karan 913  
 Debi Prasad v Lewis 200  
 Debi Prasad v Dharamjit 904  
 Debi Rai v Prohlad Das 1037  
 Debi Sahai v Basheshar Lal 1002  
 Debo Das v Ram Charan 887  
 Dedhray v Mahabir 189 384  
 Dee Kappa v Chabhasappa 205  
 Deeshofits v Peters 712  
 Deep Narain v Dietert 12  
 Degambar v Kally Nath 678  
 Degumbari v Aushootosh 834  
 Deoraj v Abhairaj 876  
 Dekari Tea Co Ltd v The Indian General Steam Navigation Co Ltd 821  
 Delhi Cloth and General Mills Co v Income Tax Commissioner Delhi 289 323  
 Delhi and London Bank v Bhukari Das 902  
 Delhi and London Bank v Oldham 849  
 Delhi and London Bank v Orchard 78  
 Delhi and London Bank v Partab Bhaslar 220  
 Delhi and London Bank v Partab Singh 706  
 Delhi and London Bank v Pam Narain 961  
 Delhi and London Bank v Uncovenanted Service Bank 240  
 Delhi and London Bank v Wordie 1241 1244  
 Dena Bundhu v Hari 637  
 Denobundhoo v Kristomonee Dossee 48  
 Deo Narain v Webb 986  
 Deo Saran v Deoki 270  
 Deodhari v Lala Seosaran 70  
 Deodip Singh v Copal Singh 538  
 Deoki v Banst Singh 167  
 Deoki v Tapesri 732

[illegible]

- Dinamani v Elahadut Khan 13 181  
 Dinanath v Sadashiv 7  
 Dinanth v Musst Mayawati 19 141  
 Dinendra v Wilson 86  
 Dinendronath v Tarakchandra 211  
 Dinendronath v Ramkumar 209  
 Dinkar v Anant 71  
 Dinkarra v Yeshvantra 821 1198  
 Dino Bundhu v Hari 1 3  
 Dino Nath v Jogendra 391  
 Dino Nath v Pratap Chandra 6 27  
 Dinobundhu v Jeggama 20 209  
 Dinsha Petit v Jam et al 6 274 275  
 Dinshaw v Calstaun 3  
 Dip Narain v Hira Singh 902  
 Dip Narain v Lachman 93  
 Dip Prakash v Bohra Dwarka Prasad 9  
 Dipchand v Sheo Prasad 3  
 Durgopal v Kesho Prasad 114  
 Durgopal v Pahladilal 32  
 Disney v Longbourne 59  
 Diwali v Apaji 194  
 Diwalibai v Sadashivdas 1048  
 Diwan v Jagta 303  
 Diwan Chand v Bedha 10  
 Diwan Chand v Hari Chand 4  
 Diwan Chand v Jharia Coal Co 967  
 Diwan Chand v Iarbat 469  
 Diwan Chand v Ralla Ram 434  
 Diwan Shih Nath v Alliance Bank of  
 Simla 425 1003  
 Doaba Bank v Hiralal 42  
 Dobson v Bengal Spinning and Weaving  
 Co 104 226  
 Dobson v The Krishna Mills Ltd 1250  
 Dodbasappa v Pradhanappa 590  
 Dodds v Tuke 77  
 Dodhu v Madhavrao 306  
 Doherty v Allman 960  
 Dola v Balya 48 51  
 Doleman & Sons v Ossett Corporation  
 1190  
 Dongarchand v Madho Singh 199  
 Dookhee Khan v Rajessuree Raner,  
 20  
 Dooki v Bansi 10  
 Doolubdass v Ramlal 124  
 Dooly Chand v Mamuji Musaji 116  
 1166  
 Dooly Chand v Mohan Lal 826  
 Doorga v Doorga  
 Doorga Churn v 884  
 Doorga Doss v Rama Nauth 324  
 Doorga Mohan Doss v Tahir Ali 880  
 Doorga Pershad v Doorga Konwari 46  
 49  
 Doornas v Govindaswami 3b 78  
 Dorab Ali v Abdul Azeez 724 767  
 Dorab Ali v Executors of Khajah  
 Moheecooddeen 769  
 Doraiswami v Balasundaram 548  
 Doraiswami v Subramania 76  
 Dorami v Annasami 374  
 Dorasami v Muthusamy 414  
 Doraswami v Chidambaram 178 669  
 Doraswami v Thungasami 877 879  
 Dost Muhammad v Mani Ram 892  
 Dost Muhammad v Said Begam 50  
 Doucett v Wise 813  
 Douglas v Collector of Benares 532  
 Douglas v Forrest 64  
 Doulat v Bhukandas 136  
 Doulat v Bissessor 1014  
 Dowdeswell v Dowdeswell 50  
 Doya Narain v Secretary of State 104  
 246 247 1248  
 Doyal v Amrita 769  
 Doyamoyi Dasi v Sarat Chander 218  
 Dreyfus & Co v Gurditta Lal 372 1189  
 Dringbier v Wood 408  
 Dryden v Frost 909  
 Dubois v Hurish Chunder 85  
 Duches of Kingstone case 34 61 62  
 63 69  
 Duckett v Gover 427  
 Duckworth v Duckworth 202  
 Duckworth v McClelland 490  
 Duke of Buccleuch 49  
 Duke v Wisden 482  
 Dukhda v Srimonto 223  
 Dukhmallah v Halway 3  
 Dukhno v Munshi Sahu 389  
 Dukshina Re 606  
 Dulal v Ram Narain 120  
 Dulare Lal v Hazari Lal 66 120  
 Dulari v Vallabdas 886 887  
 Dulchand v Ramkishan 722  
 Duljeet v Rewal, 152  
 Dulla v Shih 7  
 Dullabh  
 Dulta  
 Dum  
 Dunc  
 Dunc



Deokinandan v Bansu Singh 728  
 Deokinandan v Narsing 103  
 Deokinandan v Rajah Dhakeswar  
 Irasad 728  
 Deokinandan v Sri Ram 626  
 Deokshen v Banu 309 310 1013  
 Deonandan v Janki 440 790  
 Deonandan v Ramdhari 626  
 Deputy Commissioner of Khera v Khan  
 Jan Singh 47  
 Desai Lallubhai v Mundas 921  
 Desai Ranchhoddas v Rawal 301  
 Desaiappa v Dundappa 79  
 Devaji v Bhavanidas 133  
 Deuchar v Re 1260  
 Deutsch Asiatische Bank v Hira Lal 2 3  
 Deutsche Springstoff Actien Gesellschaft  
 v Briscoe 1191  
 Dev Gopal v Vasudev 184 185  
 Devachand v Hirachand 296 298  
 Devandra Nath v Kailash Chandra 728  
 Devarakonda v Devarakonda 70  
 Devare v Vaikunt 197  
 Devendra Nath v Ram Rachpal 394  
 Devereux v Clarke & Co 484  
 Devgurguru Ex parte 400  
 Devi Das v Muhammad 790  
 Devi Dial v Moharaj 647  
 Devi Dittamal v Official Liquidator 985  
 Devi Prasad v Lewis 197  
 Devi Prasad v Secretary of State 200  
 Devichand v Pritam Das 004  
 Devidas v Pirjada Begam 000  
 Deviditt v Nathu 70  
 Dikabai v Jefferson 530 863  
 Dikaran v Sangidas 570  
 Dewa Singh v Fazal Dad 29 30  
 Dewan Amir v Nanakchand 387  
 Dewan Singh v Gokul 50  
 Dhadphale v Gurav 27  
 Dhairyasingh v Kissandas 804  
 Dhakjee v The East India Co 246  
 Dhan Kunwar v Mahtab Singh 152  
 Dhan Singh v Basant Singh 302  
 Dhanammal v Veeraraghava 746  
 Dhanapalu v Anantha 51  
 Dhanarajee v Balakissandas 1269  
 Dhande v Chotu Lal 340  
 Dhanu Ram v Chaturbhuj 159 160  
 Dhanu Ram v Luchmeswar 141 104  
 Dhanu Singh v Sri Chandra 36  
 Dhaninder Das v Bakshi 1003  
 Dhanjibhai v Mathurbhai 119,

Dhanjibhoy v Lisbo 991  
 Dhanjushaw v Florde 103  
 Dhannamal v Moti 303 320 330  
 Dhanpat Rai v Kaban Devi 11096  
 Dhanram v Ganpat 639  
 Dhanu Pam v Murli 840  
 Dhanukdhari Singh v Mahabir Pershad  
 Singh 726  
 Dhanwanti v Sheo Shankar 745 749  
 Dhapi v Pam Pershad 341 573  
 Dharam Chand v Queen Empress 672  
 Dharam Singh v Kishen Singh 990  
 Dharamsey v Balkrishna 802  
 Dharani v Gaber 66  
 Dharanjit v Chandeswar 700 792  
 Dharmaji v Gurrav 874  
 Dharmaraja v Pethu Raja 809  
 Dharmaraja v Srinivasa 388 928  
 Dharmikota v Budharaza 937  
 Dharni v Ashitipati 688  
 Dhera Mal v Haidar Shah 991  
 Dhirajlal v Hormusji 532 036  
 Dhirendra Nath v Kamini 701  
 Dhoni v Taraknath 647  
 Dhondi v Collector of Salt Revenue  
 1006  
 Dhondiba v Pamchandra 406  
 Dhondiram v Taba Savadan 010  
 Dhondo v Balkrishna 909  
 Dhondo v Bhikaji 52 605  
 Dhond het v Raju 12  
 Dhondv Pamji 60  
 Dhondv Vaman 314  
 Dhonkal v Phakkar 169 170 371  
 Dhoroney v Radha 960  
 Dhundiraj v Ganesh 576  
 Dhunjshaw v Florde 104 100 106  
 Dhunput v Parekh 422  
 Dhuttaloor v Paidigantham 988  
 Dick v Dhunji 417 090  
 Digambar v Labhadas 308  
 Digamber v Hari 198 724  
 Dijkstra v Manorama 740  
 Dildar Ali Khan v Bhawan Sabai  
 Singh 130  
 Dildar Hussain v Sheo Narain 710  
 Dilsukh Rai v Iachbman Das 153  
 Din Dayal v Petrakhan 308  
 Dina Nath v Upendra 469  
 Dinabandhu v Chintamani 1196  
 Dinabandhu v Darya Prasad 1190  
 Dinabandhu v Durgaprasad 1191  
 Dinabandhu v Mashuda 871

- Dinamoni v Elahadut Khan 13 181  
 Dinanath v Sadashiv —  
 Dinanath v Mus t Mayawati 10 141  
 Dinendra v Wilson 86  
 Dinendronath v Tarakchandra 11  
 Dinendronath v Ramkumar 08  
 Dinkar v Anant 71  
 Dinkarra v Yeshwantar 81 1188  
 Dino Bundhu v Hari 1 3  
 Dino Nath v Jogendra 381  
 Dino Nath v Pratap Chandr 1 —  
 Dinobunthu v Karmaya 00 00  
 Dinsha Petit v Jam etj 1 4  
 Dinsbaw v Cal taun 3  
 Dip Narain v Hira Singh 00  
 Dip Narain v Lachman 03  
 Dip Praka h v Behra Dwarka Irasad  
 — 9  
 Dipchand v Sheo Irasad 3  
 Durgopal v Kesho Irasad 114  
 Durgpal v Pahladilal 3  
 Disney v Longbourne 08  
 Diwali v Apaji 104  
 Diwalibai v Sadashivda 1048  
 Diwan v Jagta 303  
 Diwan Chand v Bedha 710  
 Diwan Chand v Hari Chand 47  
 Diwan Chand v Jharis Coal Co 017  
 Diwan Chand v Iarbat 469  
 Diwan Chand v Ralla Ram 438  
 Diwan Shib Nath v Alliance Bank of  
 Simla 425 1003  
 Doaba Bank v Hiralal 42  
 Dobson v Lengal Spinning and Weaving  
 Co 104 526  
 Dobson v The Krishna Mills Ltd 1250  
 Dodbasappa v Pradhanappa 090  
 Dodds v Tuke 077  
 Dodhu v Madhav Rao 306  
 Doherty v Allman 960  
 Dola v Balya 48 51  
 Doleman & Sons v Ossett Corporation  
 1190  
 Dongarchand v Madho Singh 199  
 Dookhee Khan v Pajessuree Raneer  
 0  
 Dooki v Banaj 10  
 Doolublass v Ramlall 124  
 Dooly Chand v Mamaji Musaji 116  
 1166  
 Dooly Chand v Mohan Lal 826  
 Doorga v Doorga 67  
 Doorga Churn v Nittokally 884  
 Doorga Doss v Rama Nauth 324  
 Doorga Mohan Dass v Tahir Ally 880  
 Doorga Pershad v Doorga Konwari 46  
 49  
 Doornas v Govindaswami 53b 78  
 Dorab Ali v Abdul Azeer 724 767  
 Dorab Ali v Executors of Ahajah  
 Moherooddeen 769  
 Doraiswami v Balasundaram 548  
 Doraiswami v Subramania 76  
 Dorasami v Annasami 374  
 Dorasami v Muthusami 414  
 Doraswami v Chidambaram 178 669  
 Doraswami v Thungasami 877 879  
 Dost Muhammad v Mani Ram 892  
 Dost Muhammad v Said Begam 50  
 Doucett v Wise 813  
 Douglas v Collector of Benares 532  
 Douglas v Forrest 84  
 Doulat v Bhukandas 135  
 Doulat v Bisessur 1014  
 Dowdeswell v Dowdeswell 505  
 Doya Narain v Secretary of State 104  
 246 247 1248  
 Doyal v Amrita 769  
 Doyamoyi Dasi v Sarat Chander 218  
 Dreyfus & Co v Gurditta Mal 372 1189  
 Drucqbier v Wood 408  
 Dryden v Frost 809  
 Dubois v Hursh Chunder 595  
 Duches of Lungstone s case 34 61 62  
 63 69  
 Duckett v Gover 427  
 Duckworth v Duckworth 202  
 Duckworth v McClelland 490  
 Duke of Buccleuch 429  
 Duke v Wisden 483  
 Duhhada v Srimonto 223  
 Dukhumallah v Halway 3  
 Dulhno v Munshi Sahu 389  
 Dakhina Re 606  
 Dulal v Ram Narain 120  
 Dulare Lal v Hazari Lal 66 190  
 Dulari v Vallabdas 886 887  
 Dulchand v Ramkishan 722  
 Duljeet v Rewal 152  
 Dulla v Shri Lal 158  
 Dullabh v Narain 70  
 Dulta v Kbedu 780  
 Dumi Chand v Arja 796  
 Duncan Re 125  
 Duncan v Jeetmul 443

Dungar v Jai Ram 620  
 Duni v Pritam Das 392  
 Duni Chand v Muhammad 29  
 Duni Chand v Pritamdas 543  
 Dunne v Kumar Chandra 972 973 974  
 Dunnichand v Aziz Khan 1006  
 Durai hami v Adimuthu 57  
 Durbari Mal v Noola Singh 924  
 Durga v Balwant 166 733  
 Durga v Bhagwandas 219  
 Durga v Sashibala 42  
 Durga v Umatara 141  
 Durga Bai v Ramanatha 490  
 Durga Bibi v Chanchal 194  
 Durga Charu v Rajbala 27  
 Durga Charan v Kali Prasanna 160 202 706  
 Durga Charan v Lakhi Narain 1003  
 Durga Chowdhraji v Jewahir Singh 2 300  
 Durga Churn v Hateen 66  
 Durga Churn v Monmohini 210  
 Durga Das v Dewraj 652 678  
 Durga Das v Jai Narain 94 108  
 Durgadutt v Bholaram 703  
 Durga Dihal Das v Anoraji 992 1028  
 Durga Kunwar v Balwant 706  
 Durga Prasad In the matter of 804  
 Durga Prasad v Jai Narain 300 1020  
 Durga Prasad v Mallikarjuna 889 992  
 Durga Prasad v Mansa Ram 716  
 Durga Prasad v Narain 71  
 Durga Prasad v Raja Rajgan, 441  
 Durga Prasad v Shambhu 198  
 Durga Prasad v Sheo Charan 305  
 Durga Singh v Bisheshar Dayal 516  
 Durga Sundari v Govinda 762  
 Durpati v Bibi Ramrack Pal 904  
 Dutt v Shamal 909  
 Dutta v Khedu 1166 1167  
 Duttu Singh v Dossad Bahadur 1194  
 Dwar Bux v Fatih 15 156 653 666 661  
 Dwarka v Lachhoman 547  
 Dwarka Das v Akhay Singh 41 43  
 Dwarka Das v Krishan 13  
 Dwarka Das v Muhammad 608  
 Dwarka Dass v Girish Chunder 830  
 Dwarka Dish Re application 1004  
 Dwarka Nath v Debendra Nath 622  
 Dwarka Nath v Imperial Bank of India 143 144  
 Dwarka Prasad v Brij Mohan Lal 473

Dwarkadas v Isabhai 188  
 Dwarkadas v Jadab 243  
 Dwarkanath v Debendra 124  
 Dwarkanath v Madhavray 883  
 Dwarkanath v Ramchand 40 55  
 Dwarkanath v Tarini Sankar 202 217  
 Dwijapada Das v Kalipada Das 60  
 Dwijendra v Joges 917

## E

E v E 399  
 Eade v Jacobs 006  
 East India Railway v Badri Narain 326  
 East India Railway Co v Piyari Lal 840  
 East India Railway Co v Ram Lakhan 433  
 East Indian Railway Co v Bengal Coal Co 1241 1244  
 East Indian Railway Co v Changai Khan 300  
 East Indian Railway Co v Jit Mal 306 601  
 East Indian Railway Co v Kanai Lal 348  
 Eastern Mortgage and Agency Co v Fakuruddin 976  
 Ebyj Umarsi v W & A Graham & Co 238  
 Ebrahim v Fakhruddin 11 089 1002 1200  
 Ebrahim v King Emperor 598  
 Ebrahim v Provas Chunder 1242  
 Ebrahimbhai v Tulbai 419  
 Echin v Little 500  
 Edevam v Cohen 498  
 Edulji v Manekji 86  
 Edulji v Vulebbhoy 430  
 Edun v Bechun 64  
 Edward v Ramdin 020 027  
 Edwards v Edwards 977  
 Egremont Burial Board v Egremont Iron Ore Co 560  
 Eknath v Ranaji 816  
 Ekram v Holodhur 39  
 Elahi Baksh v Emperor 607  
 Ellarayan v Rangaswami 73  
 Ellem v Vasheer 1002  
 Elie Goldberg v Sarojini 902

Ellis v Allen 540  
 Ellis v De Silva 130  
 Ellis v Manchester Carriage Co 401  
 Ellis v Wadson 700 851 852  
 Elmes v Hedges 130  
 Emanuel v Symon 54  
 Emden v Burn 457  
 Emperor v A Harb Lal 227  
 Emperor v Bhajan 227  
 Emperor v Bihari 343 346  
 Emperor v C Dunn 1607  
 Emperor v Chimanlal 832  
 Emperor v Chote Lal 300  
 Emperor v Chunilal 4  
 Emperor v Fatch Chand 1144  
 Emperor v Har Irasat 354  
 Emperor v Jogendra Nath 1607  
 Emperor v Ka hi 304  
 Emperor v Nabab Ali 607  
 Emperor v Panchu Da 1144  
 Emperor v Probhat 297  
 Emperor v Rajani 463  
 Emperor v Rodrigue 666  
 Empress v Amar Nath 672  
 Empress v Burah 1210  
 Empress v Mayadeb 607  
 Empress v Motab Chandre 18  
 Enariloli v Kidd 101  
 Enamul v Fkrumul 572  
 Enat Mondul v Baloram, 349 351  
 Enatulla v Jiban, 602 603  
 Endoori v Venkatachinnulu 606 607  
 Englishman v Lajput Rai 130  
 Equitable Trust Co v Hafiz Mahomed  
 340 434  
 Erat Madhavan v Venganath Swarapa  
 37  
 Erawa v Sudramappa 669 670  
 Erukulappa v The Official Assignee  
 95  
 Eshen Chunder v Shama Churn 501  
 593 598  
 Eshani Das v Gopal 196  
 Esmal v Haji Jan Mahomed 339  
 Esoof Hashhim v Fatima 4  
 Estwick v Conningsby 976  
 Eswara Doss v Venkataroyar 439  
 Etakkott v Etakkott 822  
 Eusuffzeman v Sanchia Lal 642  
 Evalappa Mudaliar v Balakrishnammal  
 277  
 Eyre v Podgers 557

Ezra v Gubbay 774  
 Ezra v Secretary of State 251

## F

Fadhu Jhal v Gour Mohun 3  
 Faizuz v Prag Narain 73  
 Faiz Ahmad v Bidar Din 1012  
 Fajor Banu v Polum Bux 784  
 Fakhr ud din v Ghafur ud din 472 549  
 Fakhrul v Ram 669  
 Fakir v Amin Chand 234  
 Fakir v Emambuksh 627  
 Fakirapa v Rudrap 406 410 435  
 Fakirchand v Naginchand 66  
 Fakirgouda v Vishnudas 549  
 Fakirullah v Bhakur Prasad 370  
 Fakrunnessa v District Judge 272  
 Fakruddeen v Official Trustee of Ben  
 gal 80 610  
 Falkner v Mirza 517  
 Fane v Fane 128  
 Fani Bhusan v Surendra Nath 669 869  
 Farandra Nath v Dwarka Nath 1166  
 Faqira v Hardewa 790  
 Farhat un Nissa v Sundari 26  
 Farid Ahmed v Dulari 340  
 Farzand v Abdullah 602  
 Farzand Ali v Bismillah Begam 1024  
 Fatch Chand v Ashan Kunwar 301  
 Fatch Chand v Mansab Rai 493  
 Fatch Din v Qutab Din 710 719  
 Fatch Muhammad v Imam ud Din  
 587  
 Fatch Singh v Jagannath Singh 45  
 46 48 49 75 809 813  
 Fatema v Imdad Ali 119  
 Fatima Bibi v Ahmed Baksh 332  
 Fatimunnissa v Ashgar Husain 641  
 Fatimunnissa v Deoki 1002  
 Fatima ul Hasna v Baldeo Sohai 746  
 Fatmabai v Aishabai 70 600  
 Fatmabai v Dossabhoy 883  
 Fatmabai v Pirbhai 432  
 Fatmabai v Sonbar 293  
 Fattch Singh v Lachmi 70  
 Faujdar Rai v King Emperor 1220  
 Fawel v Eastern Counties Ry Co 15  
 Fazal v Hashmati 11 314 542 553  
 Fazal v Mantur 747 765  
 Fazal v Umsar 1061

Fazal Ilahi v Prag Narain 1189 1192  
 Fazal Iman v Rasul 30  
 Fazil v Krishna 239  
 Fazal Karim v Maula Baksh 300  
 Fazlul v Sardar 220  
 Fazloor v Altaf 66  
 Fazlur Rahim v Dwarka Nath 100  
 Fazulbhoy v Bombay and Persia S A Co 1188  
 Fazul Un Nissa v Mulo 1037  
 Fenner and Lord Re 572  
 Fennessy v Clark 561  
 Fennessy v Day and Martin 129  
 Fernandez v Rodrigues 42 1036  
 Fernandez v Wray 101  
 Feroz Din v Nawab Khan 583  
 Feroze v Nawab Khan 333  
 Feuerheerd v London General Omnibus Co 566  
 Fillingham v Dunn 1046  
 Financiere v Peruvian Guano Co 567  
 Fink v Bahadoor Singh 233  
 Fink v Buldeo Das 1946  
 Fink v Corporation of Calcutta 972  
 Fink v Maharaj Bahadur Singh 978  
 Firm Chaitanya v Jagat Chandra 958  
 Firm K K S A R v Maung Hya 1004  
 Firm Kanwar Bhan v Firm Ganpat Rai 488  
 Firozi Begam v Abdul Latif 997  
 Fischer v Kamela Naecker 131 102  
 Fisher v Nagappa 812  
 Fisher v Owen 49 501 502  
 Fitzhollmes v Bank of Upper India Ltd 914  
 Fletcher v Bealey 264  
 Fletcher's case 509  
 Foakes v Webb 566  
 Foolibai v Rampratab 1246  
 Forbes v Ammeerunnissa Begum 314  
 Forbes v Secretary of State 29  
 Forester v Secretary of State 132 141 374 1044  
 Forster v Farquhar 129 130  
 Fort Gloster Jute Manufacturing Co v Chandra 613  
 Potick Chunder v Foley 940  
 Framji v Adarji 13 108 793  
 Framji v Commissioner of Customs 125  
 Framji v Hormaji 107 737  
 Framji v Mohanving 568  
 Framji v Ratansha 140 638  
 Francis v Harrison 900

Francisco v Dos Anjos 130  
 Frankenburg v Great Horseless Carriage Co 408 412 413 418  
 Frankenstien v Gravin's Co 56 1067  
 Fraser v Cooper Hale & Co 4 4  
 Fray v Voules 14  
 Fredrick Peacock v Madan Gopal 157 212 231  
 Frome United Breweries Co v Bath Justices 12  
 Fulchand v Harilal 28  
 Fuli Bibi v Khokai 863  
 Fulkumari v Ghanshyam 2  
 Fuller v Mackey 108  
 Fussell v Dowding 861  
 Fut Chong v Maung Po Cho 350  
 Futeek v Mohender 133  
 Futtch Narain v Chundrabati 170

## G

G I P Railway v Mahadeo 248  
 Gadadhar v Radacharan 57  
 Gadigappa v Shidappa 70 748 749  
 Gadigeya v Basaya 26  
 Gafurunnissa v Narayan 106  
 Gahar v Hasi 108  
 Gaikwar Bhikar v Ghandi 991  
 Gaizaddy v Soroj Kumar 373  
 Gajadhar v Abdul Majid 708  
 Gajadhar v Ambika 325 100  
 Gajadhar v Babu Arjun 158  
 Gajadhar v Bhagwanta 52  
 Gajadhar v Firm Manulal 145  
 Gajadhar v Ganesh 290  
 Gajadhar v Hishan 136 399 914 920  
 Gajanan v Bhaskar 900  
 Gajapathi v Sasudeva 984  
 Gajendra Singh v Durga Kumar 289 821  
 Gajja Singh v Natha Singh 300  
 Gajraj v Swaminath 7 137 146 147  
 Gajraj Mati v Shami Nath 7  
 Gajranati Teorain v Akbar Hussain 764  
 Galstaun v Donnerjee 233  
 Galstaun v E D Sassoon & Co Ltd 579 579 686  
 Ganamma v Ketireddi 708  
 Ganapathi v Balasundara 170

Ganapathi v Bharati 23  
 Ganapathi v Chenna 641  
 Ganapathy v Krishnamachariar 160  
 162  
 Ganapati v Setharama 1009  
 Ganda Mal v Piranditta 403  
 Gandharv v Nirmal 26  
 Ganendra v Sri Sri Shyam 663  
 Ganesa v Channakhamani 102  
 Ganesh v Dinwari Lal 11 929  
 Ganesh v Kapu 863  
 Ganesh v Bhikham 112 118.  
 Ganesh v Damoo 16  
 Ganesh v Gopal 34  
 Ganesh v Jewadh 452  
 Ganesh v Kachy (-8 All 621) 1192  
 Ganesh v Kachy Nath (-6 All 49) 718  
 Ganesh v Lakshmi 61  
 Ganesh v Purshottam 97 "J" 32 19  
 Ganesh v Shankar 195  
 Ganesh v Tatyasa 212 212  
 Ganesh v Vasudeo 999  
 Ganesh v Vithal 74  
 Ganesh v Yehwant 11  
 Ganesh Das v Fattich Chand 662  
 Ganesh Das Ishar Das v Durga 1191  
 Ganesh Lal v Debi Das 604  
 Ganesh Lal v Kumar Satya Narayan  
 942  
 Ganesh Lal Pandit v Khetra Mohan  
 Mahapatra 924  
 Ganesh Prasad v Banadhar 109  
 Ganesh Prasad v Bhagela Ram 243  
 Ganesh Rao v Tuljaram Row 873 877  
 Ganesh Singh v Debi Singh 939  
 Ganesh v Mulchand 876  
 Ganesh v Mundi Forest Co 421 498  
 Ganesh v Charan 899  
 Ganesh v Khairati 414 809  
 Ganesh Lal v Debi Das 602  
 Ganesh Lal v Khairati 402  
 Ganga v Gaura 893  
 Ganga v Musamat Bahini 817  
 Ganga v Ram Prasad 754  
 Ganga Bishan v Jagmohan 198  
 Ganga Bishan v Murree Brewery Co  
 129  
 Ganga Charan v Ramchandra 276  
 Ganga Charan v Shashi Bhushan 347  
 Ganga Das v Yakub Ali 10 150 161  
 656 661  
 Ganga Das v Ramjoy 10  
 Ganga Deo v Joti Lal 385 938

Ganga Devi v Ram Prasad 160  
 Ganga Din v Khushali 207  
 Ganga Mulik v Bayaji 908  
 Ganga Prasad v Chuni Lal 909  
 Ganga Prasad v Ganesh Lal 82 84 86  
 Ganga Prasad v Kura 1182 1185  
 Ganga Puri v Mohan Lal 277  
 Ganga Ram v Akbari 816  
 Ganga Ram v Dina Nath 663  
 Ganga Ram v Ruli 302  
 Ganga Sahai v Baldeo Singh 1179  
 Ganga Sahai v Keshri 22  
 Ganga Sahai v Lekhray 1178  
 Ganga Singh v Chauhan Ram 1040  
 Gangabai v Khashabai 779  
 Gangadas v Bai Suraj 731 732  
 Gangadhar v Khaja 610  
 Gangadhar v Krishnanji 520  
 Gangadhar v Sekali 37  
 Gangadhar v Hubli Municipality 344  
 Ganganand v Pameshwar 822  
 Gangappa v Gangappa 319  
 Gangaraju v Somanna 181  
 Gangaprasad v Kuladnan 178  
 Gangaram v Dinkar 30  
 Gangaram v Gujar Mal 119  
 Gangaram v Nandini 29  
 Gangaram v Vasudeo 55  
 Gangayya v Venkataramayya 209 249  
 Ganga v Jangi Lal 207  
 Ganoda v Nalini 249  
 Ganoda v Shub Narain 548  
 Ganoda Sundari v Nalini 1244  
 Ganoo v Dhondu 184  
 Ganoo v Shri Desh Desheswar 587  
 Ganpat v Collector of Kanara 892  
 Ganpat v Jivan 1027  
 Ganpat v Rajkumar 1009  
 Ganpat Lal v Bind Bassini Prasad 904  
 Ganpat Narain in the matter of 966  
 Ganpati v Jivani 299 460  
 Ganpatibhatta v Devappa 710  
 Ganpatram v Isaac 227  
 Ganpatrao v Anandrao 152  
 Ganpaya v Krishnappa 643 660  
 Ganu Singh v Jangi Lal 924 925  
 Garabini v Suraja Narain 102 1024  
 Garibani v Suraja 1024  
 Garden Reach Spinning and Weaving  
 Co v Secretary of State 1017  
 Gardner v Irwin 508  
 Garudhuj Prasad v Baiju Mal 378  
 1044

Catti Lal v Bir Bahadur 240  
 Caunt v Fvney 263  
 Caura Bibi v Chasita 604  
 Cauran v Brij Raj 100  
 Cauri Shankar v Kunwar Jang 62  
 Gauri Dutt v Dohan 826  
 Cauri Shankar v Mada Koor 816 1198  
 Cauri Shankar v Mt Wanka Kunwar 480  
 Cauri Shankar v P J DeCruz 200  
 Cauri Singh v Gajadhar Da 153  
 Gaurishankar v Chinnumaya 108  
 Cauri Shankar v Keshab Deo 297  
 Caukha v Abdul 139  
 Cautret v Egerton 477 483  
 Cavadappa v Cirmalappa 304  
 Cavaranga v Boto Hari Das 516  
 Gavrishankar v Atmaram 502  
 Gaya v Awadh, 516  
 Cava v Name 1019  
 Gava Bak h v Kuar Rajendra, 16  
 Cava Prasad v Randhir Singh 139 706  
 Gavanoda v Butto Hari to 89  
 Gazette of India, 1181  
 Gedge v Poval Exchange Assurance Corporation, 490  
 Ceereeballa v Chunder Kunt 419 863  
 Geffert v Ruckchand 105 116  
 Genaram v Hanmantram 657  
 Genda Mal v Purbhu Lal 816  
 Gendo v Nihal Kunwar 638  
 Genra Prasad v Genra Bak h 1208  
 Genu v Sakharan 160 733  
 George v Vastian Sourv 1176 1177  
 Ghemandi v Amir Begam 84  
 Chanasham v Kashiram, 637 639  
 Chanasham v Lal Singh 100  
 Chanham v Moroba, 129 130  
 Chanhamlal v Bhansali, 197 694  
 Chanasham Singh v Bhola Singh 37  
 Chana. hysam v Gobunda, 976  
 Ghana. hysam Lal v Ram Narain, 136  
 Ghantavya v Papavva, 934  
 Ghariv v Cowrya, 640  
 Gha. i Ram v Manal Chand, 718  
 Gha. i Pam v Nura, 1204  
 Chazaffar v Yawar Hussain, 276 277  
 Ghaziti Bilal v Abdul Samad 749  
 Chazi ud-din v Bishan Dial, 20  
 Ghaznavi v Allahabad Bank, 946  
 Chela v Sankalchand, 40 71  
 Ghelabhai v Hargovan 20 7  
 Ghelabhai v Uderan 67 277

Ghelabhai v Nandubai 824  
 Gurdharee Singh v Koolahul Singh 2  
 Ghosumal v Todarmull 237 238 900  
 Gholam Mowlah v Ali Hafiz 277 278  
 Chulam v Dwarika Prasad, 343  
 Ghulam v Chulam 346  
 Ghulam Hussain v Dina Nath 899  
 Ghulam Kadir Khan v Mostakim Khan 900 954  
 Chulam Khan v Muhammad Hasan 986 1164 1176 1181 1183 1184 1186 1189 1199 1193  
 Ghulam Muhammad v Nur Khan, 444  
 Ghulappa v Pachavendra 68  
 Ghulsum v Ahamed, 619 629  
 Ghuznavi v The Allahabad Bank Ltd. 393 1011 1012  
 Giban v Ramch 824  
 Gibbons v Norman 48  
 Gilbert v Smith 20 280  
 Gilkinson v Subramania 11  
 Girdhar v Davabhai 40 49  
 Girdhar v Ganpat 295  
 Girdhar v Kalva 28  
 Girdhar v Kachar 110  
 Girdhar Das v Har Shankar 228  
 Girdhar Das v Sidhe hwar 766  
 Girdharee Lal v Kantoo Lal, 217  
 Girdhari v Dital, 704  
 Girdhari Lal v Pam Charan 170  
 Girdhari Lal v Crawford, 310  
 Girdhari Lal v Deputy Comm. ion r 547  
 Girdhari Lal v Pam Lal 70  
 Girdhari Lal v Umdajan, 47  
 Girdhari Singh v Bhupal Singh, 62  
 Girdhari Singh v Hardeo Narain, 702 703  
 Girdhardal v Sundar Bibi, 132  
 Girdharlal v Zorawar Singh 1007  
 Guriappa v Nungapa, 306  
 Gurbala v Bawambhar 644  
 Gurja v Kanai, 1160  
 Gurjananda v The Emperor 580  
 Gurindra v Kedar Nath, 31 32  
 Gurs v Sri Krishna, 204  
 Gurh Chunder v Kedar Nath, 902  
 Gurh Chunder v Sasi Sekharswar 1003  
 Gurh Chundra v Apurba, 3  
 Gurva v Sabapathy 64 67  
 Gurja Shankar v Gopalji, 613  
 Gurjabai v Pachunath, 304  
 Gurja Shankar v Murdhhar 25

- Gurwar v Mamt. Makhbunessa 903  
 Girana Sannadhi v Kandusami 275  
 453  
 Gladstone Wylie & Co v Joosub 660  
 674 701  
 Gledhill v Hunter 400  
 Gnanada v Nalini 41  
 Gnanambal v Parvathi 78  
 Gnanasambanda Pandara Sanadhi v  
 Venu Pandaram 194  
 Gnanendra v Prafullananda 394  
 Goba v Sakharani 162  
 Gobardhan v Bishan 151 157  
 Gobardhan v Bisbunath 173  
 Gobardhan v Munna Lal 898  
 Gobardhan v Shamakantlal 423  
 Gobardhandas v Makundi Lal 721  
 Gobind v Afzal 540  
 Gobind v Taruck 40 53  
 Gobind Das v Bushambar Das 23  
 Gobind Lal v Baldeo Singh 45  
 Gobind Lal v Ramjanam 901  
 Gobind Ram v Ganesh Ram 900  
 Gobind Ram v Kunj Behari Lal 520  
 Gobind Ram v Muhammad 533 568  
 Gobind Singh v Bhurgu Nath, 1186  
 Gobinda v Lalai 939  
 Gobinda v Kunja 341  
 Gobinda v Radha 1008  
 Gobinda Chandra v Dwarka Nath 824  
 825  
 Gobinda Lal v Shuba Das 1208  
 Gobinda Mal v Santa 509  
 Gobinda Ram v Bholanath 1061  
 Gobindjee v C J Smith 472  
 Gocool Chunder v Administrator  
 General 804  
 Goculdas v Chaganlal 1242  
 Goculdas v Ganeshlal 467  
 Goculdas v James Scott 292 827  
 Goculdas v Odhavji, 69  
 Goculdas v Sadasivier 1249  
 Goculdas Manufacturing Co v Scott  
 820  
 Goculdas v Sadasivier 120  
 Goda v Soondarammall 797  
 Godard v Gray 86  
 Godavari v Cajapati 314  
 Godavaribai v Deekappa 233  
 Godavarthi v Godavarthi 128  
 Godden v Corsten 484  
 Godhu v Shyam 1004  
 Godman v Times Publishing Co 434  
 Godu v Suraj Lal 575  
 Gokal Chand v Sanwal Das 333  
 1204 1256  
 Gokalehand v Sanwal Das 992  
 Gokul v Aukhil 141  
 Gokul Das v Nathu 106  
 Gokul v Mohri Bibi 721  
 Gokul v Shrimal 74  
 Gokul Mandar v Pudmanund 3 63 64  
 Gokul Pande v Baldeo 1018  
 Gokul Prasad v Ram Devi 374  
 Gokul Prasad v Ram Kumar 1011 1012  
 Gokulchand v Bhika 642  
 Gokulsing v Kisan Singh 158 159 160  
 163  
 Gokal Nath v Mathura Nath 194  
 Golam v Goljan 650  
 Golam Abad v Judhister 756 761  
 Golam Mahammad v Saroda 344  
 Golaupmonee v Prosomomove 884  
 Goma v Gohaldas 724  
 Gomatham v Komandur 114 141 154  
 Gonesh v Shiva 240  
 Goodhart v Hyett 129  
 Googlee v Premilali 315  
 Goor Bux v Birj Lal 514  
 Goorodoss Roy v Gohlam Mowlah 324  
 Gooropersad v Juggutehunder 324  
 327  
 Gopal v Baikuntha 923  
 Gopal v Benarasi 52  
 Gopal v Bigoo 887  
 Gopal v Hanmant 306  
 Gopal v Jhakri 1019 1020  
 Gopal v Joharimal 705 707  
 Gopal v Kashi 211  
 Gopal v Narasinga 446  
 Gopal v Pamchandarra 780  
 Gopal v Solomon 1003  
 Gopal v Vishnu 518  
 Gopal Chandra v Abdur Rahim 294  
 Gopal Chandra v Purna Chandra 814  
 Gopal Chandra v Rajani Kanta 1077  
 Gopal Chunder v Gunamoni Das 669  
 Gopal Das v Girani 233 234  
 Gopal Das v Alaf Khan 343 1001  
 Gopal Das v Mulchand 790  
 Gopal Dei v Kanno Dei 208 209  
 Gopal Dinkar v Ganesh Narayan, 1175  
 Gopal Lal v Purna Chandra 272  
 Gopal Lal v Taj Muhammad 100  
 Gopal Sah v Janji Koer 600



Gopal Singh v Court of Wards 120  
 Gopal Singh v Ganpatrao 721  
 Gopala v Lakshmana Rao 401  
 Gopala v Visvanatha 746  
 Gopala Chetti v Subbier 314 550  
 551  
 Gopaldas v Baij Nath 1164 1186  
 Gopala Row v Maria Susaya 539  
 Gopaldas v Tribhovan 174  
 Gopalan v Surayanaravana 1179  
 Gopalacharyulu v Subbamma 59  
 Gopalakrishnaaya v Sanjeeva 751  
 Gopalchandra v Purna Chandra 815  
 Gopee Lall v Chundrasee 503 934  
 Gopee Nath v Luchmeeput 753  
 Gopendra v Mati Lal 633  
 Gopeswar v Hem Chandra 1260  
 Gopi Chand v Benarsi Das 700 752  
 760  
 Gopi Chand v Hasimunnessa 204  
 Gopi Das v Lal Das 282  
 Gopi Lal v Benarsi Prasad 47  
 Gopi Mohan v Doybaki 96 140  
 Gopi Narain v Bansidhar 911  
 Gopi Nath v Dhugwant 41 67  
 Gopi Nath v Goluck Chunder 334  
 Gopi Rai v Rambhajan 151  
 Gopika Ram v Mahar Ali 1003  
 Gopika Raman Roy v Atal Singh 582  
 Gopikushna v Nilkonul 104  
 Gopial v Agarsingh 871  
 Gopinath v Moheshwar 1013  
 Gopinath v Sajani 156  
 Gopu v Rajammal 267 263  
 Gopu v Samu 524  
 Gora Chand v Prafulla Kumar 113  
 646  
 Gorachand v Baykanto 308  
 Gorak Singh v Sidh Gopal 201  
 Gorak v Vithal 352  
 Gordhan v Bishambar 441  
 Gordhandas v Gauthamchand 855  
 Gordhandas v Prankor 627  
 Gordon Re 829  
 Gosain Bhainath v Bihari Lal 329  
 Gosain v Puran Singh 301  
 Goshain v Pickmune 582  
 Gossain Money v Gour Pershad 960  
 Gossami v Romanlalji 290  
 Gosto Behary v Hari Mohan 11  
 Goswami v Govardhanlalji 100 101 103  
 Goswami Gordhan Lalji v Goswami  
 Mahudan 679

Goswami Sri Raman Lalji v Bohra Des  
 raj 289  
 Gotepati v Gotepati 61  
 Goturam v Birku 823  
 Gondoom v Venkatesa 195  
 Gour v Nilmadhab 1006  
 Gour Chunder v Chunder Coomar 732  
 Gour Mohan v Noyan 1255  
 Gour Sundar v Hem Chunder 106 600  
 657  
 Gour Surn Doss *In re* 1033  
 Gournad v Fitzgerald 485  
 Gouri Dutt v Dohan 826  
 Gourley v Plimsoil 561  
 Gourmoni v Jugat Chandra 78 79  
 Gourmony v Abdul 326  
 Goutiere v Robert 901  
 Government Pleader v Annaji 1230  
 Government Pleader v Vinayak 1230  
 Govind v Dada 671  
 Govind v Dhondbarav 68  
 Govind v Harihar 52  
 Govind v Mohonraj 241  
 Govind v Parashram 446  
 Govind v Pamkrishna 198  
 Govind v Vallabhrao 971  
 Govind v Veetil 49  
 Govind v Venkata 694  
 Govind v Venkatesh 1194  
 Govind v Vithal 305  
 Govind Narayan v Vallabhrao 975  
 Govinda v Dandas 1026  
 Govinda v Krishna 79  
 Govinda v Krishnancharlu 1206  
 Govinda v Jala Krishun 219 220  
 Govinda v Mana Vikraman 450  
 Govinda v Tiruvengadi 992  
 Govindan Nair v Achutha Memon 98  
 Govindan Nambiar v Krishnan Nambiar  
 90  
 Govindappa v Hanumanthappa 305  
 Govindaraja v Alagappa 414  
 Govindarajulu v Pangarao 876  
 Govindarajulu v Secretary of State  
 98 101 102  
 Govindarajulu v Secretary of State  
 1219 1248  
 Govindasami v Alagirisami 874  
 Govindasami v The Municipal Council  
 867  
 Govindasamy v The Union Bank Ltd  
 366 367

Govindaswami v Kandaswami 76 924  
 Govindaswami v Pethaperumal 684  
 Govindlal v Bansilal 1245  
 Govindrar v Babu 947  
 Gowri v Vigneshwar 150  
 Gowri Koer v Audh Koer 30 52a 52b  
 Gowri Prosad v Pam Ratan 430  
 Grama v Bombay Steamships 469  
 Grant v Anderson & Co 502 834  
 Grant v Subramaniam 240  
 Granville v Firth 130  
 Great N W Central Ry Co v Charles  
 74 822  
 Green v Serin 500 570  
 Greenshunder v Collins 102  
 Gregory v Dooley Chand 830  
 Grev v Hazari Lal 157  
 Grev v Woogramohun 978 979  
 Griebart v Morris 560  
 Griffiths v London and St Katharine  
 Docks Co 491  
 Griffith v Pound 420  
 Grish Chander v Sasi Shekharewar (33  
 Cal 328) 621  
 Grish Chunder v Shohi Shikharewar  
 (27 Cal 901) 130 141 620 621 842  
 Grizewood v Blane 490  
 Groves v Administrator General 177  
 Grumbrecht v Parry 557  
 Gudaru v Maradugula 80  
 Guddappa v Tirukappa 45 47 48  
 Gudri Koer v Bhubaneswari 934  
 Gudri Lal v Jagannath 93  
 Guimoni v Tarini 821  
 Guise v Jaisraj 343  
 Gujar Mal v Narain Singh 376 381  
 Gujar v Sital 782  
 Gulab v Mutassadi Lal 721  
 Gulab v Thakur 314  
 Gulabchand v Bahram 7  
 Gulab Chand v Sher Singh 116  
 Gulab Dei v Vash Motor Co 873  
 Gulab Khan v Abdul Waheb Khan  
 289  
 Gulab Khan v Ataulah 684  
 Gulab Kuar v Bansidhar 194 201  
 Gulab Kunwar v Thakur Das 1003  
 Gulab Pai v Mangli 10  
 Gulab Rai v Mangli Lal 987  
 Gulab Shah v Haveli Shah 441  
 Gulabi Bibi v Aslam Khan 776  
 Gulabrao v Magon 172  
 Gulabrao v Vinayak 996

Gulam Hussein v Mahamadali 924  
 Gulam Hussain v Piarally Abdulla 798  
 Gulam Mahomed v Shibendra 818  
 Gulba v Basanta 421  
 Gulikandi v Manni Lal 815  
 Gulli v Sawan 785 786  
 Gulzar Sing v Kalyan Chand 103  
 Gulzari v Daya Ram 658  
 Gulzari Lal v Madho Ram 156 157  
 163  
 Gunami v Ram Charan 452  
 Gunga Das v Ramjoy 987  
 Gunga Narain v Tillukram 483 534  
 Gunga Pershad v Jawahr 734  
 Gungapershad v Gopal Singh 217  
 Gunga Prosad v Brojo Nath Das 375  
 377  
 Gunraj v Mahanji 497 509 517  
 Gupta v Behari 1021  
 Gur Nanak v Jainaram 60  
 Gur Narayan v Sheo Lal Singh 59 900  
 Gur Prasad v Ram Lal 156 157  
 Guran Ditta v Pokhar Ram 1164 1184  
 Guranditta Mal v Ram Das 101  
 Gurashantappa v Gurava 385  
 Gurcharan v Shubdev 291  
 Gurdas v Bhag 9  
 Gurdas Mal v Kashi Ram 700  
 Gurdeo Singh v Chandrikah Singh 50  
 112  
 Gurdial v Diwan Chand 438  
 Gurdial v Gurbaksh 607  
 Gurdit Singh v Mat Ishar Kaur 303  
 Gurditta Mal v Mohammad 785  
 Gurdial Singh v Rajah of Faridkot  
 12 82  
 Gurmallaappa v Mallappa 874 875  
 Gurnuk Roy v Tularam 569  
 Gursangaya v Tamana 26  
 Gursaran Das v The District Board 300  
 Gurbidawa v Gangaya, 786  
 Guru Charan v Uma Charan, 7 36 1188  
 1197  
 Guru Das v Hemendra, 619 621  
 Gurudas v Bhowanipore Zemindary  
 Co Ltd 609  
 Gurumoorthi Naidu v Varadappa  
 Chetty 3  
 Gurupathappa v Narasingappa 1169  
 Gururajammah v Venkata Krishnama,  
 36  
 Gurusami v Chinna 1261  
 Guruswami v Mahommadhu 392

Gopal Singh v Court of Wards 1220  
 Gopal Singh v Ganpatrai 721  
 Gopala v Lakshmana Rao 401  
 Gopala v Visvanatha 746  
 Gopala Chetti v Subbier 314 500  
 551  
 Gopaldas v Baij Nath 1104 1186  
 Gopala Row v Maria Susaya 539  
 Gopaldas v Tribhovan 174  
 Gopalan v Surayanarayana 1179  
 Gopalacharyulu v Subbamma 59  
 Gopalakrishnayya v Sanjeeva 751  
 Gopalchandra v Purna Chandra 815  
 Gopee Lal v Chundraoleo 503 984  
 Gopee Nath v Luchmeeput 703  
 Gopendra v Matil Lal 653  
 Gopeswar v Hem Chandra 1960  
 Gopi Chand v Benarsi Das 729 752  
 760  
 Gopi Chand v Kasumunnessa 204  
 Gopi Das v Lal Das 239  
 Gopi Lal v Benarsi Prasad 47  
 Gopi Mohan v Doybaki 96 140  
 Gopi Narain v Bansidhar 911  
 Gopi Nath v Bhugwant 41 67  
 Gopi Nath v Goluck Chunder 334  
 Gopi Rai v Rambhajan 101  
 Gopika Ram v Mahar Ali 1003  
 Gopika Raman Roy v Atal Singh 1089  
 Gopikishna v Nilkonul 101  
 Gopul v Agarsingji 871  
 Gopinath v Moheshwar 1013  
 Gopinath v Sajani 156  
 Gopu v Rajammal 267 263  
 Gopu v Sami 520  
 Gota Chand v Prafulla Kumar 113  
 646  
 Gorachand v Baykanto 308  
 Gorak Singh v Sidh Gopal 201  
 Gorakh v Vithal 302  
 Gordhan v Bishambar 441  
 Gordhandas v Gauthamchand 805  
 Gordhandas v Frankor 627  
 Gordon Re 829  
 Gosain Bhannath v Bihari Lal 329  
 Gosain v Puran Singh 301  
 Gosain v Pickmuncer 582  
 Gossain Money v Gour Ferhad 960  
 Goswami v Pomanlalji 230  
 Costo Behary v Hari Mohan 11  
 Goswami v Govardhanlalji 100 101 103  
 Goswami Cordhan Lalji v Goswami  
 Makudan 699

Goswami Sri Raman Lalji v Bohra Des  
 raj 289  
 Gotepati v Gotepati 61  
 Goturam v Barku 823  
 Goudouan v Venkata 190  
 Gour v Nilmadhab 1006  
 Gour Chunder v Chunder Coomar 732  
 Gour Mohan v Noyan 1255  
 Gour Sundar v Hem Chunder 156 605  
 657  
 Gour Surn Doss *In re* 1033  
 Gourad v Fitzgerald 485  
 Gouri Dutt v Dohan 826  
 Gourley v Plumsoll 561  
 Gourmoni v Jugat Chandra 78 79  
 Gourmony v Abdul 320  
 Goutiere v Robert 901  
 Government Pleader v Annaji 1239  
 Government Pleader v Vinayak 1239  
 Govind v Dada 671  
 Govind v Dhondbarav 68  
 Govind v Harihar 52  
 Govind v Mohoniraj 241  
 Govind v Parashram 446  
 Govind v Pamkrishna 108  
 Govind v Vallabhrao 971  
 Govind v Veetil 49  
 Govind v Venkata 681  
 Govind v Venkatesh 1104  
 Govind v Vithal 900  
 Govind Narayan v Vallabhrao 970  
 Govinda v Dandas 1026  
 Govinda v Krishna 79  
 Govinda v Krishnancharl 1206  
 Govinda v Lal Krishna 219 220  
 Govinda v Mana Vikraman 450  
 Govinda v Tiruvengadi 992  
 Govindan Nair v Achutha Memon 98  
 Govindan Nambiar v Krishnan Nambiar  
 90  
 Govindappa v Hanumanthappa 305  
 Govindaraja v Alagappa 414  
 Govindarajulu v Rangarao 876  
 Govindarajulu v Secretary of State  
 98 101 102  
 Govindarajulu v Secretary of State  
 1219 1218  
 Govindasami v Alagirisami 874  
 Govindasami v The Municipal Council  
 587  
 Govindasamy v The Union Bank Ltd.  
 366 367

- Govindaswami v Kandaswami 76 924  
 Govindaswami v Pethaperumal 684  
 Govindlal v Bansilal 1245  
 Govindrar v Babu 957  
 Gowri v Vigneshwar 100  
 Gowri Koer v Audh Koer 30 52a 52b  
 Gowri Prasad v Pami Patan 430  
 Grama v Bombay Steamships 469  
 Grant v Anderson & Co 852 854  
 Grant v Subramaniam 240  
 Granville v Firth 130  
 Great W Central Ry Co v Charles  
 74 822  
 Green v Sevin 500 579  
 Greenschundar v Collins 102  
 Gregory v Dooley Chand 839  
 Grey v Hazari Lal 157  
 Grey v Woogramohun 900 909  
 Griebart v Morris 500  
 Griffiths v London and St Katharine  
 Docks Co 491  
 Griffith v Pound 420  
 Grish Chander v Sasi Shukhaheswar (33  
 Cal 328) 621  
 Grish Chunder v Shohi Shukhaheswar  
 (27 Cal 951) 130 141 620 621 842  
 Grizewood v Blane 490  
 Groves v Administrator General 177  
 Grumbrecht v Parry 557  
 Gudaru v Maradugula 85  
 Guddappa v Turkappa 45 47 48  
 Gudri Koer v Bhubaneswari 934  
 Gudri Lal v Jagannath 93  
 Guimon v Tamin 821  
 Guise v Jaisraj 343  
 Gujar Mal v Narain Singh 376 381  
 Gujati v Sitai 782  
 Gulab v Mutassadi Lal 721  
 Gulab v Thakur 314  
 Gulabchand v Baliram 7  
 Gulab Chand v Sher Singh 116  
 Gulab Dei v Vaish Motor Co 873  
 Gulab Khan v Abdul Wahab Khan  
 289  
 Gulab Khan v Ataulah 684  
 Gulab Kuar v Bansidhar 194 201  
 Gulab Kunwar v Thakur Das 1002  
 Gulab Pai v Mangli 10  
 Gulab Pai v Mangli Lal 987  
 Gulab Shah v Haveli Shah 441  
 Gulabi Bibi v Aslam Khan 776  
 Gulabrao v Magon 172  
 Gulabrao v Vinayak 996  
 Gulam Hussein v Mahamadali 924  
 Gulam Hussam v Piarally Abdulla 798  
 Gulam Mahomed v Shibendra 818  
 Gulba v Basanta 421  
 Gulkandi v Manni Lal 815  
 Gulli v Sawan 785 786  
 Gulzar Singh v Kalyan Chand 103  
 Gulzari v Daya Ram 658  
 Gulzari Lal v Madho Ram 156 157  
 163  
 Gunami v Ram Charan 452  
 Gunga Das v Ramjoy 987  
 Gunga Narain v Tillukram 483 554  
 Gunga Pershad v Jawahir 734  
 Gungapershad v Gopal Singh 217  
 Gunga Prosad v Brojo Nath Das 375  
 377  
 Gunnaji v Mahanji 497 509 517  
 Gupta v Behari 1021  
 Gur Nani v Jainaram 60  
 Gur Narayan v Sheo Lal Singh 59 900  
 Gur Prasad v Ram Lal 156 157  
 Guran Ditta v Pokhar Ram 1164 1184  
 Guranditta Mal v Ram Das 101  
 Gurashantsappa v Gurava 385  
 Gurcharan v Shibdev 291  
 Gurdas v Bhag 9  
 Gurdas Mal v Kashi Ram 790  
 Gurdeo Singh v Chandrikah Singh 55  
 112  
 Gurdial v Diwan Chand 438  
 Gurdial v Gurbaksh 657  
 Gurdit Singh v Met Ishar Kaur 303  
 Gurditta Mal v Muhammad 785  
 Gurdial Singh v Rajah of Faridkot  
 12 82  
 Gurmallaappa v Mallappa 874 875  
 Gurmuk Roy v Tularam 569  
 Gursangaya v Tamana 26  
 Gursaran Das v The District Board 390  
 Gureshdawa v Gangaya 766  
 Guru Charan v Uma Charan 7 36 1188  
 1197  
 Guru Das v Hemendra 619 621  
 Gurudas v Bhowanipore Zemindary  
 Co Ltd 669  
 Gurumoorthis Naidu v Varadappa  
 Chetty 3  
 Gurupathappa v Narasingappa 1169  
 Gururajammah v Venkata Krishnama  
 36  
 Gurusami v Chinna 1261  
 Guruswami v Mahommadhu 392

Gopal Singh v Court of Wards 12-0  
 Gopal Singh v Ganpatrai 721  
 Gopala v Lakshmana Rao 401  
 Gopala v Visvanatha 746  
 Gopala Chetti v Subbier 314 550  
 551  
 Gopaldas v Baij Nath 1164 1186  
 Gopala Row v Maria Susaya 539  
 Gopaldas v Tribhovan 174  
 Gopalan v Surayanarayana 1179  
 Gopalacharyulu v Subbamma 59  
 Gopalakrishnayya v Sanjeeva 751  
 Gopalchandra v Purna Chandra 81-  
 Gopee Lal v Chundrasee 403 984  
 Gopee Nath v Luchmeeput 753  
 Gopendra v Mati Lal 6-3  
 Gopeswar v Hem Chandra 1260  
 Gopi Chand v Beuarsi Das 729 75-  
 760  
 Gopi Chand v Kasimunnessa 204  
 Gopi Das v Lal Das 282  
 Gopi Lal v Benarsi Prasad 47  
 Gopi Mohan v Doybaki 96 140  
 Gopi Narain v Bansidhar 911  
 Gopi Nath v Bhugwant 41 67  
 Gopi Nath v Goluck Chunder 334  
 Gopi Rai v Rambhajan 151  
 Gopika Ram v Mahar Ali 10-3  
 Gopika Raman Roy v Atal Singh 582  
 Gopikushna v Nilkonul 104  
 Gopidai v Agarungu 871  
 Gopinath v Moheshwar 1013  
 Gopinath v Sajani 156  
 Gopu v Rajammal 267 283  
 Gopu v Sami 2-2  
 Gora Chand v Prafulla Kumar 113  
 646  
 Gorachand v Bajkanto 308  
 Gorak Singh v Sidh Gopal 201  
 Gorakh v Vithal 352  
 Gordhan v Bishambar 441  
 Gordhandas v Gauthamchand 8-5  
 Gordhandas v Prankor 627  
 Gordon Re 879  
 Gosain Bhannath v Bihari Lal 329  
 Gosain v Pura Singh 301  
 Goshain v Pickmune 582  
 Gossain Money v Gour Pershad 960  
 Goswami v Romanlalji 29-  
 Gosto Behary v Hari Mohan 11  
 Goswami v Govardhanlalji 100 101 103  
 Goswami Gordhan Lalji v Goswami  
 Makudan 6 9

Goswami Sri Raman Lalji v Bohra Dea  
 raj 289  
 Gotepati v Gotepati 61  
 Goturam v Birku 823  
 Goudoom v Venetessa 19-  
 Gour v Nilmadhab 1056  
 Gour Chunder v Chunder Coomar 732  
 Gour Mohan v Noyan 12-5  
 Gour Sundar v Hem Chunder 156 6-  
 657  
 Gour Surn Doss In re 1033  
 Gourad v Fitzgerald 485  
 Gouri Dutt v Dohan 826  
 Gourloy v Plimsoll 561  
 Gourmoni v Jugat Chandra 78 79  
 Gourmony v Abdul 328  
 Goutiere v Robert 9-1  
 Government Pleader v Annaji 1239  
 Government Pleader v Vinayak 1239  
 Govind v Dada 671  
 Govind v Dhondharav 68  
 Govind v Harihar 52  
 Govind v Mohomiraj 241  
 Govind v Parashram 448  
 Govind v Ramkrishna 198  
 Govind v Vallabhrao 971  
 Govind v Veetil 49  
 Govind v Venkata 684  
 Govind v Venkatesh 1194  
 Govind v Vithal 305  
 Govind Narayan v Vallabhrao 975  
 Govinda v Dandasi 1026  
 Govinda v Krishna 70  
 Govinda v Krishnancharlu 12-6  
 Govinda v Iala Krishun 219 220  
 Govinda v Mana Vikraman 455  
 Govinda v Tiruvengadi 902  
 Govindan Nair v Achutha Memon 98  
 Govindan Nambiar v Krishnan Nambiar  
 90  
 Govindappa v Hanumanthappa 3-5  
 Govindaraja v Alagappa 414  
 Govindarajulu v Pangarao 876  
 Govindarajulu v Secretary of State  
 98 101 102  
 Govindarajulu v Secretary of State  
 1219 1248  
 Govindasami v Alagirisami 874  
 Govindasami v The Municipal Council  
 887  
 Govindasamy v The Union Bank Ltd  
 366 367

Govindaswami v Kandaswami 76 924  
 Govindaswami v Pethaperumal 684  
 Govindlal v Bansilal 1245  
 Govindrav v Babu 95  
 Gowri v Vigneshvar 150  
 Gowri Hoer v Audh Hoer 35 52a 52b  
 Gowri Prosad v Pam Ratan 430  
 Grama v Bombay Steamships 469  
 Grant v Anderson & Co 852 854  
 Grant v Subramaniam 240  
 Cranville v Firth 130  
 Great N. W. Central Ry Co v Charlie  
 bol. 74 822  
 Green v Sevin 505 579  
 Greenschundar v Collins 102  
 Gregory v Dooley Chand, 839  
 Grev v Hazari Lal 157  
 Grey v Woogramohun 978 979  
 Griebart v Morris 560  
 Griffiths v London and St Katharine  
 Docks Co 491  
 Griffith v Pound 420  
 Grish Chander v Sasi Shekhareswar (33  
 Cal 328) 621  
 Grish Chunder v Shohi Shikhareswar  
 (27 Cal 951) 130 141 620 621 842  
 Grizewood v Blanc 490  
 Groves v Administrator General 177  
 Grumbrecht v Parry 557  
 Gudaru v Maradugula 85  
 Guddappa v Tirappa 40 47 48  
 Gudri Hoer v Bhubaneswari 934  
 Gudri Lal v Jagannath 93  
 Guimori v Tarini 821  
 Guile v Jaisraj 343  
 Gujar Mal v Narain Singh 376 391  
 Gujati v Sitai 782  
 Gulab v Mutassadi Lal 721  
 Gulab v Thakur 314  
 Gulabchand v Bahram 7  
 Gulab Chand v Sher Singh 116  
 Gulab Dei v Vaish Motor Co 873  
 Gulab Khan v Abdul Waheb Khan  
 289  
 Gulab Khan v Ataulah 684  
 Gulab Kuar v Bansidhar 194 201  
 Gulab Kunwar v Thakur Das 1002  
 Gulab Pai v Mangli 10  
 Gulab Pai v Mangli Lal 987  
 Gulab Shah v Haveli Shah 441  
 Gulabi Bibi v Aslam Khan 776  
 Gulabrao v Magon 172  
 Gulabrao v Vinayak 996

[illegible]

Guruswami Pillai v Veerabhadra 1268  
 Guruvayya v Anant 430 430  
 Guruvayya v Vudayappa 10 644  
 Gyanonoo v Radha 656  
 Gyanaji v Vingappa 10.2  
 Gyan Singh v Ata Husain 915 1025  
 Gyanendra v Paresb Nath 499  
 C S D v Government Leader 1271

## H

Habib Baksh v Baldeo Prasad 1010  
 1014  
 Habib Bax v Samuel Fitz & Co 860  
 Habibar v Saidannessa 373  
 Habib ud din v Hatim 767  
 Habibul Rahman v Ram Sahai 190  
 Habib ullah v Lalte Prasad 1010  
 Habib un Nissa v Munawar un Nissa  
 320  
 Habibur Rahman v Altaf Ali 333  
 Hadi v Hasim 43  
 Hadjee Ismail v Hadjee Mahomed 108  
 1246 1247 1248 1252 1253  
 Hadu v Lala 789 790  
 Hafez v Damodar 232  
 Hafez Uzir v Na imann sa 160  
 Hafiz v Abdullah 212  
 Hafizabai v Kazi Abdul Karim 862 975  
 Hafizaboo v Mahomed 457 458  
 Haider Husain v Abdul Ahad 784  
 Haigh v Haigh 575  
 Hamraj v Ram Bux 106  
 Ham v Bachu 27  
 Hamee Haroon v Abdul Karim 566  
 Haji Abdul v Haji Abdul 906  
 Haji Abdul Gani v Paja Ram 161 162  
 Haji Abdul v Munjibhai 287  
 Haji Abdul Rahman v Khoja Khalil  
 Arath 637  
 Haji Abdul Rahman v Haji Noor Maho  
 med 829 830  
 Haji Abdulla v Stamp 84  
 Haji Ali v Abdul Jalil 2.3  
 Haji Bibi v Sultan Mahomed Khan  
 606  
 Haji Cassim v Dutt 978  
 Haji Hasan v Mancharam 49  
 Haji Jakaria v Cassim 470  
 Haji Khan v Baldeo Das 110  
 Haji Mohammuddin & Co v The East  
 ern Japan Trading Co 8.6 12.6

Haji Musa v Purmanand 147 616  
 Haji Ramjan v Hafiz 549  
 Haji Saboo Sidick v Ally Mahomed  
 161  
 Haji Sajan v N C Macleod 804  
 Haji Umar v Custadi 119 589  
 Hajumasa v Purmanand 82  
 Hajon v Bur Singh 254  
 Hajrat Akramnissa v Valulnissa 3 371  
 542  
 Hakim Lal v Mooshahar Sahu 421  
 Hakim Rai v Firm Ishar 504  
 Hale v Hale 976  
 Halumbhai v Shanker 1167 1169  
 Hall v Eve 479  
 Hall v Lardet 107  
 Hall v Truman 567  
 Haller v Worman 15  
 Hamced & Co v Universal Fire Insur  
 ance Co 481  
 Hamid v Buktear 714  
 Hamid v Gayadin 306  
 Hamid Ali v Madhu 1022  
 Hamida v Jamda 977  
 Hamida Bibi v Ali Husen 782 787  
 Hamidalli v Ahmedali 381  
 Hamiduddin v Keddar Nath 446 920  
 Hamidunnissa v Gopal 89 90  
 Hamilton v The Land Mortgage Bank of  
 India 501 502  
 Hancocks v Leblache 5.8  
 Hanif v Kulsam 832  
 Hanifa Bai v Haji Siddick 1031  
 Hanmant v Anny 998  
 Hanmant v Ganesh 163  
 Hanmant v Raghavendarao 923  
 Hanmant v Subbabbat 638  
 Hanmanta v Shudu 73  
 Hanmantappa v Jyubai 541  
 Hanmantaram v Shivnarayan 8.7  
 Hannay & Co v Smurthwaite 409  
 III  
 Hanoomanprasad Panday v N t  
 Koonwaree 2  
 Hansa v Bhawa 611  
 Hansman v Bihuyi 1030  
 Hansraj v Anant 280  
 Hansraj v Lalji 441  
 Hansraj v Shiam Sunder 1019  
 Hansraj v Sundar Lal 1183  
 Hansraj Pal v Sukhray Kunwar 6.7  
 Hanuman v Hanuman 439  
 Hanuman v Muhammad 866

Hanuman v National Bank of India 374 379  
 Hanuman Pershad v Jadu Nandan 21  
 Hanuman Prasad v Bhagwati 103  
 Hanuman Prasad v Mathura Prasad 681  
 Hanumayya v Venkatasubbayya 976  
 Hanwant Singh v Lam Gopal 79  
 Har Narain v Bhagwant Kuar 1171 1180  
 Har Narain v Kharag 431 796  
 Har Prasad v Jagat Lal 204  
 Har Prasad v Ram Sarup 523  
 Hara Chandra v Bepun 42  
 Hara v Murari 373  
 Hara Kumar v Murari 542  
 Hara Lall v Nitambuni 1241 1244 1245  
 Haradhan v Iswar Das 1008  
 Hara Sah v Faizur Rehman 233 236 747  
 Harakbai v Jamnabai 8-9  
 Harakh Pam v Lakshmi Ram 1197  
 Harakhpan v Jagdeo 6-1  
 Haramoni v Hari Churn 406 410  
 Haran v Ramesh 4-3  
 Haranund v Prosunno Chunder 2 4-2  
 Harbana v Tota Sahu 449 452  
 Harbana Lal v Kundan Lal 7-5 760  
 Harbhagwan v Ahmad 614  
 Harbord v Monk 48 5-4  
 Harchand v Gulabchand 84  
 Harchandar v Lal Bahadur 96  
 Harchandra v Mahumed 809  
 Hardat v Izzat un Nissa 374  
 Hardatrai v Victoria Finance and Bond Association 534  
 Hardeo v Gauri Shankar 876  
 Hardi v Puder Perlash 863  
 Hardial v Secretary of State 1-60  
 Hardiani Lal v Pam Nath 7-9  
 Hardit Singh v Gurmukh Singh 1038  
 Harditta v Nigehia 10 6-8 661  
 Hardwari Lal v Salamat ul lah Khan 7-1  
 Harendra v Harias 1037  
 Harendra Lal v Hardasi 333 1037 1245  
 Harendra Lal v Shant Lal 78  
 Harendra Lall v Sarvamangala 1248  
 Harendra Nath v Purna Chandra 401 407 410 411 416  
 Hargobind v Hakim 67-

Hargobind v Hakim Singh 179 668  
 Hargopal v Harish Chander 604  
 Hargovan v Muli 49 62  
 Hargovind v Bhudar 161  
 Hargovindas v Jadaviboo 1006  
 Har Kumar v Jogat Bindhu 285  
 Hari v Bhubaneswari 867  
 Hari v Birendra 237 243  
 Hari v Ganpatrao 50 86  
 Hari v Lakshmi 1196  
 Hari v Narsingrao 14-6 646  
 Hari v Musammatt Tapai 939  
 Hari v Ramchandra 219 273  
 Hari v Sakharam 154  
 Hari v Shapurji 1-4  
 Hari v Sheikh 768  
 Hari v Yamunabai 78 671  
 Hari Annaji v Vasudev 3-3  
 Hari Bhagat v Anundaram 231  
 Hari Charan v Baram Khan 10-8  
 Hari Charan v Kalpada 783 790  
 Hari Charan v Manmatha 371 443 776  
 Hari Charan v Mon Mohan 161  
 Hari Das v Gadidar 998  
 Hari Ganu v Hari Ganu 10-3 10-6  
 Hari Karmakar v Robin 2-9  
 Hari Kishen v Raghubar 6-  
 Hari Kissen v Velhat Hoosen 809  
 Hari Kunwar v Lakshmi Ram 1176  
 Hari Lall Mullick In the matter of 127  
 Hari Mohun v Parmeshwar 381  
 Hari Mohan v Baburali 683  
 Hari Mohun v Surendra Narain 320  
 Hari Narain v Ganpatrao 96  
 Hari Nath v Muthur Mohun 60  
 Hari Parshad v Soogni 821  
 Hari Ram v Buta 1008  
 Hari Ram v Fori Ram 382  
 Hari Ram v Indraj 73  
 Hari Sadhan v Shub Gopal 731 7-3  
 Hari Sunkar v M Tapai 938  
 Hari Shankar v Ram Pyari 1184  
 Hari Sing v Muhammad 94 86 106  
 Hari Singh v Firm Karam Chand 583 8-1 8-6  
 Haribans Rai v Sri Niwa 93-  
 Haribhusan v Vinomatha Nath 779  
 Haridas v Baroda Kishore 196 197 231  
 Haridas v Ramdas 7-0  
 Haridas v Ratanley 3-1  
 Harinath v Krishna 129  
 Haripada v Sashu 17-



Harihar v Chandra Kumar 71  
 Harihar v Jaharuddin 913  
 Harihar v Maheswari 397 614  
 Harihar Kanta v Rama Pandu 159  
 747 748  
 Harihar Pershad v Mathura Lal 873  
 Harilal v Abhesang 713  
 Harinarain v Bhagwant 1172  
 Harinath v Haradas 690  
 Harinath v Ram Kumar 833  
 Hariram v Lalhai 70 830  
 Harish v Nripandra 223  
 Harish Chandra v Chandpore Co 177  
 802  
 Harish Chandra v Pran Nath 419  
 Harishankar v Naran 712  
 Harivaladas v Utamchand 1240  
 Harjas Rai v Naram Singh 600  
 Harjas Rai v Rameshar 917  
 Harji v Devi Ditta 606  
 Harjivandas v Bhagwandas 802 804  
 Harjivan v Shivrani 683  
 Harkisandas v Chhaganlal 420 421  
 Harkishandas v Bai Ichha 215  
 Harmange Singh v Ram Gopal 397  
 Harnam v Ganpat 704  
 Harnam v Muhammad 107  
 Harnam Singh v Atri 396  
 Harnam Singh v Salig Ram 195  
 Harnam Singh v Milkhu Ram 684  
 Harnand Lal v Chaturbhuj 39 882  
 Harnandroy v Gootiram, 630  
 Harris v. 851 974  
 Harris v.

Hart v.  
 541.

Haur Kaur v Mundi Lal 886  
 Haveli Shah v Paunda Khan 98  
 Hawley v Peade 008  
 Hawthorn Is re 90  
 Hay v Iam Chandar 207  
 Hayatunnessa v Achaia Khatun 172  
 Hays v Padmanand 76  
 Hazari Lal v Ambica 37  
 Hazari Lal v Bhawani Ram 432  
 Hazarimal v Namdev 734  
 Hazariram v Kedar Nath 662  
 Hazrat Akramunissa v Yabulunissa 634  
 Heap v Marri 494 490  
 Heera v Iestony 139  
 Heeralal v Ram Surun 069  
 Heusinger v Droz 4 8  
 Hem Kunwar v Amba Prasad 315  
 Hemanginee v Kumode Chander 877  
 Hemangini v Bhagwati 873 819  
 Hemanta Kumari Devi v Midnapur  
 Zamindari 9 824 907  
 Hemanta v Banku Behari 840  
 Hemanta v Baranagore 900 902  
 Hemanta v Brojendro 304  
 Hemchand v Azam Sakeralal 4 832  
 Hemendra v Dharani 915  
 Hemendra v Fakir 70 918  
 Hemendro v Rajendrolal 41  
 Hennesey v Wright 007 061  
 Henrich Bjorn 1260  
 Hervey v Smith 96  
 Het Naram v Ramdeni 126  
 Het Ram v Raja Dutt 93  
 Het Ram v Shadi Lal 901 902  
 Het Singh v Tika Pam 389  
 Hewetson v Day 996  
 Hickman v Berens 10  
 Hira v Mill 111  
 Higgins v Welch 487  
 v Imami Ali 441  
 v Savaji 602  
 Davis 565  
 Amit Prasad 700  
 v Jatwar 8  
 Khushal 712  
 trav 82

Hingan Lal v Mansa Ram 10  
 Hingo v Jhura 70  
 Hingu v Heramba 510  
 Hingu Lal v Baldeo Ram 429 435  
 Hingu Singh v Jhura Singh 533  
 Hipgrave v Case 301  
 Hira v Bachu 27  
 Hirachand v C I P Plv 49  
 Hira Lal v Chandra 761  
 Hira Lal v Hoti Lal 447  
 Hira Lal v Karim un Nisa 767  
 Hira Lal v Kishan Lal 901  
 Hira Lal v Parinehar 134 183  
 Hira Lal v Udov Chandra 811  
 Hira Lal Ghose v Chandra Kanto Ghose  
 75 76 761  
 Hirabhai v Manecklal 374  
 Hirachand v Aba 170  
 Hirachand v Kanchand 174  
 Hirala v Bai 130  
 Hirala v Bhairav 419 422  
 Hirala v Kishan Lal 899  
 Hirala v Manilal 391  
 Hirala v Narisal 127  
 Hirala v Udov Chandra 611  
 Hiranand v Gurmukh Lal 102  
 Hirdhaman v Jinchoor 11 14  
 Hurjee Devraj & Co v Maungnyun 499  
 Hurjibhai v Jamsbedji 280 322 327  
 Hirnan Bibi v Sohan Bibi 60  
 Hit Lal v Joboo 903  
 Hitendra v Sir Pameshwar 977  
 Hitendra v Sukhdeb 872  
 Hodges v Delhi and London Bank 291  
 Hodgkinson v Fernie 1176 1177 1183  
 Hodgson v Railway Passengers Assu-  
 rance Co 1191  
 Hodsoll v Taylor 301  
 Hoo Moe v Seedat 528  
 Hogarth Shipping Co Ltd v Mitsui  
 Bussan Kaisha Ltd 120  
 Holkar v Dadabhai 1242 1243  
 Hollis v Burton 401 497 591  
 Holmes v Millage 974 977  
 Hook v Administrator General of  
 Bengal 77  
 Hope The 530  
 Hope Mills Ltd v Vithaldas 545  
 Hori Lal v Munimam Kunwar 903  
 Hormasji v Keshav 717  
 Hossain Ali v Abid Ali 4 832  
 Hossain Khan v Raphael 83  
 Howard v Wilson 1179

Howat on v Durrant 42  
 Howel Morgan Re 561  
 Hribay Nath v Ramchandra 811  
 Hriday Nath v Akhil Chandra 421 849  
 Hriday Nath v Akshay Lal 817  
 Hriday Nath v Ramchandra 111 816  
 Hubert v Groves 262  
 Hub Lal v Gulzari Lal 52a 64  
 Huddersfield Banking Co v Henry Lister  
 and Son 15 74 292 293  
 Hudson v Basdeo 1024  
 Hudon v Morgan 980  
 Hughes v Delhi and London Bank 898  
 Hughes v Creame 416  
 Hughes v Justin 536  
 Hughes v London Edinburgh and Glas-  
 gow Assurance Co 579  
 Hughes v Pump House Hotel Co 427  
 Hukam Chand v Canga Ram 163  
 Hukam Chand v Hayat 388  
 Hukam Chand v Kamalchand 3 302  
 393 394 992 994  
 Hukam Singh v Lallanji 802  
 Hukam Singh v Surajpal 395  
 Hulas v Sheo Prasad 627  
 Hummi v Aziz ud din 346  
 Humphries & Co v The Taylor Drug Co  
 482 483  
 Hunoomanpersand v Mussumat Koon-  
 waree 501  
 Hunsraj v Pachordas 1242  
 Hunt v Wimbledon Local Board 14  
 Hunt v Worsfold 450  
 Hunt In re 803  
 Hurbans v Thakoor Purshad 1035  
 Hurdayal v Haji Adam 702  
 Hurdeo v Gridhari 1271  
 Huree Das v Meer Moazzum 837  
 Huri Mohan v Naumuddin 516  
 Huro Prasad Roy v Kali Prasad Roy  
 225 228  
 Hurlpurshad v Sheo Dyal 1017  
 Hurree Persad v Koonjo Behary 391  
 Hurri Pershad v Nalib Singh 642  
 Hurri Sunker v Mukhtaram 66  
 Hurri Chunder v Kali Sunderi 312  
 62 101 1252  
 Hurro v Surut 141  
 Hurro Chunder v Shoorodhonee 2 374  
 39  
 Hurro Pershad v Bhupendro 139  
 Hury Doyal v Dm Doyal 666  
 Husain Balsh v Lachhman Das 11 9

Hanhar v Chandra Kumar 71  
 Hanhar v Jaharuddin 973  
 Hanhar v Maheswari 397 614  
 Hanhar Ranta v Iama Pandu 159  
 747 748  
 Hanhar Pershad v Mithura Lal 873  
 Harilal v Abhesang 713  
 Harinarain v Bhagwant 1172  
 Harinath v Haradas 690  
 Harinath v Ram Kumar 833  
 Hariram v Lalbai 70 830  
 Harish v Nripendra 203  
 Harish Chandra v Chandpore Co 177  
 802  
 Harish Chandra v Pran Nath 419  
 Harishankar v Naran 712  
 Harivalladas v Utamchand 1240  
 Harjas Rai v Narain Singh 600  
 Harjas Rai v Rameshar 917  
 Harji v Devi Ditta 606  
 Harjivandas v Bhagwandas 802 804  
 Harjivan v Shivram 683  
 Harkisandas v Chhaganlal 490 491  
 Harkishandas v Bai Ichha 210  
 Harmange Singh v Ram Gopal 397  
 Harnam v Ganpat 764  
 Harnam v Muhammad 152  
 Harnam Singh v Atri 396  
 Harnam Singh v Salig Ram 190  
 Harnam Singh v Milkhi Ram 694  
 Harnand Lal v Chaturbhuy 390 882  
 Harnandroy v Gootiram 530  
 Harris v Beauchamp Bros 801 974  
 Harris v Camble 592 0  
 Harris v Petherick 108  
 Harris v Taylor 84  
 Harris v Warre 491  
 Harrison v Rumsey 74  
 Harsaran v Muhammad 340 342  
 Harshankar v Bajjnath 190  
 Hart v Tara Prasanna Mukherji 239  
 241  
 Hasan v Sheo Prasad 397 399  
 Hassan Ali v Ganzi Ali 153  
 Hassan Ali v Lachman, 354.  
 Hashim Ali v Abdul Rahman 304  
 Hashim v Martin 135  
 Hasoon Arta v Jawadounness, 230  
 Hassanbhai v Umaji 588 901  
 Hassanbhoy v Cowasji. 875.  
 Haswa v Mahbub 1165.  
 Hatimbhai v Framroz. 1243, 1245.  
 Hatton v Harris 397 398, 399

Haur Haur v Munns Lal 886  
 Haveli Shah v Painsi Khan 98  
 Hawley v Reade 508  
 Hawthorn *Inter se* 90  
 Hay v Ram Chindar 202  
 Hayatunnesa v Achana Khatun 172  
 Hays v Padmanand 76  
 Hazari Lal v Ambica 372  
 Hazari Mal v Bhawani Ram 432  
 Hazurmal v Namdev 734  
 Hazariram v Kedar Nath 602  
 Hazrat Akramnissa v Valulnissa 634  
 Heap v Murri 494 490  
 Heera v Iestony 639  
 Heirali v Pannuram 569  
 Hemmer v Dr z 478  
 Hem Kunwar v Amba Prasad 315  
 Hemunness v Kumode Chander 977  
 Hemant v Bhagwati 873 879  
 Hemant Kumari Debi v Midnapur  
 Municipal 924 874  
 Hemanta v Banku Behari 840  
 Hemanta v Baranagore 900 907  
 Hemanta v Bijendro 304  
 Hemchand v Azam Sakeralal 4 832  
 Hemendra v Dharani 915  
 Hemendra v Fakur 786 918  
 Hemendra v Rajendra Mall 417  
 Hennessey v Wright 507 561  
 Hennrich Bjorn 1266  
 Hervey v Smith 981  
 Het Naram v Ramdem 126  
 Het Ram v Raja Dutt 932  
 Het Ram v Shadi Lal 901 902  
 Het Singh v Tika Ram 389  
 Hewetson v Deas 990  
 Hickman v Berens 15  
 Hien v Will 111  
 Higgins v Weeks 487  
 Hikumtulla v Imam Ali 441  
 Hildreth v Savary 602  
 Hill v Hart Davis 568  
 Him Kunwar v Amba Prasad 700  
 Himanchal v Jatwar 822  
 Himatram v Khushal 712  
 Himmat Lal v Shivajirav 82  
 Hinchliffe Re 571  
 Hinde v Poornath 83 86  
 Hindley v Jovnarain 200 352.  
 Hindustan Assurance, Ltd.  
 116 117 118 390.  
 Hindustan Bank v Mohini,  
 Hinga v Munna, 838.

- Hingan Lal v Manca Ram 10  
 Hingu v Jhuri 70  
 Hingu v Heramba, 510  
 Hingu Lal v Baldeo Parm 429 430  
 Hingu Singh v Jhuri Singh 333  
 Hipgrave v Case 301  
 Hira v Bachu 27  
 Hirachand v C I P Ph 248  
 Hira Lal v Chandra 761  
 Hira Lal v Kott Lal 447  
 Hira Lal v Karim un Ni 566  
 Hira Lal v Kishan Lal 901  
 Hira Lal v Parmeshar 154 163  
 Hira Lal v Udov Chandra 81  
 Hira Lal Ghose v Chundra Kanto Ghose  
 750 751  
 Hirabhai v Manecklal 374  
 Hirachand v Aba 175  
 Hirachand v Katchurchand 178  
 Hiralal v Bai An 300  
 Hiralal v Bhairon 419 420  
 Hiralal v Kishan Lal 899  
 Hiralal v Manilal 386  
 Hiralal v Narain 127  
 Hiralal v Udov Chandra 811  
 Hiranand v Gurmukh Rai 102  
 Hirdhaman v Jinghoor 11 312  
 Hurjee Devraj & Co v Maungnyun 499  
 Hurjabhai v Jamsbedji 289 320 327  
 Hirnan Bibi v Sohan Bibi 60  
 Hit Lal v Joboo 903  
 Hitendra v Sur Pameshwar 977  
 Hitendra v Sukhdeb 872  
 Hodges v Delhi and London Bank 291  
 Hodgkinson v Fernie 1176 1177 1183  
 Hodgson v Railway Passengers Assu-  
 rance Co 1191  
 Hodsoll v Taylor 361  
 Hoe Moe v Sedat 328  
 Hogarth Shipping Co Ltd v Mitsui  
 Bussan Kaisha Ltd 120  
 Holkar v Dadabhai 1242 1243  
 Hollis v Burton 401 497 581  
 Holmes v Millage 974 977  
 Hook v Administrator General of  
 Bengal 77  
 Hope The 30  
 Hope Mills Ltd v Vithaldas 645  
 Hori Lal v Munmam Kunwar 903  
 Hormasji v Keshav 717  
 Hossein Ali v Abdul Ali 4 83  
 Hossein Khan v Raphael 83  
 Howard v Wilson 1179  
 Howatson v Durrant 42  
 Howell Morgan Re 31  
 Hrbay Nath v Ramchandra 811  
 Hriday Nath v Akhil Chandra 421 849  
 Hriday Nath v Akhaya Lal 817  
 Hriday Nath v Ramchandra 111 816  
 Hubert v Groves 262  
 Hub Lal v Gulzari Lal 52a 64  
 Huddersfield Banking Co v Henry Lister  
 and Son 15 74 292 293  
 Hudson v Basdeo 1024  
 Hudon v Morgan 980  
 Hughes v Delhi and London Bank 698  
 Hughes v Creame 416  
 Hughes v Justin 336  
 Hughes v London Edinburgh and Glas-  
 gow Assurance Co 379  
 Hughes v Pump House Hotel Co 47  
 Hukam Chand v Ganga Ram 163  
 Hukam Chand v Hayat 388  
 Hukam Chand v Kamalanand 3 302  
 393 394 992 993  
 Hukam Singh v Lallanji 902  
 Hukam Singh v Surajpal 388  
 Hulas v Sheo Prasad 627  
 Hummi v Aziz ud din 546  
 Humphries & Co v The Taylor Drug Co  
 482 483  
 Hunoomanpersand v Musamat Korn-  
 waree 301  
 Hunsraj v Pachorias 1242  
 Hunt v Wimbledon Local Board 54  
 Hunt v Worsfold 400  
 Hunt In re 803  
 Hurbans v Thakoor Purshad 1000  
 Hurdayal v Haji Adam 702  
 Hurdeo v Gridhari 1271  
 Huree Dass v Meer Moazzum 837  
 Huri Mohan v Naumuddin 516  
 Hero Prasad Poy v Kala Prasad Poy  
 225 228  
 Hurlpurshad v Sheo Dyal 1017  
 Hurree Prasad v Koonjo Behary 394  
 Hurri Pershad v Nasib Singh 642  
 Hurri Sunker v Mukhtaram 66  
 Hurriish Chander v Kala Sunderi 312  
 602 1045  
 Hurro v  
 Hurro 374

Husain Bhai v Beltie 10  
Husain Bhai v Batul Shah 10 16 16  
Husaini Begum v Collector of Muzaffar  
nager 10 16  
Husein v Saji 146  
Husenbhor v Ahmedbhor 3 6  
Huseni Begam v Collector of Moradabad  
270 276  
Hussein Saheb v Babaji 240  
Hussey v Horne Payne 492  
Hutchinson v Clover 568  
Huxley v West London Extension Rv  
Co 124 129 130  
Hyam v Bengal Stone Co 1 9  
Hyst Mahomed v Shaikh Mannu 11  
Hyattunnesa v Ashia Kboteen 171

I

Ibn Husain v Ramday 470  
Ibrahi v Sangaram 246  
Ibrahim v Jusuf 54  
Ibrahim v Konammal 68 1  
Ibrahim v Mohsin 1160 118 1  
Ibrahim v Muni Mir 6 7  
Ibrahim v Nihalchand 938  
Ibrahim v Pamjadu 77 1  
I E. Abowath v A E Abowath 1708  
Ibrahimbhai v Fletcher 504  
Ibrahimji v Dejanji 269  
Idal Films Limited v Richards 421  
Ide In re 854  
Idumla Paravan v Pethi Pedder 928  
Ijatulla Bhuvan v Chandra Mohan 269  
621  
Ikramul Huq v Wilkie 321  
Ilahi v Jawinda 102 1  
Ilahi Khan v Sher Ali 944  
Imam Ali v Bujrath 879  
Imam Din v Pusanchand, 868  
Imam Khan v Ayub Khan 47 49  
Imamlandi v Mutashli 802  
Imamuddin v Bindubasmin 641  
Imamuddin v Lalulhar 43  
Imamuddin v Salarrath Pasi 73 740  
Imamuddin v Sri Ram 803  
Imamunni v Lakshat Hussain 160  
669  
Imlichuni v Lalji 165  
Imdad Ali v Isan Lal 140 160 161

Imperial Pressing Co v British Crown  
Assurance Corporation 83  
Imperial Tobacco Co v Bonnan 285  
Imtiaz un Nissa v Chuttan Lal 164 754  
Inayat v Fazi Muhammad, 277  
Inayat Ali v Murad Ali 66  
Inayatullah v Nisar 118  
Indaji v Cooverji 237  
Indar Kunwar v Jaipal 131  
Indar Pal v Imperial Bank 183  
Indar v Thakur 81  
Indarjit v Ichha 69  
Indarpal v Mewa Lal 446  
Indar Kumari v Jaipal Kumari 1041  
India General S & I Co Ltd  
v Lal Mohan 433 640  
India Provident Co Ltd v Govinda  
109  
India Spinning and Weaving Co v  
Climax Syndicate 1243 1744  
Indian Iron and Steel Co v Banoo 1220  
Indomati v Jogashar 154  
Indra Chand v Forbes 374 377  
Indra Chandra v Gish Chandra 307  
Indra Chandra Singh, In the goods of  
1208  
Indrabhusan v Janardhan 1017  
Indrajit v Amarsingh 1017 1018  
Indramani Dasi v Sarendra 940  
Indur v Khandadai 1184  
Indur Chunder v Radhakshore 934  
Indur Kuar v Gue Praad 452  
Indur Subharami v Khandadai 1160  
Indurjeet Singh v Padhey Singh 620  
Injad Ali v Mohini 1000  
International Continental Coutehouse  
Compagnie v Mehta & Co 819 850  
809 801  
Intizan v Narain 741  
Intu Meah v Durbulsh  
Irangowda v Irla 1  
Irangowda v 8  
Irappa v Bhimappa  
Irawa v Satyappa 7  
Irla  
Irr 1111  
I 17

Ishan Chunder v Famekwar 453  
 Ishaq Ali Khan v Chunni 533  
 Ishar Das v Asif Ali 745  
 Ishar Das v Lal Singh 811 817  
 Ishar Das v Parmanand 157 158  
 Ishardas v Kehab Deo 1165  
 Ishri v Gopal 667  
 Ishri Prasad v Shri Ram 83 85 87  
 Ishwar v Devar 421  
 Ishwar v Coppi 910  
 Ishwarar v Chudama 141  
 Ismail v Sultan Bibi 61  
 Ismailji v Ismail 100 110  
 Ismailji v Macleod 354 1220  
 Israel v Shamser 902 903 907  
 Isup Ali v Gour Chandra 36 37  
 Iswar Chandra v Haris Chandra 637  
 639  
 Iswar Prasad v Farhat Hussain 133  
 Ishwari v Sheotahal 1254  
 Ittiachan v Velappan 343  
 Ives v Williams 1186 1190  
 Ivyappa v Pama Lakshammamma 512  
 Izburan v Izburan 160 937  
 Izzat-un-Nisa Begam v Partab Singh  
 717

## J

Jachin v Cheninessa 825  
 Jackson v Baryl railway & Co 1186  
 Jackson v Litchfield, 808  
 Jadab v Anath 1010  
 Jadab Chandra v Dinanath 147  
 Jadav v Jailash 56  
 Jadov v Chhagan 869  
 Jadu v Bhabotoran 582  
 Jadub v Kanai 569  
 Jadubansi v Mahpal Singh 13 779 784  
 Jadunandan v Deo Narain 1007  
 Jadunandan v Sheonandan 10 644  
 Jadunath v Ruplal 219  
 Jadu Nath v Amulya 70  
 Jafar v Ranjit Singh 1006  
 Jaffar Khan v Daud Shah 269 270  
 Jafferji v Miyadin 775  
 Jafri Begam v Saira Bibi 178  
 Jafri Begam v Syed Ali Raja 1180  
 Jag Shah v Jamchand 903  
 Jagabandhu v Haris 430

Jagadinand v Rajendra 1033  
 Jagadis v Harihar 310 871  
 Jagadish v Bama Sundari 178  
 Jagadish v Kripa Nath 243  
 Jagdip v Harku 1220  
 Jagdip v Holloway 380  
 Jagdish v Harban 547  
 Jagan v Ganda Mal 108  
 Jagan Nath v Balkishan 50  
 Jagan Nath v Daud 754 755 761 765  
 Jagan Nath v Fateh Chand 376  
 Jagan Nath v Cinesh 716  
 Jagan Nath v Lalman 987  
 Jagan Nath v Mahund 758  
 Jagan Nath v Mannu Lal 1105  
 Jaganandan v Krishna Chand 109  
 Jaganath v Akali 23  
 Jaganathdas v Ramdas 14  
 Jagannada v Basawayya 762  
 Jagannadham v Venkatasubba Rao 63  
 Jagannat v Tore 447  
 Jagannath v Chhedri 1171 1172  
 Jagannath v Debi Prasad 675  
 Jagannath v Kalachand 899  
 Jagannath v Mohra Kuar 52  
 Jagannath Prasad v Surajmal 933 934  
 Jagannath v Sassoon 352 472  
 Jagannath v Sheonandan 139  
 Jagannath v Sita Ram 183  
 Jagannath v Tara 200  
 Jagannatha v Kathaperumal 760  
 Jagannatha v Sarathambal 837  
 Jagannath v Amurunnissa 703  
 Jagat v Sarwan 1197  
 Jagapati v Ekambara 14  
 Jagat Nath v Ram Karan 794  
 Jagannath v Hanuman 1018  
 Jagarnath v Kamta Prasad 388  
 Jagarnath v Kishen 196  
 Jagarnath v Moti Lal 182  
 Jagarnath v Ram Phal 681  
 Jagat v Dhundhey 241  
 Jagat Chandra v Gunny 699 701  
 Jagat Chunder v Iswar Chunder 194  
 898  
 Jagat Pande v Sarwan Pande 1196 1197  
 Jagat Tarini Dasi v Naba Gopal 971  
 878  
 Jagatjit v Sarabjit 44 142  
 Jagernath v Dip Rani 140  
 Jagernath v Mohra Kuar 915  
 Jaggar Nath v Jolhu 626 627  
 Jaggeswar Dutt v Bhuban 897

- Jagmowor v Kailash 764  
 Jagrani v Kuar Durga 1018  
 Jahar v Kanuni Dibi 138 140  
 Jahnabai v Brojo 851  
 Jai Berham v Kedar Nath Marwari 316 317 318  
 Jai Cobind v Jatesri Pratap 141  
 Jai Copal v Muna Lal 1006  
 Jai Indra v Baldeo Singh 980  
 Jai Krishan v Bhola Nath 626  
 Jai Narain Bibu Lal v Narain 1190  
 Jaibahadar v Motukdhari 723 741  
 Jaijit Rai v Cobind 910  
 Jaikaran v Raghunath 638  
 Jaikisondas v Zenabai 976  
 Jaimal v Caneshu Mal 440  
 Jaimangal Deo v Bed Saran 58  
 Jainti Prasad v Bachu Singh 516  
 Jaimulabdin v Krishna 164  
 Jairaj Mal v Padma Kishan 71  
 Jairam v Atmaram 1244 1245 1246  
 Jairam v Nowroji 77  
 Jairamdas v Zamonlal 963  
 Jalal Din v Quaim Dun 499  
 Jalsutram v Bommadevaray 40  
 Jalim Chand v Yusufali 644  
 Jalmeja v Ashaur 439  
 Jamadar Singh v Derazuddin 45 46  
 Jamaitunni v Lutfanessa 70  
 Jamal Brothers & Co Ltd v Chyp Moh & Co 713  
 Jamal Bros v Chyp Moh 1255  
 Jamal ud din v Mujtaba Husam 23 28  
 Janibu Chetty v Palaniappa 903  
 Jambulavva v Rajamma 1011  
 James v Fadoor County Council 484  
 James Bevis v Turner 131  
 James Currie In the matter of 124  
 Jamil v Maharaja of Sikkim 14  
 Jamini v Kali Prasad 15  
 Jamini Nath v Dharma Das 151 37  
 Jammalamadaka Subba v Jannala Venkatarrayadu 315  
 Jamna v Mathura 10 644  
 Jamna v Naib 1169 1171 1172  
 Jamna v Sarjit 81 79 800  
 Jamna Bai v Vasant Rao 67  
 Jamna Bai v Sitabkh Jan 501  
 Jamna Das v Jannautar 95  
 Jamna Das v Lda Ram 291  
 Jamna Dk v Salapathy Chetty 34  
 Jamnadas v Damodar 454  
 Jamnadas v Sorabji 792  
 Jamna Prasad v Raghunath 198  
 Jamoona v Bhamasoodaree 96  
 Jamsedji v Bawabhai 353  
 Jamsedji v Husseinbhai 973  
 Jam etji v Dadabhoy 314  
 Jam etji v Hari Dayal 15 179  
 Jamsheji v Hirjiabhai 508  
 Jamuna Parshad v Canga Parshad 900  
 Jan Ah v Ram Nath 26  
 Jan Mahomed v Mashar Bibi 90  
 Jan Mahomed v Syed Nurudin 283  
 Jan Muhammad v Habi Baksh 220  
 Jinal Kishore In the matter of 32  
 Janakbati v Gajanand 824  
 Janakdhar v Janaki 889  
 Janakdular v Ambica Prasad 0  
 Janaki v Narayanasami 11  
 Janaki Nath v Prabhosini 1055 1058  
 Janardan v Janakibai 45  
 Janardan v Martand 10 16  
 Janardin v Nilkanth 993  
 Janardin v Ram Dhone 2  
 Janardin v Shub Eerhad 499 995  
 Janardhan v Kishoraji 923  
 Janardhan v Pamchandra 14 150 787 1061  
 Janardhanan v Verghese 341 342  
 Janendra v Sures Chandra 1176  
 Janendra Nath v Kumar Jogendra 146  
 Jang Bahadur v Bank of Upper India Ltd 146 178 208  
 Jang Bahadur v Hanwant 683 684  
 Jang Bahadur v Shankar 14 15  
 Jangal v Laljit 48  
 Jangi Singh v Chandar Mol 924 925  
 Janji v Collector of Allahabad 892  
 Janji v Gauri 843  
 Janji v Nannihal 875  
 Janji v Sarup 383 385  
 Janji v Sukhrani 548  
 Janji Das v East India Ry 196  
 Janji Kuer v Lachmi 69  
 Janji Ray v Iaja Kalanand 510  
 Janjibai Chimna 92  
 Janjibai v Shrinivas 458  
 Jangh Lal v Iaddu Ram 150 151  
 Janmat v Ghulam 118  
 Janokinath v Ramrunjun 404 425  
 Janoo v Batchu 110  
 Janoo v Mahamad 84 85 86  
 Janoo Hassan v Batchu 1247

Janson v Driefontein Consolidated  
 Mines Ltd 251  
 Jarachand v Champi 374  
 Jarao v Bhagwan, 430  
 Jarao Kumari v Gopi Chand 1040  
 Jarp v Jogendra Nath 300  
 Jariutoll Butool v Hoamee Begum  
 1041  
 Jasimuddin v Bhuban 29, 827  
 Jasoda v Kartika 647  
 Jasraj v Akubai 1243  
 Jasrat ingri v Secretary of State 722  
 Jathari v Medini 1012  
 Jatharedan v Bunchu 774  
 Jatindra v Gagan, 643  
 Jatindra v Mamdra 1181  
 Jatindra v Srinath 868  
 Jatindra Nath v Peyer Deje Bibi 605  
 Jatra Mohun v Aukhil Chandra 1002  
 Jauhri Lal v Peman 684  
 Javherbai v Haribhai 731  
 Jawahar v Mul Raj 1183  
 Jawahar Bano v Shujaat Husain 1024  
 Jawahar Singh v Sawa Singh 671  
 Jawahur v Nekiram 109  
 Jawahur Singh v E D Sassoon & Co  
 109  
 Jawahra v Albar Husain, 268 275  
 276 421  
 Jayanti Venkatta v Damisetla 914  
 Jayantilal v Nagnath 532  
 Jayappa v Shevangowda 380  
 Jayarama v Vridhagiri 752  
 Jechand v Aba 200  
 Jeewanbai v Manordas 127  
 Jeewandas v Ranchoddas 171  
 Jehangir v Secretary of State 30 246  
 248 296 566 1200  
 Jehrabai v Bismillahi 793  
 Jeklam v Sir S Subramania 268  
 Jenkins v Robertson 69  
 Jerancho v Dakore Temple Committee  
 112 273  
 Jerryappa v Shevanguond 991  
 Jeshankar v Bai Divali 1010 1028  
 Jeswant v Jet Singhee 606  
 Jetalal v Varajlal 1020  
 Jetha v Durgadutt 694  
 Jetha v Gulraj 127 894  
 Jetha Bhima & Co v Lady Janbai 210  
 211  
 Jethabhai v Amarchand 390  
 Jethabhai v Chapsey 23 28 392

Jethalal v Varajlal 544 546 1011  
 Jeuna Bahu v Parmeshwar 923  
 Jewan Lal v Oudh Commercial Bank  
 107  
 Jhamman Lal v Kewal Ram 165  
 Jhanda v Mohan Lal 175  
 Jhanda Singh v Mst Lachhmi 47 870  
 Jhanda Singh v Sadiq 604  
 Jhunday Lal v Sarman Lal 1012  
 Jhari Singh v Pirthi Nath 502  
 Jharula Das v Jalandhar 59  
 Jhotu Lal v Ganouri 347  
 Jhumman v Dinooonath 194  
 Jhuni Lal v Bisheshar Das 347 348  
 351 611 816 817  
 Jia Bibi v Ilahi Baksh 545  
 Jiban v Durga 76  
 Jibunti Nath v Shub Nath 440  
 Jijibhoy v Chettyar 358  
 Jina Ranchod v Jodha Gbella 264,  
 Jino v Manon 512  
 Jit Mal v Jwala Prasad 171  
 Jita Singh v Hari Singh 818 815  
 Jita Singh v Mansingh 875  
 Jitmand v Ramchand 213  
 Jivabai v Teja 128  
 Jivan v Hira 108  
 Jivangiri v Gajanan 323 1034  
 Jivanlal v Bai Manchha 128  
 Jivanlal Varajray In re 1230  
 Jivanna v Appalu 934  
 Jivappa v Jeerji 83 147  
 Jivarathnam v Srinivasa 940  
 Jivraj v Bhagwandas 701  
 Jivraj v Pragn 398  
 Jivraju v Purushotam 447  
 Jiwan Ali v Basa Mal 996  
 Jiwan Baksh v Mubinal Huq 173  
 Jiwan Singh v Sawa Val 761 765  
 Jiwarem v Nand Ram 381  
 Jnanendra v Profullananda 46 1011  
 Jnanendra v Shorashi 903  
 Jodha v Gokaran 921  
 Jodooonath v Broje Mohun, 10 730  
 Johurmull v Kedarnath 15 974  
 Joggobundhu v Purmanand 683  
 Jogemaya v Baidyanath 900  
 Jogendra v Asutosh 641  
 Jogendra Narayan v Durga Charan 888  
 Jogendra v Debendra 972  
 Jogendra v Durga 886 887 888  
 Jogendra v Govri 921



Jogendra v Monmotha 701  
 Jogendra v Irovath 643  
 Jogendra v Sham Da 170  
 Jogendra v Satyenra 922  
 Jogendra Chandra Sen v Wazidunnissa 337 391 1036  
 Jogendra Narayan v Satyenra 294  
 Jogendra Nath v Rajendra Nath 303  
 Jogeniranath Roy v Price 249 250  
 Jogendro Chunder v Dwarka Nath 472  
 Jogesh v Himendra 728  
 Jogesh Chandra Gupta In the matter of 462  
 Jogeshwar Roy v Raj Narain 510  
 Joo M han Deb v Daudoon 897  
 Jogodindro v Sarup Sundari 7 816  
 Jogodihuri v Kailash Chandra 10 167 184  
 Jugul Kishore v Chamma 33  
 Jogunnesa v Satish Chandra 357  
 John v Carter 365  
 John v Sambamurthi 102 695  
 Jomathi v Alarappa 939  
 Jonardhan v Ramdhona 515 602  
 Jonardon v Sambhu Nath 1176  
 Jones v Curling 130  
 Jones v Hughes 494  
 Jones v Monte Video Co 567  
 Jones v Scottish Accident Insurance Co 109  
 Joint Hindu Family v Ghulam Hussain 458  
 Joosub v Kemp 17 251  
 Joce Antonio v Franco 111 90  
 Joeph v Joseph 441  
 Joshi v Dilor 30  
 Joshi v Jhinguria 393  
 Josiam v Swami 750 781  
 Jotendronath v Rajkrishna 118  
 Jotindra Nath v Sarfaraj 981  
 Joti v Izari 825  
 Joti Prasad v Aziz Khan 898  
 Joti Prasad v Richard 613 614  
 Jotinra v Bejoy 479  
 Jotindra v Mahomed 165  
 Jotindro Nath v Dwarka Nath 702 887 891  
 Jowad Hussain v Gendan Singh 135 136  
 Jowala Lam v Hari, 800  
 Joward Hussain v Gendan Singh 914 920

Joy Chandra v Sreenath 57  
 Joy Gobind v Monmotha 790 792  
 Joy Prakash v Sheo Golam 1165 1184  
 Joviall & Co v Gopuram 1258  
 Joyman Bewa v Easin Sarkar 386  
 Joynarain v Shubpersad 961  
 Joyta v Mahomed 588 615  
 Judu Lal v Janki Koer 62  
 Jugul Kishore v Chari 01  
 Jugul Kishore v Home hwar Singh 1044  
 Jugalkishore v Lakshmandas 267 269 271  
 Jugdeo v Rajah Singh 22  
 Jugdeo Singh v Habibulla 901  
 Jugeshwar v Jagatdhar 824  
 Jugannath v Tulka hera 255  
 Juggernauth v Brijnath 1244  
 Juggobundhu v Purnanand 682  
 Juggobundhu v Pam Chunder 652 653  
 Juggobundo v Wat on & Co 615  
 Juggodumba v Puddomonev 1244  
 Juggomohun v Kaisreechund 124  
 Juggomohun v Manickchand 14  
 Juggobundhu v Jadu 350 353  
 Jugalpat Chunder v Poopechand 131  
 Jugul Das v Queen Empress 265  
 Jugul Kishore v Jugul Kishore 240  
 Jugul Kishore v Deva Prayanna 92  
 Jugul Kishore v Kartic Chunder 511 903  
 Juji v Annai 639  
 Juma v Mubarak Khan 1187  
 Juma v Abdul 671  
 Juma Dass v Harcharan Das 962  
 Juma Bai v Ramnathan 1249  
 Jumnabai v Vissondas 996  
 Jungli Lal v Laddu Ram 142 797  
 Jupiter General Insurance Co v Abdul Aziz 104 108 341 1303  
 Juranu v Jathi 767  
 Jurawan v Mahabir 13  
 Justain Hull v Paull 128 130 132  
 Justices of the Peace for Calcutta v The Oriental Gas Co 12 1253 1259  
 Justin Hull v Arthur Francis 296 1254  
 Jwala v Pirbhoo 866  
 Jwala Prasad v East India Railway 353  
 Jvoti Prakash v Mukti Prakash 355 991

Jyoti Prakash v Jhowmull 483  
 Jyoti Chandra v Har Chandra 937

## K

K. B. Dutt v Tarapra-anna 143  
 K. H. Secunder v J. A. N. Kaniar 972  
 K. V. A. L. Chettivar Firm v Maricar 51  
 Kachar v Bai Rathore 414 451  
 Kachar v Oghadbbai 670  
 Kachu v Lakshmanasing 6 931  
 Kachu v Trumbak, 49  
 Kadareesur v Mohun Chandra 671  
 Kadarnal v Surajmal, 106  
 Kadarnath v Hem Nath 21  
 Kader Buksh v Shaik Serajuddin 949  
 Kader Khan v Jug-eeswar 602  
 Kadhore In the matter of the petition of 1221  
 Kadir v Ilahi Bakhsh 146 655  
 Kadir v Muthukrishna 793  
 Kadir Bakh v Bhawani 3  
 Kadirvelusami v The Eastern Development Corporation 181  
 Kadma v Muhammad Ali 939  
 Kadumbiny v Kumudini 838  
 Kahan Singh v Mohan Lal 1180  
 Kahandas In re 219  
 Kahir Muhammad v Umar Din 61  
 Kahn v Ali Mahomed 702 972  
 Kaldas v Padmakisor 304  
 Kailash v Girdja 60 73 135 901  
 Kailash v Gopal 161  
 Kailash v Nabadwip 538  
 Kailash Chandra v Sadar Munsif 975  
 Kailash Mondal v Baroda Sundari 45  
 Kaim Ali v Lalukant 175  
 Kain v Farrer 569  
 Kaja of Pittapur v Secretary of State 300  
 Kaji Ahmad v Kaji Mahamad 593  
 Kalaria v Paja Venkata 304  
 Kakubai v Hargowan 702  
 Kala Chand v Jagannath 803  
 Kala Mia v Harperink 727  
 Kalappa v Kalappa 306  
 Kalavati v Chedilal 874 875  
 Kallee Coomar v Pran Kishore 55  
 Kalenther v Ma Mi 429

Kaleshr v Jagan 444  
 Kali v Izzatunnissa 307  
 Kali Charan v Ashutosh 620  
 Kali Charan v Jewat 158  
 Kali Charan v Sarat Chunder 347 1178 1182  
 Kali Charan v Sheo Buksh 57  
 Kali Charan v Suraj Kumar 393  
 Kali Das v Draupadi 499  
 Kali Daval v Nagendra Nath 790 792 1003  
 Kali Dayal v Umesh Prasad 57  
 Kali Kanta v Gouri 27 422  
 Kali Kanta v Shyam Lal 761  
 Kali Kishore v Guru Prasad 732  
 Kali Krishna v Secretary of State 40 142  
 Kali Kristo v Ram Chunder 1015  
 Kali Padu v Dino Nath 138 139  
 Kali Prasanna v Panchanan 811 816  
 Kali Prasanno Ghose v Rajani Kant 1180 1181 1184 1185  
 Kali Pai v Tulsi Ram 434  
 Kali Raj v Tulsi Pai 1221  
 Kali Soonderi Dabia In re 1046  
 Kalakkal v Palani 543  
 Kalanchand v Sitabai 36  
 Kalan v Kalan 307  
 Kalan v Ram Ratan 431  
 Kalan Singh v Musat Shanno 901  
 Kalanasundram v Egavedeswara 374  
 Kalappa v Kumarasami 539  
 Kalappan v Varadarajulu 181  
 Kaldas v Gor Parjaram 28  
 Kaldas v Nathu 432  
 Kaldas v Prasanna 79  
 Kaldas v Prasanna Kumar 717 726  
 Kalika v Tulsi 1018  
 Kalikanta v Gouri 420  
 Kalimuddin v Esahakuddin 546 547  
 Kalimuddin v Kalimuddin 135  
 Kaluga v Narasimha 402  
 Kalpada v Hari 141 155 753 867 891  
 Kalshunker v Gopal Chunder 59  
 Kalyugam v Chokalinga 81  
 Kaljulum v Sooryanarayana 543  
 Kalla v Basant 155  
 Kalla Prasad v Manmohan Lal 66  
 Kalla Singh v Paras Ram 328  
 Kallapa v Venkatesh 588  
 Kalloo v Kader Singh 920  
 Kallu v Faiyaz 60  
 Kallu v Manni 1007

Kally Soondery v Hurresh Chunder, 1202

Kalma Prasad v Kunj Behari 1003

Kalu v Latu 398

Kalu v Janmea 420

Kalu v Vishram 1002

Kalu Dalpat v Narayan 1009

Kaluram v Gangaram 291

Kalyan v Kamta 637 639

Kalyan Singh v Jacan Irjsud 79

Kalyan Singh v Pahu 808

Kalyanbhai v Ghanshamlal 601

Kalyanchand v Bhogilal 170

Kalyanchand v Sitabai 60 77

Kalyanee v Hari 744

Kamal Kutti v Ibrayi 150

Kamalakshi v Ramasami 860

Kamalamma v Komandur 917 924

Kamalnath v Bithal Das 331

Kaman v Mulli 889

Kamaruddin v Piar Lal 172

Kamatchi v Sundaram 972

Kamatchunathan v Emperor 607

Kamayya v Bhimarasetti 684

Kamayya v Papayya 816

Kambhai v Humatsinghi 257

Kameshar Prasad v Run Bahadur 156

Kameswar v Rajkumar 47 49

Kamini v Ram Nath 814

Kamini Debi v Promotha 7

Kamini Kumar v Rajendra 808

Kamiseti v Katha 104 100

Kamla Prasad v Pandey Ram 18

Kammu v Messamat Fahuman 68

Kamrakh Nath v Sunder Nath 896 887

Kamta v Parbhu 1009

Kamta Prasad v Indomta 607

Kamta Prasad v Mohan 742

Kamta Singh v Bhagwan Das 817

Kanakkia Lal v Kali Dhin 681

Lal v Suraj Kunwar 306 884

v Bangachariar 1009

v Jamaruban, 1026.

v Malgury, 875.

yya, 875.

RE 818.

Kandaswami v Subramania 967

Kandivil v Zamorin of Calcut 00

Kandoth v Abdul 84

Kandra v Taraprasanna 593

Kandu Mal v Tilak Ram 396

Kandunni v Kattamma 49

Kanhai v Durga 66

Kanhaya v Kanhaiya 980

Kanhaya v Kanhaiya Lal 346 342 971

Kanhaya Lal v Ashraf Khan 48

Kanhaya Lal v Baldeo Prasad 1006

Kanhaya Lal v H H The Maharaja of Benares 57

Kanhaya Lal v Jalannath Prasad 1164 1160

Kanhaya Lal v Tirbeni 294

Kanhaya Lal v National Bank of India 159 711 700

Kanhya v Mshin Lal 306

Kanhya Lal v Narain Singh 1180

Kanhya Lal v The Court of Wards 141

Kanzak v Monohur 220

Kanji v Advocate General 267 283

Kanji v Arjun 23

Kanji Mal v Durga Prasad 1024

Kannayya v Venkata 19 141 289 010

Kannaswami v Jagathambal 514 809 811 817

Kanshi Ram v Haram Narain 307

Kanshi Ram v Rao Baldeo 814

Kanthamma v Manchiraju 732

Kanti Chunder v Kissory Mohun Roy 1241 1242

Kanti Chunder v Selgram 1061

Kanti Ram v Kutubuddin 898

Kapul Deo v Ram Rikha 883

Kapur Chand v Kanhaiya Lal 78

Kapurta v Wali 696

Karakavalasa v Karanam 618

Kara Lal v Punjab National Bank 917

Karamchand v Bal hand 126

Karam Kuar v Kirpa Singh 133

Karam Singh v Vir Singh 315

Karamat v Mir Ali 759

Karamuddin v Niamut 221

Karim Elahi v Sher Ahmed 1246

Karim Mahomed v Rajooma 397 398

Karimbhai v Conservator of Forests 693

Karim-un-nisa v Phul Chand 693

v. Tirukkalvalu 241

Rajimbhoy, 877

- Kartman v Bishna 953  
 Kartori v Maharaj Bahadur 961  
 Karpaga v Vania 213  
 Karsondas v Chhotalal 512  
 Karsondas v Gungabai, 3-1  
 Kartick v Juggernath 239  
 Kartick v Sridhar 70 533  
 Kartick Chandra v Ashutosh 153  
 Kartick Churn v Gopalkrishna 109  
 Kartick Nath v Tilukdhari 140 141  
 Kartik Chandra v Narendranath 7-1  
 Karunakara v Krishna 747  
 Karuppan v Somasundaram 20-  
 Karuppa v Kolanthayan 21  
 Karuppan v Ayyathoras 34-  
 Karuppanan v Srinivasan 333  
 Karuthan v Subramanya 194  
 Kasam v Maruti 4 18  
 Kasam Khan v Haji Isuf 26  
 Kasandas v Anklashwar 30  
 Kashee Lal v Ameer Jan 28  
 Kasheeshuree v Greesh Chunder 19-  
 201  
 Kasbi v Bajrang Prasad 52  
 Kasbi v Jamuna 14- 726  
 Kasbi v Mukhta 62-  
 Kashi v Sadashiv 431  
 Kashi v The Union Bank of India 661  
 Kashi Chandra v Kailash Chandra 2-  
 Kashi Chandra v Priyanath 918 939  
 940  
 Kashi Mohan v Bishnoo 4  
 Kashi Prasad v Balbhadra 330  
 Kashi Prasad v Miller 1-7  
 Kashinath and others, In the matter of  
 1220  
 Kashinath v Anant 94  
 Kashinath v Gangubai 275  
 Kashinath v Nana 343  
 Kashinath v Nathoo 445  
 Kashinath v Ramis 922  
 Kashinath v Pamechandra 79  
 Kashinath v Sadashiv 504 693  
 Kashinatha v Uthumansa 161  
 Kashiram v Pandu, 618  
 Kasi Doss v Kassim Sait 866  
 Kasi Nath v Murari 303  
 Kasinath v Himmat Ali 294  
 Kasim v Isuf 12 83  
 Kasinath v Sadashiv 501  
 Kasiwar v Mohendra Nath 40  
 Kasiwar v Aswini 31  
 Kassim v Isuf 83  
 Kassim v Johurmull 469  
 Kassirav v Vithaldas 717  
 Kassim Goolam v Dayabhai 6-8 661  
 Kastur v Fakira 584  
 Kasturbhai v Hiralal 326 330  
 Kasturchand v Pargha 143  
 Kasturshet v Rama 646  
 Katama Natchiar v Rajah of Shivagun-  
 ga 60  
 Katchekaleyan v Kachivijaya 587  
 Kathiawar and Ahmedabad Banking  
 Corporation Ltd v Gurdas 462  
 Kathuresan v Ramasami 752  
 Kattiya v Ramaswami 340 3-3  
 Kattiyas v Raman 161  
 Kattusberi v Vallotil 409  
 Katum v Haji Mahomed 703  
 Kaulesher v Dost Muhammad 120  
 Kaunsilla v Chander Sen 217  
 Kaunsilla v Ishri Singh 174  
 Kausalia v Gulab Kuar 100- 1027  
 Kavaji v Wallace 101  
 Kaveri v Venkamma 172  
 Kaveri v Yasurba 88-  
 Kaveri Ammal v Sastri Ramier 220  
 Kaveribai v Mehta 1-3-  
 Kaveribai v Mehta & Sons 728 729  
 Kay v Poorunchand 270  
 Kayem Biswas v Bahadur Khan 1012  
 Kazem Ali v Azim Ali 7  
 Kazi Hassan v Sagun 277  
 Kebal v Rajani 30- 1019 1023  
 Kedamba v Lakshmi 66  
 Kedar v Chand 996  
 Kedar v Protap 867  
 Kedar Nath v Anant Prasad 618 807  
 Kedar Nath v Bishwanath 567  
 Kedar Nath v Dinabundhu 433  
 Kedar Nath v Harra Chand 806  
 Kedar Nath v Kahi Churn 744  
 Kedar Nath v Motilal 1041  
 Kedar Nath v Prosonna Kumar 109  
 Kedar Nath v Rakhal Das 718  
 Kedar Nath v Sheo Shankar 44  
 Kedarnath v Gonesh 11  
 Keeley v Wakley 837  
 Kellie v Fraser 1245  
 Kelly v Briggs 485  
 Kela v Meenalshi 640  
 Kemp v Goldberg 481  
 Kendal v Hamilton 2 3-  
 Kennedy v Dodson, 559 561 562  
 Kent Coal Concessions v Duguid 567

Hally Soondery v Hurresh Chunder 125  
 Halma Prasad v Kunj Behari 1003  
 Halu v Latu 398  
 Halu v Janmea 422  
 Halu v Vishram 10,  
 Halu Dalpat v Narayan 1009  
 Haluram v Gangaram 294  
 Halyan v Hamta 637 639  
 Halyan Singh v Jagon Prasad 79  
 Halyan Singh v Pahmu 808  
 Halyanbhai v Ghanshamlal, 631  
 Halyanchand v Bhogulal 172  
 Halyanchand v Sitabai 60 77  
 Halyanee v Hari 744  
 Kamal Kuttiv Ibrahim 150  
 Kamalakshi v Ramasami 860  
 Kamamma v Komandur 917 924  
 Kamalnath v Dithal Das 331  
 Kaman v Mulli 889  
 Kamaruddin v Piri Lal 172  
 Kamatchi v Sundaram 972  
 Kamatchinathan v Emperor 607  
 Kamayya v Dhimarasetti 634  
 Kamayya v Papayya 816  
 Kambhai v Himatsinghji 257  
 Kameshar Prasad v Run Bahadur 166  
 Kameswar v Rajkumari 47 49  
 Kamini v Ram Nath 814  
 Kamini Debi v Promotha 7  
 Kamini Kumar v Rajendra 808  
 Kamiseti v Katha 104 100  
 Kamla Prasad v Pandey Ram 18  
 Kammu v Mesamma; Fahiman 68  
 Kamrakh Nath v Sunder Nath 886  
 887  
 Kamta v Parbhu 1009  
 Kamta Prasad v Indomtas 657  
 Kamta Prasad v Mohan 742  
 Kamta Singh v Bhagwan Das 817  
 Kanahia Lal v Kali Dhin 681  
 Kanahal Lal v Suraj Konwar 306 984  
 Kanakammal v Raagachariar 1009  
 Kanakayya v Janardhan 1026  
 Kanakayya v Mulpary 875  
 Kanakayya v Venkataramayya, 875  
 Kanaku v Nagalinga, 1173, 1184  
 Kanara v Govinda, 913  
 Kanaran v Komappan 91, 517  
 Kanchan v Baij Nath, 1010  
 Kandasami v Kuppai Mooppam, 924  
 Kandasami v Subbar 515  
 Kandasami v Subroya, 204

Kandaswami v Subramania 967  
 Kandaval v Zamorin of Calicut 00  
 Kandoth v Abdul 84  
 Kandra v Taraprasanna 093  
 Kandu Mal v Titak Ram 396  
 Kandanu v Katamma 49  
 Kanhai v Durga 66  
 Kanhaiya v Kanhaiya 960  
 Kanhaiya v Kanhaiya Lal 346 372  
 971  
 Kanhaiya Lal v Ashraf Khan 48  
 Kanhaiya Lal v Baldeo Prasad 1006  
 Kanhaiya Lal v H H The Maharaja of  
 Benares 57  
 Kanhaiya Lal v Jagannath Prasad  
 1164 1186  
 Kanhaiya Lal v Tirbeni 204  
 Kanhaiya Lal v National Bank of India  
 109 711 722  
 Kanha v Mahul Lal 306  
 Kanha Lal v Narsim Singh 1180  
 Kanha Lal v The Court of Ward 141  
 Kanizak v Monohur 220  
 Kanji v Advocate General 267 283  
 Kanji v Arjun 23  
 Kanji Mal v Durga Prasad, 1024  
 Kannayya v Venkata 19 141 289  
 510  
 Kannuswami v Jagathambal 514 809  
 811 817  
 Kanchi Ram v Karam Narain 307  
 Kanchi Ram v Rao Baldeo, 814  
 Kanchamma v Manchiraju 732  
 Kanti Chunder v Hussory Mohun Roy  
 1241 1242  
 Kanti Chunder v Saligram 1061  
 Kanti Ram v Kutubuddin 898  
 Kapil Deo v Ram Rukha 883  
 Kapur Chand v Kanhaiya Lal 78  
 Kapuria v Wali C. 6  
 Karakavalasa v Karanam 618  
 Kara Lal v Punjab National Bank 917  
 Karachand v Balchand 126  
 Karan Kuar v Kirpa Singh, 133  
 Karan Singh v Vir Singh 315  
 Karamat v Mir Ali 759  
 Karamuddin v Niamut 221  
 Karim Elahi v Sher Ahmed 1246  
 Karim Mahomed v Rajooma 397 398  
 Karimbhai v Conservator of Forests, 899  
 Karim-un-nisa v Phul Chand, 693  
 Kariya v Tirakkaveju 341  
 Karmali v Rahimboy 877

Karman v Bishna 943  
 Karori v Maharaj Bahadur 961  
 Karpaga v Vania 243  
 Karondas v Chhotalal 512  
 Karondas v Gungabai 331  
 Kartick v Juggernath 239  
 Kartick v Sridhar 70 535  
 Kartick Chandra v Ashutosh 158  
 Kartick Churn v Gopalkrishna 109  
 Kartick Nath v Tilukdhari 140 144  
 Kartik Chandra v Nagendra Nath 751  
 Karunakara v Krishna 747  
 Karuppan v Somasundaram 203  
 Karuppa v Holanthayan 24  
 Karuppan v Aryathoras 543  
 Karuppanan v Srinivasan 333  
 Karuthan v Subramanya 191  
 Kasam v Maruti 4 15  
 Kasam Khan v Haji Isuf 26  
 Kasandas v Anklieshwar 39  
 Kasheo Lal v Ameer Jan 228  
 Kashee huree v Greesh Chunder 197  
 201  
 Kash v Bajrang Prasad 52  
 Kashi v Jamuna 145 726  
 Kashi v Mukhta 627  
 Kashi v Sadashiv 431  
 Kashi v The Union Bank of India 661  
 Kashi Chandra v Kailash Chandra 27  
 Kashi Chandra v Priyanath 918 939  
 940  
 Kashi Mohan v Bishnoo 4  
 Kashi Prasad v Balbhadder, 380  
 Kashi Prasad v Miller 107  
 Kashinath and others, In the matter of  
 1220  
 Kashinath v Anant 94  
 Kashinath v Gangubai 275  
 Kashinath v Nana 343  
 Kashinath v Nathoo 445  
 Kashinath v Rama 922  
 Kashinath v Ramchandra 79  
 Kashinath v Sadashiv 504 693  
 Kashinatha v Uthumansa 161  
 Kashiram v Pandu 618  
 Kasi Das v Kassin Sat 866  
 Kasi Nath v Murari 303  
 Kassinath v Himmat Ali 294  
 Kasim v Isuf 12 83  
 Kasinath v Sadashiv 501  
 Kasiswar v Mohendra Nath 40  
 Kasiwar v Aswini 31  
 Kassim v Isuf 83

Kassim v Johurmull 469  
 Kassirav v Vithaldas 717  
 Kassim Goolam v Dayabhai 658 661  
 Kastur v Fakira 584  
 Kasturbhai v Hiralal 326 330  
 Kasturchand v Pargha 143  
 Kasturshet v Rama 646  
 Katama Natchiar v Rajah of Shivagun  
 ga 60  
 Katchekalevans v Kachivijaya 587  
 Kathuwar and Ahmedabad Banking  
 Corporation Ltd v Gurdas 462  
 Kathiresan v Ramasami 752  
 Kattiya v Ramaswamia 340 353  
 Kattiyaat v Raman 161  
 Kattusheri v Vallotil 409  
 Katum v Haji Mahomed 703  
 Kaulesher v Dost Muhammad 120  
 Kaunsilla v Chander Sen 217  
 Kaunsilla v Ishri Singh 174  
 Kaushia v Gulab Kuar 1008 1027  
 Kavaji v Wallace 101  
 Kaveri v Venkamma 172  
 Kaveri v Yasurba 883  
 Kaveri Ammal v Bastri Pamier 220  
 Kaveribai v Mehta 1253  
 Kaveribai v Mehta & Sons 728 729  
 Kay v Poorunchand 570  
 Kayem Biswas v Bahadur Khan 1012  
 Kazem Ali v Azim Ali 7  
 Kazi Hassan v Sagun 277  
 Kebal v Rajani 307 1019 1028  
 Kedambi v Lakshmi 68  
 Kedar v Chand 996  
 Kedar v Protap 867  
 Kedar Nath v Anant Prasad 618 801  
 Kedar Nath v Bishwanath 567  
 Kedar Nath v Dinabundhu 438  
 Kedar Nath v Harra Chand 806  
 Kedar Nath v Kali Churn 744  
 Kedar Nath v Motilal 1041  
 Kedar Nath v Prosonna Kumar 109  
 Kedar Nath v Rakhai Das 718  
 Kedar Nath v Sheo Shankar 44  
 Kedarnath v Gonesh 11  
 Keeley v Wakley 837  
 Kelho v Fraser 1245  
 Kelly v Briggs 485  
 Kelu v Meenalshi 640  
 Kemp v Goldberg 484  
 Kendal v Hamilton 2 33  
 Kennedy v Dodson, 559 561, 562  
 Kent Coal Concessions v Duguid 567

- Kerakoose v Serle 871  
 Keramat v Kumar Arihna 40  
 Kering Rupchand & Co v Murray 17  
 20.  
 Kesar Singh v Asa Singh 49  
 Kesar Singh v Indar Singh 994  
 Kesava v Corindichari 323  
 Keshab v Ajhar 194  
 Keshab v Manirudin 67  
 Keshav v Krishnarav 889  
 Keshav v Vinayak 94 114 296  
 Keshav Chandra v Jovifunesa 303  
 Keshav Ram v Ranchhod 899  
 Keshava v Lakshminarayana 91  
 Keshavlal v Bai Gurja 23  
 Keshavlal v Parvati 43  
 Keshavram v Ranchhod 446  
 Keshawesarindra v Rani Debendra 867  
 915  
 Kesho Prasad v Shammندان 793  
 Kesho Prasad v Sheo Pargash 61  
 Kesho Prasad v Srinubash 901  
 Kesho Prasad Singh v Narayan Dayal  
 10.5  
 Keshobati v Macgregor 9.9 982  
 Keshub Roy v Aristo Witter 804 806  
 Kest v Abdul Ha am 773  
 Kest Chand v National Jute Mills Co  
 637  
 Kesrisang v Naransang 308  
 Kesserbai v Kaku 703  
 Kessoram v Secretary of State 248  
 Kessowji v Khimji 110 1242  
 Kessowji v Luckmidas 1246 124,  
 Kessowji Issur v GIP Ry Co 101"  
 1018 1019  
 Kevaldas v Prestonj 57.  
 Keymer v Visvanatham 80  
 Keynsham Blue Lias Co v Barker 109  
 Khairasheb v Chotibibi 41"  
 Khadem Hoosem v Emdad Hoosem 293  
 Khadir Moideen v Pama Naik 433  
 Khagaram v Ram Sankar 933  
 Khagendra v Sahyram 320  
 Khagendra v Shashadhar 9 9  
 Khagen Ira Nath v Iran Nath 547  
 710  
 Khairajmal v Daim 216 93"  
 Khairati v Hanni Begum 599  
 Khair un Nissa Bili v Oudh Com  
 mercial Bank Ltd. 9.0  
 Khajah Asenoolajoo v Solomon 133  
 936.  
 Khali v Khatir 500  
 Khalil ur Rahman v Gokul 730  
 Khamiso v Rasu 4  
 Khan v Ali Mahomed 703  
 Kharak v Lachman 612  
 Kharrara v Omed 600  
 Kharda Co Ltd v Durga Charan 440  
 810 817  
 Khatija v Ismail 96  
 Khatija Bibi v Taruck 116  
 Khatizan v Sonairam 1254 1200  
 Khem Karan v Har Dayal 866  
 Khem Singh v Raghur 164  
 Khema v Dhanj 1007  
 Khemchand v Khairuddin 949  
 Khemraj v Kishnulal 906  
 Kherodamoyi Dasi v Habib Shaha 901  
 Kheshtia Pal v Pancham Singh 109  
 Khetpal v Tikam Singh 143 171  
 Khetra v Mumtaz Begam 722  
 Khetra Mohan v Sarat Chandra 160  
 Khetrapal v Shyama 164  
 Khetra Mohan v Sheikh 751  
 Khetsidas v Varotumdas 671  
 Khetter v Kali 530  
 Khettra Nath v Ushabala 1196  
 Khairajmal v Daim 217 670  
 Khidir Bux v King Emperor 672  
 Khumchand v Bhogilal 821  
 Khumchand v Sobhagchand 812  
 Khumji v Forbes 102  
 Khuradamoyi v Adhar 294  
 Khisor v Chhanga 309  
 Khitish Chandra v Nagendra Nath 343  
 354  
 Khodayatul v Harihar 139  
 Khotaram v Nawaz 441  
 Khub Lal v Jhapa 298 456 698  
 Khub Lal v Jugdish 985  
 Khub Lal v Raghubans 620  
 Khub Ram v Surat 694  
 Khuda Bakhsh v Aziz Alam 2 0  
 Khuda Bakhsh v Allah Ditta 399  
 Khuda Bakhsh v Imam Ali 607  
 Khuda Bakhsh v Mathura Das 700  
 Khudiram v Chandicharan 1184 1180  
 Khuddus v Sawdagar 441  
 Khudi Pal v Lal Rai 813  
 Khulna Loan Co v Jnanendranath  
 1"  
 Khunni Lal v Pameshar 799  
 Khursadi Begum v Secretary of State  
 278

- Aburshed Alam Khan v Rahmatullah Khan 1060 1061  
 Abushal v Bhimabai 215  
 Abushal v Punamchand 133  
 Abushaldas v Chumanlal 1041  
 Abubali Ram v Gokul Chand 109  
 Abushalchand v Nandram 208 226 1208  
 Abushu Ram v Tulsi Ram 8  
 Abushrobhai v Hormazsha 176 608  
 Abwaja Muhammad In the matter of 329 1034  
 Afayat Ali v Ram Singh 370  
 Aing v Hoare 35  
 Aing v Secretary of State for India 124  
 Aing Emperor v Barendra Kumar Ghose 1264  
 Aing King & Co v Davidson 201  
 Aingston v Corker 489  
 Aisani v Subabhat 1021  
 Aischer & Co v Gruban 84  
 Aint v Chancel 879  
 Airpa Ram v Mangal Sen 102  
 Aisandas v Pachappa 496 499 505  
 Aishan Kunwar v Ganga Prasad 614  
 Aishan Lal v Garuddwaja 220  
 Aishan Lal v Jai Lal 119  
 Aishan Lal v Sultan Singh 575  
 Aishan Lal v Umrao Singh 937  
 Aishan Narain v Pala Mal 438 441 442  
 Aishan Prasad v Har Narain Singh 430 432 904  
 Aishan Lal v Charat Singh 212  
 Aishan Narain v Pala Mal 441  
 Aishan Parshad v Har Narain 432  
 Aishan Pershad v Tiluckdhar 1037  
 Aishanand v Pratab Narain 620 629  
 Aishni Bai v Budhu Pam 613  
 Aishorechand v Madhowji 526  
 Aishore v Chhanga 398  
 Aishore v Chunder Nath 29  
 Aishore v Gisborne & Co 606  
 Aishore v Sabdal 515  
 Aishore Bun v Dwarakanath 678  
 Aishore Bun Mohunt v Prosunpo Coomar 78  
 Aishore Chand v Ishar Singh 224  
 Aishore Singh v Bahadur Singh 63  
 Aishori v Chunder 772  
 Aishori Mohun v Chundra Nath 22 163  
 Aishori Mohun v Gul Mohamed 119  
 Aishory Mohun v Mahomed 754  
 Aishun Lal v Muhammad 766 769  
 Aissen v Suklal 537 798  
 Aissorimohun v Harsukh Das 719 724  
 Aissun Sing v Sturt 101  
 Aistna amy v Municipal Commissioner for Madras 526  
 Knowles v Roberts 494 496  
 Kochappa v Sashi Devi 262 267  
 Kodai Singh v Jaist Singh 627  
 Kojo Pon v Atta Fua 393  
 Kokamal v Gulabsing 511  
 Kokil v Edal Singh 730  
 Kokil Singh v Ramasray 1183 1188  
 Kolaremathu v Madhavi 181  
 Kollantavida v Tiruvalli 220  
 Kolliparee v Kankipati 1049  
 Komappan v Ukkaran 59  
 Ko Maung Gyi v Daw Tak 384  
 Kombi v Pang 1150  
 Kombi Achen v Kochunni 1006  
 Kommachi v Pakker 230 239  
 Kondayya v Narasimhulu 2  
 Kondeti v Nukamma 219  
 Kondi v Chundal 821  
 Kondiba v Mestresjean 415  
 Konerrav v Gurrav 50  
 Kooni Meera v Mahomed 28  
 Kora Lal v Punjab National Bank 670 740  
 Koramall v Mongulal 581  
 Korbai Ally v Sharoda Proshad 18  
 Kossella v Behares 130  
 Kotaguri Venkata v Vellankum 613 1053  
 Ko Tha Hayim v Ma Hain 10 735  
 Koti Pujari v Manjaya 89  
 Koti Reddi v Subbiahm 248 249 250  
 Kotticth v Udaya 94  
 Kovvuri v Tallapragadha 415  
 Kower Narain v Sreenath 15  
 Koylash Chandra v Christophoridi 188  
 Koylash Chunder v Sonatun 3  
 Koyyana v Doosy 57a 720  
 Krpa Ram v Jawahir Lal 570  
 Krishanath v Ram Lakshmi 748  
 Krishna v Akilanda 93  
 Krishna v Amrui 52  
 Krishna v Atul 422  
 Krishna v Balaram 1103  
 Krishna v Bhan Mansaram 120  
 Krishna v Bhau 144  
 Krishna v Bunwan 42 43  
 Krishna v Corporation of Calcutta 780



- Krishna v Kedarnath 31"  
 Krishna v Mst Iromula 106  
 Krishna v Mohesh Chandra 290  
 Krishna v Pachaiyappa 493 504  
 Krishna v Protap Chunder 333  
 Krishna v Raman 91  
 Krishna v Ramkumar 1046  
 Krishna v Saraswatula 163 749  
 Krishna v Sarimuthu 638  
 Krishna v Thanikachala 1254 1255  
 Krishna Ayyangar v Vallaperumal  
 Pallal 2  
 Krishna Ayyar v Muthu  
 Kumaresawmya 697  
 Krishna Behari Poy v Brojeswari  
 Chowdranee 38  
 Krishna Bhoopathi v Paja of  
 Vizianagaram 1044  
 Krishna Boi v The Collector and  
 Government Agent Tanjore 477  
 Krishna Chandra v Dina Nath 155  
 Krishna Chandra v Mohesh Chandra  
 91  
 Krishna Das v Collector of Patna  
 345  
 Krishna Das v Ram Gopal 2 6  
 Krishna Das v Ram Ugrah 335  
 Krishna Kishore v Amarnath 145  
 Krishna Persad v Moti Chand 319 753  
 765  
 Krishna Rao In the matter of 1261  
 Krishnabai v Hari Govind 8 3  
 Krishnabai v Manohar 483  
 Krishnabai v Sivaram 170  
 Krishnabhupati v Vikrama 711  
 Krishnadoss v Ghanshanloes 1244  
 Krishnairah v Gajenda 671  
 Krishnayar v Krishnasamy 183  
 Krishnaji v Dimodar 184 18  
 Krishnaji v Gajanan 97 94 96  
 Krishnaji v Ganesb 216  
 Krishnaji v Mahadev 144 740  
 741 91"  
 Krishnaji v Maruti "  
 Krishnaji v Motilal 433  
 Krishnaji v Rajmal 15  
 Krishnaji v Sangappa 445  
 Krishnaji v Secretary of State 257  
 Krishnaji v Wamanaji 483  
 Krishnama v Appasami 164  
 Krishnama v Krishnasami 2"  
 Krishnama v Narasimha 101"  
 Krishnamachariar v Srirangammal, 534  
 Krishnammal v Soundataraja 445  
 Krishnamoorthy v Pamayya 895  
 Krishnan v Ittinan 184  
 Krishnan v Kanman 56  
 Krishnan v Muthu 1185  
 Krishnan v Venkatespathi 157 666 707  
 Krishnappa v Abdul Khader 715  
 Krishnappa v Periaswamy 155  
 Krishnappa v Shivappa 404  
 Krishnarao v Krishnarao 725  
 Krishnasami v Engel 956  
 Krishnasami v Kanakasabai 87 90  
 Krishnasami v Krishnamma 25  
 Krishnasami v Krishnamachariar 24  
 Krishnasami v Panga 638  
 Krishnasami v Samarum 29  
 Krishnasami v Soma undaram 718  
 Krishnasami v Sundarappayyar 450  
 Krishnasami v Virasami 23  
 Krishnasamy v Chengalrija 392 1002  
 Krishnasanker v Chandra banker 931  
 Krishnaswami Karuppan 655  
 Krishnakishore v Rooplal 144  
 Krishnapada v Chaitanya 903  
 Krista Chandra Ghose v Krista Sakha  
 Ghose 950  
 Krista v Pancharam 603 604  
 Kristamma v Chapa 347 351 354  
 Kristam v Janakiramayya 164  
 Kristnam v Pathma Bee 719  
 Kristnama v Mangammal 171  
 Kristnasawmy v Official Assignee of  
 Madras 215 213 95"  
 Kristo Indro v Huromonee 327  
 Kristo Kunkar v Rukodacaunt 170  
 Kristo Raman v Kedarnath 175 176  
 666  
 Kristodhone v Nandaram 208  
 Kristamma v Chapa 351  
 Krupasindhu v Mahanta 376 381  
 Kshurode v Nabin Chandra 470 471 479  
 Kuarmou v Wasif Ali 513  
 Kuber v Jamakar 571  
 Kubera v Koman 32  
 Kubra Jan v Pam Bah 96 452  
 Kudhai v Sheo Dayal 655  
 Kudratulla v Kubra Begam 217 902  
 Kudratulla v Upendra 141  
 Kulada v Ramanand 294 922  
 Kulada Prasad v Khudiram 439  
 Kulada Prasad v Sadhu Charan 395  
 Kulakada v Vibhwanatha 1005 1007  
 Kulandai v Indra 343

Kulandaivelu v I amaswami 340  
 Kuldip v Banvari 302  
 Kuldip v Kuldip 812  
 Kulendra v Palakishore 337  
 Kulsum v Ali Akbar 1143 1197  
 Kumar v Pameshwar Mohabir 306  
 Kumar Ba anta v The Secretary of  
 State 325 326  
 Kumar Ganga v Pirthichand Lal 962  
 Kumar Ganganand v Maharaja Sir  
 Rameshwar Singh 918  
 Kumar Ganganand v Pirthuchand 922  
 Kumar Krishna v Hari Narain 530 564  
 Kumar Pame hwar v Pami Pikhath  
 123 306 567 570  
 Kumar Saradindu v Dhurenda 862  
 Kumara v Theravaya 719 721  
 Kumarandv v Venkatasubramania 58  
 Kumarappa v Manavala 304  
 Kumaretta v Sabapathy 141 154  
 Kumbalinga v Arivaputra 223  
 Kumud v Hari 21  
 Kumud Nath v Jotindra Nath 546  
 Kundan Lal v Faqirchand 900  
 Kundan Lal v Shiv Daval 614  
 Kunhamed v Chathu 768  
 Kunhan v Mannan 974  
 Kunhavan v Ithukutti 204 205  
 Kunhi v Kutti 1015  
 Kunhi v Malhi 210  
 Kunj Bihari v Bindeshri 634  
 Kunj Behari v Meest Narain 28  
 Kunj Lall v Banwari Lall 1167 1170  
 1194 1196  
 Kunj Man v Jaganath 59  
 Kunja v Manindra 93 94 115  
 Kunja Lal v Narsamba 127  
 Kunji v Raman, 67  
 Kunji Lal v Durga Prasad, 1197  
 Kunjo Behary Singh v Madhub Chundra  
 308  
 Kunjolal v Idurath 750  
 Kunveri v Pitamberdas 1058  
 Kunwar Lal v Lala Beni 696  
 Kupp v Dorasami 194 306  
 Kuppans v Kumara 52a 157 163 774  
 Kuppaswami Aiyar Re 1260  
 Kuppaswami v Baraswami 880  
 Kuppaswami v Subba 49  
 Kuppaswami v Singaravelu 789  
 Kuppaswami v Subramaniyam 976.  
 Kuppaswami v Zamindar of

Kuppaswami v Kamalammal 870  
 Kupusami v Rathnavelu 980  
 Kupusami v Ventataramier 76  
 Kura v Madho 51  
 Kura v Udmi 983  
 Kura Mal v Ram Nath 1258  
 Kurgodgouda v Ningangouda 381  
 Kuriya Mal v B. hambir Das 294  
 Kurutolain v Nuzbat ud Dowla 40  
 Kurugodappa v Soogamma 384 873  
 Kushalchand v Nandram 1208  
 Kusum v Satya 840  
 Kutbuddin v Privanayaga 945  
 Kuttie Ali v Chundan 49  
 Kutti v Subramania 215  
 Kwai Tong Kee v Lim Chaung 231  
 Kyalasa v Ramasami 771  
 Kylene Hone v Kylene Soon 15 1051

## L

Labh Singh v Pam Lal 1020  
 Lachmi v Bhullu 36 37  
 Lachharam v Virji 115  
 Lachhman v Baba 644  
 Lachman v Baldeo 108  
 Lachman v Brippal 1184  
 Lachman v Chaturbhuj 653  
 Lachman v Ganga 726  
 Lachman v Jamna 1015  
 Lachman v Jarbunda 106 692  
 Lachman v Mohan 397  
 Lachman v Munia 270  
 Lachman Das v Abparlash 1168  
 1180 1184  
 Lachman Lal v Kanbaya Lal 302  
 Lachman Parsad v Ram Krishan 613  
 Lachman Singh v Musummat Puna 302  
 Lachman Singh v Pam Lagan 296  
 Lachmeswar v Manowar 130 303  
 Lachmi v Balmakund 319 346 350 533  
 Lachmi v Jwala 142  
 Lachmi v Mitthu 241  
 Lachmi v Muhammad 782 500  
 Lachmi v Pam Bahadur 342 857  
 Lachmi v Ram Charan 962 979  
 Lachmi Chand v Bepin Behari 1259.  
 Lachmi Narain

- Krishna v Kedarnath 317  
 Krishna v Mst Fromila 106  
 Krishna v Mohesh Chandra 290  
 Krishna v Iachayappa 423 504  
 Krishna v Protap Chunder 293  
 Krishna v Raman 91  
 Krishna v Ramkumar 1016  
 Krishna v Saraswathula 163 749  
 Krishna v Savitrimuthu 635  
 Krishna v Thanikachala 1251 1735  
 Krishna Ayyar v Nallaperumal  
 Idem 2  
 Krishna Ayyar v Muthu  
 Kumara swamiya 897  
 Krishna Behari Poy v Brojeswari  
 Chowdranee 39  
 Krishna Bhooopathi v Rsa of  
 Vizianagaram 1011  
 Krishna Boi v The Collector and  
 Government Agent Tanjore 451  
 Krishna Chandra v Dina Nath 155  
 Krishna Chandra v Mohesh Chandra  
 11  
 Krishna Das v Collector of Patna  
 345  
 Krishna Das v Pam Gopal 256  
 Krishna Das v Ram Ugrah 539  
 Krishna Kishore v Amarnath 145  
 Krishna Iqbal v Moti Chand 319 753  
 765  
 Krishna Pao In the matter of 1961  
 Krishnabai v Hari Corind 6 3  
 Krishnabai v Manohar 253  
 Krishnabai v Savitaram 179  
 Krishnabhupati v Vikrama 711  
 Krishnade v Chanshan lae 1944  
 Krishnavah v Cajenda 61  
 Krishnayyar v Krishnasamy 165  
 Krishnaji v Damodar 181 18.  
 Krishnaji v Gajanan 9 91 96  
 Krishnaji v Ganesh 16  
 Krishnaji v Mahadev 141 740  
 44 917  
 Krishnaji v Maruti 7  
 Krishnaji v Motilal 433  
 Krishnaji v Lajmal 15  
 Krishnaji v Sangappa 445  
 Krishnaji v Secretary of State 257  
 Krishnaji v Wamnyji 423  
 Krishnama v Appasami 164  
 Krishnama v Krishnasami 27  
 Krishnama v Sarasimha 1017  
 Krishnamachariar v Sitrangammal, 201  
 Krishnammal v Soundataraja 445  
 Krishnamoorthy v Ramayya 895  
 Krishnan v Ittinan 184  
 Krishnan v Kaniran 66  
 Krishnan v Muthu 1185  
 Krishnan v Venkatapathi 156 666 707  
 Krishnappa v Abdul Khader 718  
 Krishnappa v Periaswamy 155  
 Krishnappa v Shivappa 404  
 Krishnarao v Krishnarao 724  
 Krishnasami v Angel 956  
 Krishnasami v Kanakasabay 57 90  
 Krishnasami v Krishnama 25  
 Krishnasami v Krishnamachariar 74  
 Krishnasami v Panga 635  
 Krishnasami v Samaram, 28  
 Krishnasami v Somasundaram 718  
 Krishnasami v Sundarapillayyar 450  
 Krishnasami v Virasami 3  
 Krishnasamy v Chingairaya 332 1002  
 Krishnashanker v Chandrashanker 231  
 Krishnaswami Karuppan 655  
 Kishore Kishore v Poopilli 144  
 Kishtopada v Chaitanya 803  
 Krishna Chandra Ghose v Krishna Sakha  
 Ghose 950  
 Krishna v Pancharam 603 604  
 Kristamma v Chitra 317 351 354  
 Kristam v Janakiramayya 164  
 Kristnam v Pathma Beo 719  
 Kristnama v Mangammal 171  
 Kristnaswamy v Official Assignee of  
 Madras 21 213 9  
 Kristo Indro v Huromonee 327  
 Kristo Kinkur v Burrodacount 150  
 Kristo Raman v Kedarnath 175 176  
 666  
 Kristodhone v Nandaram 208  
 Kristamma v Chapa 151  
 Krupasindhu v Mahanta 3 6 391  
 Kshirode v Nabin Chandra 470 471 518  
 Kuarmoni v Wasif Ali 513  
 Kuber v Lamakar 871  
 Kubera v Koman 35  
 Kubra Jan v Pam Bah 96 452  
 Kudhai v Sheo Dayal 655  
 Kudratulla v Kubra Begam 217 90  
 Kudratulla v Upendra 141  
 Kulada v Lamanand 291 922  
 Kulada Prasad v Khudiram 439  
 Kulada Prasad v Sadhu Charan 395  
 Kulakada v Vishwanatha 1005 1007  
 Kulandai v Indra 343

Kulandaivelu v Pamaswami 340  
 Kuldip v Banvari 302  
 Kuldip v Kuldip 812  
 Kulendra v Rai Kishore 337  
 Kul um v Ali Akbar 1183 1197  
 Kumar v Pameshwar Mohabir 306  
 Kumar Ba anta v The Secretary of  
 State 323 326  
 Kumar Ganga v Pirthuchand Lal 962  
 Kumar Ganganand v Maharaja Sir  
 Pame hwar Singh 918  
 Kumar Ganganand v Pirthuchand 923  
 Kumar Krishna v Hari Narain 530 864  
 Kumar Pameshwar v Jani Pikhnath  
 123 306 367 370  
 Kumar Saradindu v Dharendra 862  
 Kumara v Thevaraya 19 21  
 Kumarandv v Venkatasubramania 55  
 Kumarappa v Manavala 304  
 Kumaretta v Sabapathv 141 154  
 Kumbalinga v Arivaputra 223  
 Kumud v Hari 21  
 Kumud Nath v Jotindra Nath 346  
 Kundan Lal v Faqirchand 900  
 Kundan Lal v Shiv Dayal 614  
 Kunhamed v Chathu 766  
 Kunhan v Mannan 074  
 Kunhayan v Ithukutti 204 203  
 Kunhi v Kutti 1015  
 Kunhi v Makhi 210  
 Kunj Bihari v Bindeshri 634  
 Kunj Behari v Mast Narain 23  
 Kunj Lall v Banwari Lall 1167 1170  
 1194 1196  
 Kunj Man v Jaganath 59  
 Kunja v Manindra 93 94 115  
 Kunja Lal v Narsamba 127  
 Kunji v Paman 67  
 Kunji Lal v Durga Prasad 1107  
 Kunjo Behary Singh v Madhub Chundra  
 308  
 Kunjola v Idurali 750  
 Kunveri v Pitamberdas 1038  
 Kunwar Lal v Lala Beni 696  
 Kupp v Dorasami 194 306  
 Kuppana v Kumara 52a 157 163 774  
 Kuppaswami Aiyar Pe 1260  
 Kuppaswami v Bayaswami 880  
 Kuppaswami v Subba 49  
 Kuppaswami v Singaravelu 789  
 Kuppaswami v Subramaniam 976  
 Kuppaswami v Zamindar of Kalahasti  
 129

Kuppaswamy v Kamalammal 870  
 Kuposami v Rathnavelu 980  
 Kuposami v Ventataramier 76  
 Kura v Madho 31  
 Kura v Udmu 933  
 Kura Mal v Ram Nath 1238  
 Kurgodgouda v Ningangouda 381  
 Kuriya Mal v Bishambar Das 294  
 Kurrutulam v Nuzbat ud Dowla 40  
 Kurugodappa v Soogamma 334 873  
 Kushalchand v Nandram 1208  
 Kusum v Satya 840  
 Kutbuddin v Privanayaga 945  
 Kutte Ali v Chindan 40  
 Kutti v Subramania 215  
 Kwai Tong Kee v Lim Chaung 231  
 Khlasa v Pamasami 771  
 Kylene Hone v Kyon Soon 15 1001

## L

Labh Singh v Pam Lal 1020  
 Lachmi v Bhull 36 37  
 Lachharam v Virji 115  
 Lachhman v Baba 644  
 Lachman v Baldeo 198  
 Lachman v Brupal 1184  
 Lachman v Chaturbhuj 633  
 Lachman v Ganga 726  
 Lachman v Jamna 1015  
 Lachman v Jarbundan 196 692  
 Lachman v Mohan 397  
 Lachman v Munia 279  
 Lachman Das v Abparlash 1168  
 1180 1184  
 Lachman Lal v Kanhaya Lal 302  
 Lachman Parsad v Ram Kishan 613  
 Lachman Singh v Musummat Puna 302  
 Lachman Singh v Ram Lagan 296  
 Lachmeswar v Manowar 130 303  
 Lachmi v Balmal und 319 346 330 533  
 Lachmi v Jwala 142  
 Lachmi v Vitthu 211  
 Lachmi v Muhammad 782 800  
 Lachmi v Ram Bahadur 342 887  
 Lachmi v Ram Charan 962 979  
 Lachmi Chand v Bepin Behari 1239  
 Lachmi Narain v Balmukund 533  
 602 786  
 Lachmi Narain v Darbari Lal 7 533  
 Lachmi Narain v Kunji Lal 183  
 Lachmi Narain v Makund 199  
 Lachmi Narain v Sheo Nath 1196  
 Lachmi Narain v Uman Dat 933

- Krishna v Kedarnath 317  
 Krishna v Mast Iromila 106  
 Krishna v Mohesh Chandra 290  
 Krishna v Iacharyappa 423 501  
 Krishna v Irotab Chunder 513  
 Krishna v Raman 91  
 Krishna v Ramkumar 1016  
 Krishna v Saraswatula 103 749  
 Krishna v Savirimuthu 638  
 Krishna v Thirukachala 1254 1255  
 Krishna Ayyanar v Vallaperumal Pillai 2  
 Krishna Arvar v Muthu Kumarasawmiya 69  
 Krishna Behari Poy v Brojeswari Chowdranee 38  
 Krishna Bhooopathi v Rya of Vizianagaram 1044  
 Krishna Bai v The Collector and Government Agent Tanjore 47  
 Krishna Chandra v Dina Nath 155  
 Krishna Chandra v Mohesh Chandra 591  
 Krishna Das v Collector of Tanja 315  
 Krishna Das v Pam Gopal 6  
 Krishna Das v Ram Ugrah 539  
 Krishna Kishore v Amarnath 145  
 Krishna Persad v Moti Chand 319 753 765  
 Krishna Rao In the matter of 1761  
 Krishnabai v Hari Govind 423  
 Krishnabai v Manohar 583  
 Krishnabai v Savlaram 179  
 Krishnabhupati v Vikrama 711  
 Krishna lo v Ghanchandoss 144  
 Krishnairali v Gajenda 671  
 Krishnayyar v Krishnasamy 145  
 Krishnaji v Damodar 184 185  
 Krishnaji v Gajanan 9 91 96  
 Krishnaji v Ganesh 216  
 Krishnaji v Mahadev 144 740 741 91  
 Krishnaji v Maruti 7  
 Krishnaji v Motilal 433  
 Krishnaji v Rajmal 15  
 Krishnaji v Sannappa 445  
 Krishnaji v Secretary of State 25  
 Krishnaji v Wamanaji 443  
 Krishnama v Appasami 161  
 Krishnama v Krishnasami 27  
 Krishnama v Narasimha 101  
 Krishnamachariar v Srirangammal 551  
 Krishnasammal v Soundataraja 445  
 Krishnamoorthy v Pamayya 895  
 Krishnan v Itinan 188  
 Krishnan v Kanman 56  
 Krishnan v Muthu 1185  
 Krishnan v Venkatapathi 151 666 707  
 Krishnappa v Abdul Kader 718  
 Krishnappa v Periaswamy 15  
 Krishnappa v Shivappa 404  
 Krishnarao v Krishnarao 728  
 Krishnasami v Engel 956  
 Krishnasami v Kanakasabai 87 90  
 Krishnasami v Krishnama 25  
 Krishnasami v Krishnamachariar 24  
 Krishnasami v Pangi 635  
 Krishnasami v Samaram 25  
 Krishnasami v Somasundaram 718  
 Krishnasami v Sundarappiyyar 450  
 Krishnasami v Virasami 23  
 Krishnasamy v Chengalraya 392 100  
 Krishnashanker v Chandri hanker 231  
 Krishnaswami Karuppan 655  
 Krishno Kishore v Rooplall 144  
 Krishnopada v Chaitanya 903  
 Krista Chandra Ghose v Krista Sakha Ghose 950  
 Krista v Lancharam 603 604  
 Kristamma v Chapa 317 351 354  
 Kristam v Janakiramayya 164  
 Kristum v Pathma Bee 719  
 Kristnama v Mangammal 171  
 Krishnasawmi v Official Assignee of Madras 21 213 95  
 Kristo Indro v Huromonee 327  
 Kristo Kunkur v Burrodacunt 170  
 Kristo Ramani v Kedarnath 175 176 666  
 Kristodhona v Nandaram 208  
 Kristamma v Chapa 351  
 Krupasinghu v Mlabinta 376 381  
 Kuldrole v Nabin Chandra 470 471 518  
 Kuarmoni v Wasif Ali 513  
 Kuber v Lamakar 871  
 Kubera v Koman 32  
 Kulra Jan v Pam Bali 96 452  
 Kudhai v Sheo Dayal 655  
 Kudratulla v Kubra Begam 217 90  
 Kudratulla v Upendra 141  
 Kulada v Imanand, 291 922  
 Kulada Prasad v Khudiram 439  
 Kulada Prasad v Sidhu Charan 395  
 Kulalkada v Vishwanatha 1005 1007  
 Kulandai v Indra 343

Kulandaivelu v Pamaswami 340  
 Kuldip v Banwari 302  
 Kuldip v Kuldip 812  
 Kulendra v Patikore 537  
 Kulum v Ali Akbar 1143 1197  
 Kumar v Pamehwar Mohabir 306  
 Kumar Basanta v The Secretary of State 325 326  
 Kumar Ganga v Pirthichand Lal 962  
 Kumar Ganganand v Maharaja Sir Pameshwar Singh 918  
 Kumar Ganganand v Pirthichand 922  
 Kumar Krishna v Hari Narain 530 664  
 Kumar Pameshwar v Pami Pikhath 123 306 567 570  
 Kumar Saradindu v Dhurenda 662  
 Kumara v Thevaraya 719 721  
 Kumarand v Venkatasubramania 58  
 Kumarappa v Manavala 304  
 Kumaretta v Sabapathy 141 154  
 Kumbalinga v Arisaputra 223  
 Kumud v Hari 21  
 Kumud Nath v Jotindra Nath 546  
 Kundan Lal v Faqirchand, 900  
 Kundan Lal v Shiv Dayal 614  
 Kunhamed v Chathu 766  
 Kunhan v Mannan 974  
 Kunhayan v Ithukutti 204 205  
 Kunhi v Kutti 101  
 Kunhi v Mahli 210  
 Kunj Bihari v Bindeshri 634  
 Kunj Behari v Meest Narain 28  
 Kunj Lal v Banwari Lal 1167 1179 1194 1196  
 Kunj Man v Jaganath 59  
 Kunja v Manindra 93 94 115  
 Kunja Lal v Narsamba 127  
 Kunji v Raman, 67  
 Kunji Lal v Durga Prasad 1197  
 Kunjo Behary Singh v Madhub Chundra 308  
 Kunjolal v Idurali 750  
 Kunveri v Pitamberdas 1043  
 Kunwar Lal v Lala Beni 696  
 Kupp v Dorasami 194 306  
 Kuppana v Kumara 52a 167 163 774.  
 Kuppaswami Aiyar Re 1260  
 Kuppaswami v Bavaaswami 880  
 Kuppaswami v Subba 49  
 Kuppaswami v Singaravelu 789  
 Kuppaswami v Subramaniam 976  
 Kuppaswami v Zamindar of Kalahasti 129

Kuppaswamy v Kamalammal 870  
 Kuppasami v Rathnavelu 980  
 Kuppasami v Ventataramier 76  
 Kura v Madho 51  
 Kura v Udm 983  
 Kura Val v Ram Nath 1258  
 Kurgodigouda v Aingangouda 381  
 Kuriya Mal v Bishambar Das 294  
 Kurutulan v Nuzbat ud Dowla 40  
 Kurugodappa v Soogamma 354 673  
 Kushalchand v Nandram 1208  
 Kusum v Satra 840  
 Kutbuddin v Privanayaga 945  
 Kutto Ali v Chindan 49  
 Kutti v Subramania 215  
 Kwa Tong Kee v Lim Chaung 231  
 Kyla v Pamasami 771  
 Kyoung Hone v Kyoung Soon 15 1051

## L

Labh Singh v Ram Lal 1040  
 Lachmi v Bhulli 36 37  
 Lachharam v Virji 115  
 Lachhman v Baba 644  
 Lachman v Baldeo 198  
 Lachman v Brijpal 1184  
 Lachman v Chaturbhuj 653  
 Lachman v Ganga 726  
 Lachman v Jamna 1015  
 Lachman v Jarbunda 196 692  
 Lachman v Mohan 397  
 Lachman v Munia 279  
 Lachman Das v Abparkash 1168 1180 1184  
 Lachman Lal v Kanhaya Lal 302  
 Lachman Parsad v Ram Krishan 613  
 Lachman Singh v Musummat Puna 302  
 Lachman Singh v Pam Lagan 296  
 Lachmeswar v Manowar 130 303  
 Lachmi v Balmakund 319 346 350 533  
 Lachmi v Jwala 142  
 Lachmi v Mitthu 241  
 Lachmi v Muhammad 782 800  
 Lachmi v Ram Bahadur 342 887  
 Lachmi v Pam Charan 962 979  
 Lachmi Chand v Bepin Behari 1259  
 Lachmi Narain v Balmukund 533 602 786  
 Lachmi Narain v Darbari Lal 7 533  
 Lachmi Narain v Kunji Lal 183  
 Lachmi Narain v Makund 199  
 Lachmi Narain v Sheo Nath, 1196  
 Lachmi Narain v Uman Dat 933

Lakshminarain v Hoare Miller & Co 1191  
 Lakshmi band v Kachubhai 793  
 Latha Singh v Bhag Singh 1166  
 Ladhari Singh v Manager Court of Wards 600  
 Laduram Nathmull v Nanjilal 1165  
 Lafone v Falkland Islands Co 569  
 Lahore Bank v Ghulam 141  
 Lahore Bank Ltd v Lakh Ram 1015  
 Laird v Briggs 500 502 503  
 Lajja Ram v Bhambhu Nath 790  
 Lakhchand v Lalchand 304  
 Lakhipriya v Raikishori 997  
 Lakshmi v Ishar 934  
 Lakshmi Das v Balak Ram 441  
 Lakshmichand v Kachubai 394  
 Lakshmiram v Poonam Chand 903  
 Lakho v Salamat 397  
 Lakhu Rai v Mahiraja Kesho Prasad 765  
 Lakpati v Daulat Singh 786  
 Lakhan v Nikunja Moni 804 805  
 Lakshan Chandra v Ramdya 764 771  
 Lakshminarasimham v Somasundaram 1173  
 Lakshmakha v Naga 410  
 Lakshman v Babaji 6, 89  
 Lakshman v Gopal 383  
 Lakshman v Govind 161  
 Lakshman v Hari 510  
 Lakshman v Maruti 304 1060  
 Lakshman v Moru 684  
 Lakshman v Narhari 197  
 Lakshman v Ramchandra 70  
 Lakshmana v Appalwar 609  
 Lakshmana v Chinnathambi 876  
 Lakshmanan v Kuttayan 79  
 Lakshmanan v Muthaya 808 813 898  
 Lakshmanan v Parasivam 716  
 Lakshmanan v Palaniappa 994  
 Lakshmanaswami v Rangamma 82-8-6  
 Lakshmandas v Ganpatray 274  
 Lakshmandas v Jugalkishore 263  
 Lakshmandas v Lane 307  
 Lakshan Chandra v Ramdas Mondal 102  
 Lakshmi v Atal 57b  
 Lakshmi v Batchayya 397  
 Lakshmi v Ishar 1077

Lakshmi v Kadire an 751  
 Lakshmi v Kuttunni 750  
 Lakshmi v Maru 294  
 Lakshmi v Ponnassa 654  
 Lakshmi v Sankaran 745  
 Lakshmi v Subbarama 786 787  
 Lakshmi Bai v Hari 501 502  
 Lakshmi Bai v Madhavray 172  
 Lakshmi Bai v Raji 78 145 547  
 Lakshmi Bai v Santapa 736  
 Lakshmi Bai v Veshant 801  
 Lakshmichand v Chotooram 717  
 Lakshmikanthar v Jagannatharaja 668  
 Lakshminukutta v Mariathummal 938  
 Lakshminarasimham v Lakshminarasimham 707  
 Lakshmi Narain v Mast Ratni 1720  
 Lakshminankar v Raghunath 385  
 Lakshminankar v Vishnuram 74 83  
 Lakshman Das v Jugal Kishore 6  
 Lakshman v Madhav 525  
 Lakshmanan v Kannappan 314  
 Lal Bahadur v Abharan 937  
 Lal Behary Singh v Habibur Rahman 9-3  
 Lal Bihari v Parkali 66  
 Lal Chand v Behari Lal 344  
 Lal Das v Kishore Das 151  
 Lal Jin v Ma Mva 1008  
 Lal Kunwar v Charanj Lal 600  
 Lal Singh v Ghansham 506  
 Lal Singh v Kadir Bakhsh 10, 106  
 Lal Umrao v Lal Singh 693 743  
 Lala Bhugwat v Rai Pasbupati 329  
 Lala Chet Narain v Pamphal 539  
 Lala Das v Mina Mal 11 688  
 Lala Gauri Shanker v Janki Parshad 1003  
 Lala Kandha v Lala Lal 307  
 Lala Kurat v Palukdhari 7  
 Lala Punjabet v Motiram 811  
 Lala Ram v Thakur Prasad 202  
 Lala Rup Narain v Gopal Devi 414  
 Lala Som Ram v Kanhaiya 47  
 Lala Suraj Prasad v Golab Chand 897 904  
 Lala Surja Prasad v Golab Chand 904  
 Lalchand v Behari Lal 340 342  
 Lala Chhajmal Das v Brihbhukan Lal 125  
 Lal Das v Ashordas 153  
 Lalit v Satish 786  
 Lakhtagar v Bai Suraj 109

Laht Mohan v Radharaman 65  
 Lalit Mohan Mandal v Satish Chandra  
     Das 844 845 849  
 Lalji v Bajnath, 1043  
 Lalji v Gaya 639  
 Lalji v Odoja 188  
 Lalji v Walji 22 28  
 Lalji Mal v Nand Kishore 157  
 Lalji Shau v Lachmi Narain 539  
 Lalla v Ramanandan 61 868  
 Lal a Bun. udhur v Koonwar Bundesere  
     56.  
 Lalla Sheo v Ramanandan 541  
 Lallessor v Janji 441 456  
 Lalman v Chintamani 132  
 Lalman v Shiam 920  
 Lalman Das v Jagan Nath 165  
 Lalta v Nandkure 539 604  
 Lalta Prasad v Ram Karan, 541  
 Lalta Prasad v Sadiq Husen 375  
 Lalta Prasad v Sri Ganeshji 621  
 Lalta Prasad v Suraj Kumar 174  
 Lahu v Ka hibai 715  
 Lalubhai v Bhimbhai 350  
 Lamb v Orton 566  
 Lambton v Parkinson 131  
 Land Mortgage Bank v Sudarudeen  
     1241 1244  
 Landeragan v Feast 579  
 Langat Singh v Janji Koer 80  
 Lanka v Lanka 728  
 Latafut v Anunt 974  
 Latchaya v Kotamma 291  
 Latchman v Maddan Mohun 133 140  
 Latifunnissa Bibi v Nazirun Bibi 277  
 Laurentius v Dhuki 463  
 Lawrence v Lord Norreys 498 504  
 Lawrie v Lees 397  
 Laxman v I amchandra 1174  
 Laxmibai v Hussainbhai 842  
 Laxminarayan v Chimmuram 523  
 Laxmishankar v Hamjabhai 502  
 Le Mesurier v Wajid 1239  
 Leake v Daniel 146 646  
 Leckie v Joy Gobendo 130  
 Lecky v Bank of Upper India 201  
 Ledgerd v Bull 112 113 118  
 Lee Conservancy Board v Button 521  
 Letch v Abbott 486  
 Leka v Bhauna 7 8 10 135 995 996  
     997  
 Lekh Pam v Ramji 390  
 Lekhan v Babu Ram 1009

Lekraj v Shamlal 799  
 Lekraj Roy v Kanhya Singh 326  
 Levy Bros v Subooh Kumar 1259  
 Lewis v The Earl of Londesborough  
     570  
 Libabati v Bishun Chobey 38  
 Laldhar v Chaturbhuj 141 154 178  
 Lalanand v Luckimpur 1045  
 Lalawati v Chote Singh 613  
 Lalo v Jagru 785 793  
 Lam Pin Sin v Eng Wan Hock 601  
     683  
 Lama v Rama 26  
 Langa v Lakshumanan 156  
 Langanimal v Venkatammal 406 410  
 Lingangowda v Basangowda 59 904  
 Lipman v Pulman 130  
 Little v Spreadbury 14  
 Li Tong v S A P M Firm 997  
 Livesley v Gilmore 823  
 Llanduano Urban District Council v  
     Woods 263  
 Llewellyn v Chum Lal 104 105  
 Lloyd v Great Western & Metropolitan  
     Dairies Co Ltd 456  
 Loburi v Assam Railway & Trading Co  
     118  
 Lockyer v Ferryman 35  
 Lodna Colliery Co v Bipin 1244  
 Lohre v Deo Hans 1024  
 Loke Nath v Dasarathi 24  
 Loke Nath v Keshab Ram 453  
 Lokessur v Purgun 683  
 Lokhee v Kallypudde 219 220 223  
 London Association for Protection of  
     Trade v Greenlands Limited 422  
 London and Blackwall Ry Co v Cross  
     96.  
 London Bank v Burjorji 86  
 London Bank v Gobind 86  
 London Bank v Hormusji 12 86  
 London Bombay and Mediterranean  
     Bank v Mahomed 595  
 London Bombay Bank v Badee 103  
 London Chatham and Dower Railway  
     Co v South Eastern Railway Co 125  
 London Drapery Stores In re 799  
 London Gas Light Co v Chelsea 565  
 London General Omnibus Co Ltd v  
     Lavell 611  
 London & North Western Ry Co v  
     Lansay 84  
 Long v Jaswantlal 146





Madho Das v Rukhman 1062  
 Madho Lal v Katwari 145  
 Madho Pra ad v Gajudhar 523 579  
 Madho Prasad v Moti Chand 118  
 Madho Pra ad v Peary Lal 690  
 Madho Ram *In re* 12-0 1221  
 Madho Ram v Nandu Lal 302  
 Madho Singh v Ka hi Singh 305  
 Madhori v Parbati 1055 1060  
 Madhori Saran v Parlati 1060  
 Madhub Chunder v Nobodeep 64  
 Madhub Chunder v Pajoomar Doss 1-61  
 Madhub Lal v Woopendranaram 949  
 Madhuban Das v Narain Das 789  
 Madhura v Se ha Pedli 540  
 Madhuri v Dithal 555  
 Madhuri Saran v Bi hambhar 746  
 Madhu udan v Behari Lal 1-0  
 Madhu udan v Bhugwan 905  
 Madhu udan v Gobinda 155 161  
 Madhusudan v Kamini Kanta 101-  
 Madhusudan v Shankaracharya 24  
 Madhwa v Venkata 1-7  
 Madhu v Satti 79  
 Madon v Bai Kanta 70 540  
 Madras Pj Co v Put 967  
 Madras Steam Navigation Co v Shal-  
 mar Work 1-66  
 Madwick v Wimbie 9-6  
 Magan Lal v G I P Ry Co 65  
 Maganlal v Bombay Co 1-49  
 Maganlal v Do ha 155 163 745 749  
 Maganlal v Shakra 770 9-1  
 Magaua *In re* 598  
 Magni I am v Jiwa Lal 351  
 Magnuram v Bakubai 1208  
 Magnuram v Dhowtal Roy 125  
 Magnuram v Mehdi Hossein 55  
 Maha Prasad v Paman Mohan 114  
 Mahabala v Kunhanna 2  
 Mahabharat v Surja Kanta 710  
 Mahabir v Behari 10  
 Mahabir v Collector of Allahabad 1052  
 Mahabir v Dhanukdhari 730  
 Mahabir v Manohar 1166  
 Mahabir v Purbhoo Nath 51  
 Mahabir Pershad v Dhanukdhari 758  
 759  
 Mahabir Pershad v Macnaghten 50 52  
 731  
 Mahabir Pershad v Moheswar Nath 769

Mahabir Prasad v Anup Narain 326  
 Mahabir Prasad v Balkisun Das 1197  
 Mahabir Pra ad v Bishan Dayal 809  
 Mahabir Prasad v Jogendra Nath 712  
 Mahabir Prasad v Sheodaya 605  
 Mahabir Singh v Behari Lal 65 89  
 Mahadaji v Hari 1-01  
 Mahadeo v Baagit 469  
 Mahadeo v Bhola Nath 754  
 Mahadeo v Budhai Ram 307  
 Mahadeo v Dhobi 670 760 761  
 Mahadeo v Drigbijai 722  
 Mahadeo v Lakshmi Narayan 1051 1054  
 Mahadeo v Musammat Hamidan 641  
 Mahadeo v Rama 375 379  
 Mahadeo v Ramchandra 94  
 Mahadeo v Sheo Kanan 13  
 Mahadeo v Somnath 913  
 Mahadeo v The Secretary of State 342  
 887  
 Mahadeo v Trimbal bhat 79  
 Mahadeo Lal v Darsan 205  
 Mahadeo Singh v Talib Ali 784  
 Mahadev v Gajadhar 3-  
 Mahadev v Janu 684  
 Mahadev v Krishnabai 877  
 Mahadev v Lakshman 1032  
 Mahadev v Lakshmi Narayan 535  
 Mahadev v Narayan 1165  
 Mahadev Prasad v Badri Das 1181  
 Mahadev v Vasudev 746  
 Mahadevappa v Bhima 682 684  
 Mahadevappa v Srinavasa 210  
 Mahadu v Krishna 29  
 Mahalakshmi *In re* 883 1030  
 Mahalinga v Kuppsnachariar 659  
 Mahamad v Mahammad 221  
 Mahamad Ishaq v Sheikh Akramul 453  
 Mahamatyaya v Haridas 911  
 Mahamdi Begum v Tufail Hasan 73  
 Mahamed v Mohamed 199  
 Mahamed v Panchapekesa 978  
 Mahammad v Ahmedbhai 1046  
 Mahammad Abdul Gaffur v Muhammad  
 Samsuddin 622  
 Mahammad Gauhar v Samiruddin 42  
 Mahant v Caudasama 3-0  
 Mahant v Chudasama 1046  
 Mahant v Darshan 269  
 Mahant v Parshotamdas 808 813  
 Mahant Rachu v Mahant Raghunath  
 1000  
 Mahant v Sakina 174.

- Mahant Dhimodar v Iraj Kumar 339  
 603 604  
 Mahant Darelhan v Bikramajit 790  
 Mahant Dyal v Mahant Sundar 1031  
 Mahant Golind v Rani Debendrabala  
 103  
 Mahantha v Mahalir 49  
 Maharaj Bahalur v I C Lal 79  
 Maharaj Bahalur v Siva Saran 206 2  
 Maharaj Bahadur Singh v Sachandra  
 Nath 209  
 Maharaj Bahalur Singh v Balchand  
 33  
 Maharaj Bahadur Singh v Bauruddin  
 909  
 Maharaj Bahadur Singh v Forbes 718  
 Maharaj Kishore v Kiran 24  
 Maharaj Narain v Shashi 20  
 Maharaj Tewari v Har Charan 3  
 Maharaja v Harihar 601  
 Maharaja Bir Kishore v Ali Ahmad 87  
 Maharaja Kesho Prasad v Lal Brij Mo-  
 han Lal 3947  
 Maharaja Kesho Prasad v Shiva Saran  
 33330  
 Maharaja Kishore v Karam Sashi 1205  
 Maharaja of Benares v Debi Dayal 17  
 Maharaja of Bharatpur v Kacheru 255  
 Maharaja of Bharatpur v Rani Hanno  
 Dei 140 937  
 Maharajah of Bobbili v Narasaraju 647  
 Maharaja of Bobbili v Narasaraju 146  
 Maharaja of Burdwan v Apurba 23  
 973  
 Maharaja of Faridkot v Anantram 77  
 Maharaja of Jaipur v Lalji Sahai 206  
 Maharaja of Pithapuram v Rama Rao  
 120  
 Maharaja of Rewah v Swami Saran 200  
 Maharaja of Vizianagaram v Secretary  
 of State 906  
 Maharaja Ravene hwar v Rai Bijnath  
 1047  
 Maharaja Sir Nripendra v Maharaja  
 Manindra 201  
 Maharaja Sir Iameshwar v Harihar  
 604  
 Maharajah Madhava Singh Ia re 318  
 Maharajah of Burdwan v Apurba 300  
 Maharajah of Jeypore v Iraj Canga  
 raju 1270  
 Mahbub Ali v Muhammad 638  
 Mahindra v Chirli Chandra 66  
 Mahendra Ram v Sita Lal 511 517  
 Mahesh v Ianjor 60  
 Mahesh Chandra v Ianchu 402  
 Mahim Chandra v Naba Chandra 840  
 Mahesh Chandra v Jogendra Lal 674  
 Mahendra Nath v Khetra Mohan 1000  
 Mahim v Anil Bandhu 47  
 Mahindra v Aswini 128  
 Mahindra Chandra v Lal Mohan 116  
 117  
 Mahip Narain v Mannu Singh 20  
 Mahipat v Nathu 811  
 Mahmud Sheikh v Messrs Kankinarah  
 & Co 1171  
 Mahmudar v Sarat Chandra 918  
 Mahomed v Abdul Hassan 8  
 Mahomed v Ali Buksh 338  
 Mahomed v Cohen 4  
 Mahomed v Collector of Pongoo 449  
 Mahomed v Comandur 199  
 Mahomed v Cajoraj 1014  
 Mahomed v Hakimaj 1167 1190  
 Mahomed v Harperink 768  
 Mahomed v Hasin Banu 430  
 Mahomed v Horain 838  
 Mahomed v Husen 421  
 Mahomed v Imtiaz 304  
 Mahomed v Kishori Mohun 212  
 Mahomed v Krishnan 414  
 Mahomed v Laldin 100  
 Mahomed v Mohini Kanta 130  
 Mahomed v Sayyasi 734  
 Mahomed v Sheikh Ahmed 462  
 Mahomed v Sitaramayyar 306  
 Mahomed v Valli 1184  
 Mahomed v Wazid Ali 840  
 Mahomed v Yeoh 3  
 Mahomed Akbar v Sukhdeo 748  
 Mahomed Akil v Aslamusa 613  
 Mahomed Ali v William Stansfield 337  
 Mahomed Balha v Nicol 479  
 Mahomed Bukhsh Khan v Hosseini  
 Bibi 210 49  
 Mahomed Cam v David 747  
 Mahomed Golab v Mahomed Sultman  
 69  
 Mahomed Hamidulla v Tohirenni 21  
 Bibi 200 21  
 Mahomed Ibrahim v Amlika Prasad  
 22  
 Mahomed Ibrahim v Sheikh Hamja 21  
 Mahomed I mail v Ahmed 22  
 Mahomed Jackeria v Ahmed Mahomed  
 3

- Mahomed Kasim v Secni Pakir 83  
 Mahomed Khaleel v Les Tanneries  
 Lvonnaise 1019 1020  
 Mahomed Khan Bahadur v Mahomed  
 Munawar 640  
 Mahomed Mehdi v Mohini Kant 171  
 Mahomed Mira Ravuthar v Savvasi  
 Vijaya Raghundha 493 756 760  
 Mahomed Mozuffer Hossain v Kishori  
 Mohan Roy 763  
 Mahomed Rashid v Rahmat Ullah 827  
 Mahomed Shuffi v Laldin 832  
 Mahomedali v Bayamma 30  
 Mahomedally v Abdul Hussein, 1244  
 Mahomedbhai v Adamji 102 435  
 Mahommed Zohorubddin v Mahommed  
 530  
 Mahommed v Chhatoo 146  
 Mahommed v Mahommed 702  
 Mahram Das v Ajulhia 132  
 Mahtab Singh v Hub Lal 780  
 Mai Bu v Mai Oh 975  
 Maiden v Bhondu, 526  
 Mailthi v Somappa 1031  
 Maina Bibi v Chaudhari 43  
 Maistry v Aziz 547  
 Majed v Raghobur 133  
 Majurajba v Maganlal 1010  
 Makand Dev v Gopi Nath 302  
 Makanji v Bhukandas 188  
 Makar Ali v Sarfu Din, 766 767 768  
 Makbool v Bazle Sabhan 747  
 Makrand v Hallu 924  
 Maksud v Nargis 496 443  
 Maksud Ali v Firm Sheikh Abdullah  
 1024  
 Maktab Beg v Hassan Ali 1006  
 Maktum v Imam 50  
 Makund v Bahori Lal 298  
 Makund v Saraswati 79  
 Makund Ram v Nanbat Singh 1197  
 Makund Ram v Sahq Ram 1176  
 Makundi v Parbhu 537  
 Malamal v Kavalappara 992  
 Malap Kaur v Hakim Singh 1012  
 Malawa Ram v Madan Gopal 1036  
 Malchand v Osman 823  
 Malhar v Narasinha 277  
 Malhari v Vinayak 52a  
 Malhi v Imam ud din 56  
 Malik Fazul Rahaman v Mst Hokila  
 636  
 Mallarjun v Narhari 216 217 317 348  
 600  
 Mallapragadu v Lingham 794  
 Mallayya v Punnammama 49 61 871  
 Mallayya v Veerayya 1013  
 Mallikarjuna v Pathaneni 1009  
 Mallikarjunadu v Lingamurti 240 744  
 901 902 910 917 923  
 Maloji v Sagaji 51  
 Malubhai v Sursangji 68  
 Maluka v Sundar Singh 679  
 Mama v Sassoon 497 503  
 Mamat Ram v Bapu Ram 26  
 Mame v Mamun 1012  
 Mammod v Locke 166 771  
 Man Cobinda v Shashundra Chandra  
 840  
 Man Han v R M A L Firm 1024  
 Mana v Malaichery 1106  
 Manackjee D v R M N Chettyar 933  
 Manadananda v Teraknanda 273  
 Manager v Bhatoo 640  
 Manager of Court of Wards v Rama  
 swamy 1013  
 Manager of Sri Veenakshi Devasthanam  
 v Abdul Kasim 202 876 827  
 Manager Vithoba Thirap Shambog v  
 Vigneshwar 934  
 Manaji v Aramita 747  
 Manaji v Khandoo 884  
 Manaku v Sitaram 562  
 Manali Saravana Mudahar v Rajagopala  
 Chetty 133  
 Manavala v Kumarappa 344  
 Manavikraman v Ananthanarayana 96d  
 Manavikraman v Avusilan 286  
 Manavikraman v Collector of the  
 Nilgiris 296 1260 1271  
 Manavikraman v Unniappan 133 136  
 913  
 Mancharam v Fakirchand 774  
 Mancharam v Pranshaukar 194  
 Mancherji v Thakurdas 227  
 Manchharam v Kalidas 77  
 Mandal & Co v Fazul 443  
 Mandan Lal v Gajendrapal 1073  
 Mane v Dhani 42  
 Maneckji v Goolbu 893 996  
 Maneckji v Wadia 1233  
 Manepalli v Manepalli 107  
 Mangal v Rup Chand 120  
 Mangalathammal v Narayanswami 57a  
 Mangian Lal v G I P Ry Co 63

Manwar v Bhatoo 1171  
Mangar Sahu v Bhatoo 921 1171  
Mangaya v Sriramulu 14  
Manu Bai v Lodd Govind 833  
Mani Lal v Durga Prasad 310 311 317  
Mani Mohan v Amaratan 4 316 1011  
Manick Lal v Surrut Comarce 913  
Manickam v Mahudam 463 339 312  
Manickka v Rajagopala 163  
Manujan v Khadem Hossein 23  
Manuk Lal v Banamali 707  
Manukham v Tatayya 637  
Manulal v Banubai 330  
Manulal v Goculdas 80  
Manulal v Ghulam Hussain 41  
Manulal v Gordhan Spinning & Manufacturing Co 738  
Manulal v Ishvarbhay 261 264  
Manulal v Mandil 300 133  
Manulal v Motibhai 694  
Manulal v Nanabhai 233 234  
Manulal v Nathelal 710  
Manindra Chandra v Bhagabati 790  
Manindra Chandra v Lal Mohan 111  
Manindra v Iamli 802 903  
Manindra v Secretary of State 249  
Maniram v Vithu 143  
Maniram Seth v Seth Upchand 307  
Manisha v Syali 330  
Manjappa v Rajagopala 113  
Manji v Hoorbai 221  
Manjunath v Venkatesh 78  
Manly v Lattersen 1034  
Manmatha v Abu Zafer 177  
Manmatha Nath v Lachmi 167  
Manmotha v Lakhal 661 61  
Manni v Crooke 173  
Manohar v Lakshmiram 261 269 43  
Manohar v Lakshman 887  
Manohar v Lami Autar 110 911  
Manohar Das v Futeh Chand 139  
Manohar Das v Lami Autar 961  
Manohar Lal v Baldeo Singh 31  
Manohar Lal v Jadunath Singh 874 875  
Manohari v Muhammad 129  
Manoharlal v Nanak Chand 123  
Manorath Das v Ambika 146  
Manphul Singh v Hakim Hamid 1031 1031 1032  
Manab Ali v Nihal Ghana 1704

Manujendra v Jnan 794  
Manzur Hasan v Muhammad Zaman 29  
Marhabala v Kunhanna 403  
Maqbul v Lalit 92 924  
Maqbul Shah v Muhammad 63  
Marakarutti v Verran 396  
Marath v Seshu 180  
Maria v Iana 138 307  
Mariamissa v Joynah Bibi 36  
Mariam un ni sa v Babu Ram 1033  
Marianna sa v Parakalpa 602  
Marigeya v Havat Sahab 138  
Marimuthu v Subbaraya 218  
Marivittil v Pathram 39 133  
Mariyal Paman v Narayanan 899  
Market & Co v Knight Steamship Co 403 420  
Markur In re 67  
Marriott v Chamberlain 482 336  
Marshall v Inter Oceanic & Co 487  
Martand v Daya 734  
Martand v Dhondu 937  
Martin v Lawrence 190  
Martin v M Taggart 453  
Martiros v Subramanian 1238  
Maruthamalai v Kalani 868  
Maruthamuthu v Krishnamachariar 838  
Maruti v Vithu 469  
Massey v Steel 96 140  
Mashtat un nissa v Pami 171  
Mashtat un ni a Bibi v Kaniz 1013  
Maslamani v Sethuswami 642  
Maslamania v Thiruvengadam 45 10 47 48 433  
Mas on v Morridge 860  
Mason v Westoby 96  
Masst Shahzadi v Muhammad Dasim 37  
Masum un nissah v Latifan 813  
Mata v Beni 878  
Mata Amber v Sri Dhar 913  
Mata Dun v Jamna Das 1009  
Mata Dun v Kazim Husain 891 998 900  
Mata Irsad v Nageshar 61  
Matabur Singh v Abbai Nandan 784  
Mataur v Abdul 111 701  
Mateur v Abdul 761  
Mathappa v Chellappa 83

- Mathar Singh v Rambaz Singh 304  
 305  
 Matheran Steam Light Tramway Co  
 Ltd v Lang 613  
 Mathews Jare 430  
 Mathewson v Gobardhan 157  
 Mathewson v Ram Kanai 432  
 Mathooru Kant v India General S &  
 Co 3  
 Mathura v Haran Chandra 412 1253  
 Mathura v Jagdeo 334  
 Mathura v Kailas 147  
 Mathura v Mussamat Anurago 663  
 Mathura v Nathuni 734  
 Mathura v Nabin Chandra 1012  
 Mathura Irasad v Satva Narayan  
 108  
 Mathura v Pam Charan 547  
 Mathura v Ram Kumar 1007  
 Mathura Das v Jamna 257  
 Mathura Das v Lachman 159 756  
 Mathura Das v Raja Narindar 934  
 Mathuradas v Ebrahim 700 701 855  
 856  
 Mathuradas v Panhalal 227  
 Mathura Nath v Ume h Chandra 242  
 339 353  
 Mathurapore Zamindari Co Ltd v  
 Bhasaram 655  
 Mathurbhai v Nadiad City Municipa-  
 lity 1251  
 Mathursi v Mathursi 978  
 Matigara Coal Co v Shragers Ltd 1245  
 Matiram v Ramkumar 379  
 Matir Rasul v Abdul Sali 869  
 Matra Mondal v Hari 87 89  
 Matru Mal v Durga Kanwar 901 902  
 Matthews v Munster 14  
 Matuldhari v Ramdas 922  
 Maturi v Kota 94  
 Maula v Gulzar 456  
 Maulvi v Jagat 421  
 Maulvi v Kishnudeo 326  
 Maung Ba Thein v Ma Jhan Myint 49  
 Maung Bhaung v Maung Shwe 783  
 791  
 Maung Ohn Tin v P I M P S P M  
 Chettyar Firm 754 755 759  
 Maung Chet Pe v Narayan Chettyar  
 610  
 Maung Hlaing v Maung Chit 305  
 Maung Hmat v Ma Htay 65 77  
 Maung Khant v Ma Thet 575  
 Maung Klaw v Ko Aye 1052  
 Maung Law San v Maung Po Thein  
 642 643  
 Maung Lun Bye v Maung Po Nyun  
 705 737  
 Maung Ba Than v District Council  
 Pegu 322  
 Maung Ba Thein Ma v Thin Myint 500  
 503  
 Maung Be Tu v Ma Thet Su 540  
 Maung Naung v Maung Ba Gyi 767  
 Maung Ma v Maung Kan 815  
 Maung No v Maung Po 45 47 50  
 Maung Ban Gyi v Ma Ngwe Bon 380  
 Maung Pa v Abdul Ganni 353  
 Maung Pe v Ma Lon 430 439  
 Maung Pe v Ma Shwe 886 895  
 Maung Po v Ma Shwe Ma 785  
 Maung Po Nyun v Ma Saw Tin 185  
 Maung Po Pe v Maung Kwa 712  
 Maung Po Shan v Maung Po Hin 1040  
 Maung Pwaw v Soya Pe 539 604  
 Maung Pye v Ma Hla Kyin 721  
 Maung Sa v Ma Uma 614  
 Maung San v U Pon Gyiaw 897  
 Maung San v Maung Nyi 565  
 Maung Saw v Ma Bwin Byu 541  
 Maung Sein v Maung Tun 1052  
 Maung Shwe v Karambu 901  
 Maung Shwe v Min Nyun 1179  
 Maung Shwe Myat v Maung Po Sin  
 505  
 Maung Than v Zamat Bibi 1007  
 Maung Thein v S A & Firm 179  
 Maung Thwe v Ma Shwe 55  
 Maung Tin v Maung Po 431  
 Maung Tin v Ma Yi 642  
 Maung Tun U v Maung Po 346 436  
 Maung Tun Sein v Ko Tu 582  
 Maung Tunu v Maung Po 1197  
 Maung Tun v Maung Tun 1184  
 Mayula Ammal v Mayula Maraceer  
 309  
 Mawazzam v Shebash 967  
 Maxim Nordenfelt & Co v Nordenfelt  
 486  
 May v Newton 421  
 Mayabhai v Tribhuvandas 10  
 Mayaram v Pany S.  
 Maya hankar v Hari hankar 23

- Mayhew v Tullock 101  
 Mayor of Bradford v Bradford Corporation 128  
 Mayor of Lyons v Advocate General of Bengal 293  
 Mazhar Ali v Sajjad Husain 407  
 Mazhar Hossain v Bodha 319 320  
 McCheane v Gyles 429  
 McColla v Jones 506  
 McInerney v Secretary of State 30 216 251  
 Md. Warish v Rahaman 506  
 Meah v Durga 1056  
 Meango v Baviah 607  
 Meekjee v Kasowjee 32  
 Med Singh v Kabir un nissa 783  
 Medai Kahani In the matter of 638  
 Medni Prasad v Nand Keshwar 700  
 Meenakshi v Myle 107  
 Meenakshi Naidoo v Subramania Sastri 112  
 Meenakshisundaram v Chokkabanga 728  
 Meenatchi v Ananthanarayana 353 796  
 Meerudin v Rahisa 777  
 Megh Narayan v Radha 659  
 Megh Raj v Toles Pam 827  
 Meghan Dube v Pran Singh 1009  
 Meighjee v Kalooram 1207  
 Megh Lal v Hira Lal 120  
 Mehmunis a v Mehmedunissa 641 642  
 Mehdi Husain v Sughra Begum 799  
 Mehr Baksh v Sanghe Khan 937  
 Mehr Chand v Amritsar Bank 509  
 Mehr Chand v Labhu Ram 30  
 Mehra v Darsi Ditta Mal 57  
 Mehta Jethalal v Jamnaram 28  
 Meik v The Midnapur Zamindary Co Ltd. 2 203  
 Mellor v Sudebottom 578  
 Mellor v Swire 307  
 Mela Lal v Harbhaj 10  
 Menajudhi v Toam Mandal 709  
 Mengha v Sucha Dul 1000  
 Menon v Lafan 517  
 Merah v Sheriff 330 340 1198  
 Mercantile Marine Service Association v Toms 491  
 Mercier v Cotton 209 71  
 Mewa Kuar v Binar Khasad 441  
 Mewa Lal v Ahmed 171  
 Meyappa v Lemannan 415  
 Meyappa v Sufraiman 508 509  
 Meyyappa v Chudambaram 710 776 936  
 Meyyappan v Meyyappan 182  
 Mhasu Bhaui v Divalat 1022  
 Michael v Briggs 421  
 Midnapore Zamindary Co Ltd v Naresch Narayan Poy 38 69 71 72 74 298 620 806  
 Midnapur Zamindary Co v Secretary of State 515  
 Midnapur zamindary Co Ltd v Amulga 790 797 1003  
 Midnapur Zemindari v Uma Charan 301 302 303  
 Mighell v Sultan of Johore 111 206  
 Mihar Ali v Muhammad Husen 340  
 Milbank v Milbank 48 483  
 Milkhi v Met Lunn 304  
 Miller v Budh Singh 803  
 Miller v Harper 480  
 Miller v Harvin 507  
 Miller v Lakhmani Debi 59  
 Miller v National Bank of India 529  
 Miller v Pam Pajan 972  
 Miller v Runga Nath 924  
 Millington v Lorin 478 479 480  
 Mills v Jennings 900  
 Mina Kumari v Bijoy Singh 509 210 211  
 Mina Kumari v Jagat Sattani 217  
 Mian Jan v Abdul 39  
 Minakshi v Kahanarama 27  
 Minakshi v Subramanya 6 7 88  
 Minakshi v Vela 55  
 Minahal v Kharjeti 74  
 Munt v Morgan 500  
 Mir Khan v Sharu 807  
 Mir Umar Ali v Nasib un nissa 7  
 Mirah v Rehmoobhoy 293 97  
 Miran Baksh v Sher Muhammad 1106  
 Miran Baksh v Allah Baksh 78  
 Mirza Abdullah v Ramzan 516  
 Mirza Abdul v Ahmad Husain 326  
 Mirza Hummat 1009  
 Mirza Mahomed v Sajjad Mirza 606 661 806  
 Mirza v Sheo Baksh 61  
 Mirza Lal v Mitul Lal 731  
 Mirza Shu v Bha 1011  
 Mirza Debe v Buldeo 809  
 Mistry v Aziz 517  
 Mitchell v Mathura Das 718

Mitna v Syud Fuzl 557  
 Mitter Poddar v Jadab Chandra 40 42  
 Mitthu v Kishan 241  
 Mira Mahomed v Zorabai 838 1253  
 1255  
 Mira Wali Ulla v Sayed Bava 275  
 Modhe v Dongre 435 559  
 Modhusudan v Brae 43 70  
 Mohabir v Chandra 394  
 Mohabir Prasad v Adhikari 1041  
 Mohabor v Hazi 278  
 Mohamad Abdul Hafiz v Latif Hussain 29  
 Mohamed v Mohamed 1248  
 Mohamed v Monohar 314 315  
 Mohamidu v Fitcher 162 862  
 Mohammad Abdul v Akram 708  
 Mohammad v Pachunath 57  
 Mohan Lal v Damodar Das 1169  
 Mohan Lal v Maya Lal 511  
 Mohanlal v Bai Kashi 327  
 Mohanavelu v Annamalai 409 425  
 Mohanlal v Ganga Prasad 871  
 Mohanund v Akial 737  
 Mohan Lal v Hali Charan 759  
 Mohan Lal v Bilaso 440  
 Mohan Manor v Tago Uka 902  
 Mohan Singh v Jagat Singh 659 661  
 Mohan Singh v Panchanan 159 165  
 Mohar Chand v Habib 1256  
 Mohar Singh v Daulat Pam 441  
 Mohari Bibi v Shyama Bibi 973  
 Mohendra Lal v Anundo Coomarr 1258  
 Mohendra Nath v Shamsunnessa 60 67  
 Mohendro v Ishun Chunder 573  
 Mohendro Narain v Gopal 761  
 Mohesh Chandra v Jamiruddin 1013  
 Mohesh Chandra v Padma Kishore 600  
 Mohesh Chunder v Manick Lal 836  
 Moheshchandra v Satrugan 1040  
 Moheshur Singh v The Bengal Government 314 1057  
 Mohibulla v Imami 825 826 827  
 Mohideen v Bulshi Ram 344 1221  
 Mohideen v Mahomed 766 767  
 Mohideen v Pitcher 325  
 Mohideen v Syed Osman 35  
 Mohim Chandra v Anil 15  
 Mohima Chandra v Atul Chandra 449  
 Mohinee v Ram Kant 740  
 Mohini v Bungsi 493  
 Mohini v King Emperor 672

Mohini v Ramdas, 339  
 Mohini v Sankar Das 307  
 Mohini v Satis Chandra 289  
 Mohini v Surendra 256  
 Mohit Narain v Thakan 723  
 Mohiuddin v Sayiduddin 268 270  
 276 277 421  
 Mohammad Afzul v Abdul Hamid 1178  
 1196  
 Mohna Mal v Tulsi Ram 309  
 Mohori v Dharmodas 863  
 Mohsham Ali v Mula 1025  
 Mohsun v Haider 161  
 Mohsin Ali v Masum Ali 174  
 Mohammad v Mootechand 1034  
 Mohammad Zahoor Ali Khan v Putta  
 Keor 505 511  
 Mohun v Azeem 431 794  
 Mohun v Ram Dial 70  
 Mohun Chunder v Azeem 431  
 Mohun Lal v Nanibala 763  
 Mohun Lal v Bebes Doss 326  
 Mohun Lal v Joy Narain 1183  
 Mohunt Bhagwan v Khetter Moni 212  
 351 714  
 Mohunt Das v Nil Komul 55  
 Mordeen v Mordeen 614  
 Mortheensa v Apa 769  
 Mokham Chand v Ganga Ram 656  
 Mokund Lal v Chotay Lal 450  
 Mollov v Kirby 559  
 Mon Mohan v Dwarka Nath 176  
 Mon Mohini Ghose v Parvati Nath  
 Ghose 897  
 Mon Mohun v Durga 618  
 Mon Mohun v Secretary of State 76  
 Monappa v Surappa 223  
 Mome v Scott 261  
 Monilal v Khiroda 305  
 Moniram v Mryan 1220  
 Monjiram v Seth Manecklal 1003  
 Monkee v Bhullunder 841  
 Monmatha v Josada Lal 535  
 Monmatha v Mueset Lucknu 669  
 Monmohney v Radha Kristo 714  
 Monmohini v Banga 824  
 Monmotho v Harish Chandra 280 419  
 Monohar v Jai Narayan 967  
 Monohar Das v Futeh Chand 671  
 Monohur v Pomanauth 129  
 Monohur Lal v Govri Sunkur 441  
 Monohur Mookerjee In the matter of  
 1046



Monomohini v Nara Narayan Roy. 500 502

Montgomery & Co In re 1182

Mookoond v Mahomed 374 376

Moolaswami v Tattayya 1034

Mool Chand v Alwar Chetty 1261

Mool Chand v S Lattifat 63

Mooljee Dharase & Co v Woolla 993 1230

Moola v Chartered Bank of India 153

Moola & Sons v Lean Shiam Sway 327 329

Moon v Dickinson 829

Moopan v Karupanan 532 536

Moorajee v Visramjee 1034

Moore v Gamagee 1247

Moos v Abdul Hussain 973 981

Moran v Mittu 334

Morel Brothers & Co Ltd v Westmoreland 493

Morshwar v Kushaba 290

Morgan & Owen v Morgan 477 481 490 496 511 520

Morley v Morley 900

Moro v Visaji 175

Moroba v Ghanasham 321

Morris v Baumgarten 101

Morris v Edwards 557 560

Morrison Ex parte 529

Moru v Gangabai 930

Moru v Hasan 637

Mosa v Fbrahim 47

Moser v Marsden 493

Moses v Meyer 345

Moshingan v Mozari 132

Mosley v Virgin 51

Moss v Malings 401 487

Mostyn v West Mostyn Co 566

Mota v Vithal 72

Motahar v Mohammad 730

Mothura Mohan v Akhoy Kumar 217 634

Moti v Ramohari 934

Moti Chani v Ganga Prasad 321 324 325 327 330 1034

Moti Lal v Bishambhar 50

Moti Lal v Kunjan Lal 50

Moti Lal v Jam Narsain 90 794

Moti Lal v Luchak Chandra 160

Moti Lal v Bhawanji 50

Moti Lal v Hannu 63

Moti Lal v Kishori Lal 50

Moti Sahu v Chhatra Da 516

Motilal v Bai Mani 153

Motilal v Chandmal 801

Motilal v Fulchand 734

Motilal v Ghellabhai 417

Motilal v Harbuddin 212

Motilal v Nana 341 342

Motilal v Nandram 539

Motilal v Surajmal 100 106

Motilal v Thakore 386 910

Motiram v Bharat 900

Motiram v Yesu 822

Motirahu v Premrahu 910

Moturi v Sri Pajah Venkatadri 80

Mouna Gurusamy v Shielh Muhammadhu 907

Moung Tha v Moung Pan 370

Mowar Sheobaksh v Mowar Thakur Dayal 1006

Mowji v Kurerji 410

Mowji v Nemchand 83

Mowla Nawaz v Sajidunnissa Bibi 330

Mozaffar Ali v Hedavet 7

Mridendra v Dibakar 1002

Mritunjoi v Balrakand 320

Mst Begani v Bui Shah 178

Mst Beti v Sikdar Singh 303

Mst Chunraun v Jagotbali 36

Mst Deoki v Jwala Prasad 399

Mt Bamphu v Harbaksh Singh 106

Mt Muna Boer v Durga Prasad 164

Mubarak v Ahmad 194 199

Mubarak v Secretary of State 934

Muddoorooden Dev v Bamachurn 3

Mudhaun Mohun v Gokul Doss 130 689

Muft v Fazal 282

Muft v Lala 503

Mugnee Pam v Canesh 30

Muhamad v Rahim Bee 310

Muhammad v Abdul (46 Mad 130) 49

Muhammad v Abdul Karim 172 914

Muhammad v Abdul Majid 499

Muhammad v Abdullah 332 797

Muhammad v Ahmed 21

Muhammad v Ajudhya 338 683 887

Muhammad v Alim un Nissa 920

Muhammad v Aulia 791

Muhammad v Bicheho 760 769

Muhammad v Binkil Lal 90

Muhammad v Carlier 190

Muhammad v Chela Lal 80

Muhammad v Chhattoo Lal 141

Muhammad v Chinthamani 80

- Muhammad v Chulm Bt 40  
 Muhammad v Ih an Ulah 312 400 761  
 1204  
 Muhammad v Jai Narain 766  
 Muhammad v Jarao 504  
 Muhammad v Jas Ram 903  
 Muhammad v Kally 26  
 Muhammad v Khu halo 780  
 Muhammad v Kunj 817  
 Muhammad v Mahud un N a 1018  
 Muhammad v Manavikrama 1001  
 Muhammad v Manohar 78  
 Muhammad v Muhammad 100 106  
 107 130 219 309  
 Muhammad v Nabian 70  
 Muhammad v Niamat un n a 626 700  
 Muhammad v Panna Lal 249  
 Muhammad v Payag Sahu 20  
 Muhammad v Padhe Pam 41  
 Muhammad v Pahat Ali 1031  
 Muhammad v Savad Ahmed 20  
 Muhammad v Secretary of State 334  
 Muhammad v Shams un Nissa 512  
 Muhammad v Somitra 50  
 Muhammad v Tikamchand 119 137  
 Muhammad v V. bhanath 50  
 Muhammad Abdul v Ala Baksh 290  
 Muhammad Abdul v Dil ukh Pat 937  
 Muhammad Abdul Jalil v Muhammad  
 Obaid Ullah 219 220 221 223  
 Muhammad Abid v Muhammad Aghar  
 1189  
 Muhammad Ahmad v Zahur 00  
 Muhammad Akter v Tasadduq 294  
 Muhammad Alladad v Muhammad 1009  
 Muhammad Ashari v Nisar Husain 970  
 980  
 Muhammad Ayab v Muhammad Mah  
 mud 342  
 Muhammad Bak h v Muhammad Piar  
 27  
 Muhammad Baksh v Shadi Muhammad  
 1019  
 Muhammad Fayaz v Kalla Singh 444  
 Muhammad Hafiz v Muhammad Zala  
 riya 436 442 443  
 Muhammad Hasan v Inayat 793  
 Muhammad Hussain v Abdul 441  
 Muhammad Ibrahim v Ahmad 1194  
 Muhammad Ibrahim v Allah Baksh 876  
 Muhammad Ibrahim v Umatullah Jan  
 589  
 Muhammad Inamullah v Narsin 92  
 Muhammad Ishaq v Muhammad Rus  
 tam 76  
 Muhammad Isam v Rukia Begam  
 150  
 Muhammad Mubarak v Sahu 710  
 Muhammad Nawaz Khan v Alam Khan  
 1193  
 Muhammad Pamzan Khan v Sardar  
 Begam 1196  
 Muhammad Riza v Muhammad Ashari  
 262  
 Muhammad Razi v Karbalu 172  
 Muhammad Saveed v Muhammad Is  
 mail 108  
 Muhammad Shafi v Karamat Ali 104  
 100  
 Muhammad Sharif v Radha Mohan 213  
 Muhammad Suleman v Fatima 1200  
 Muhammad Umar v Ummatul 439  
 Muhammad Yakub v Hamid Ali 938  
 Muhammad Wali Khan v Muhammad  
 Mohi ud Din 323  
 Muhammad Yusuf Khan v Abdul  
 Rahman Khan 347  
 Muhammad Zafaryah v Abdul 793  
 Muhammad Zakaria v Kishun 728  
 Muhammad Zakaria v Muhammad Hafiz  
 101  
 Muhammadan Association v Bakhs  
 421  
 Muir v Jenks 536  
 Mukh Lal Singh v Jagdeo Tewari 423  
 Mukhoda v Gopal Chander 217 218  
 Mukhoda v Pam Churn 501 814  
 Mukhtar v Mogarrab 10 167  
 Mukta Prasad v Mahadeo 380 991  
 Muktamala v Pamchandras 69  
 Mukunda Lal v Jogesh Chandra 401  
 Mukund v Shantaram 1020  
 Mukund Ram v Bahq Ram 1176  
 Mukyapana v Kala 437  
 Mul Chand v Downe & Co Ltd 798  
 1006  
 Mul Chand v Mukta 218  
 Mul Chand v Piar Lal 604  
 Mula Ram v Jiwandaram 207  
 Mulchand v Chhagan 178  
 Mulchand v Gill & Co 33 962  
 Mulchand v Muhammad Ali 843  
 Mulchand v Sanchand 104 107  
 Mulchand v Tarru Prasad 302 991  
 Mulla v Maung Po 153  
 Mulk Raj v Ralla 700  
 Mulla Abdul v Sukhnaboo 146  
 Mulla Singh v Jagannath 133  
 Mulraj Khatun v Vishvanath 3

- Mullick v Sheo Prasad 439 449  
 Mullins v Howell 74  
 Mulo v Ram Lal 66  
 Multan Chand v Bank of Madras 690  
 Multan Chand v Kharshedji 691  
 Mummadi v Venkata 914  
 Mumtaz Ali v Farhat Ali 117  
 Mumtaz Begam v Fateh Hussain 101  
 Mumtaz Hussain v Lewis 249  
 Mumtaz v Rasulan 889  
 Mumtaz ud Daula v James Skinner 370  
 Muna Koor v Durga Prasad 141  
 Munawar Ali v Jagmohan Ram 102  
 Munchershaw v New Dhurmsay Co  
     523 566  
 Mungle Chand v Gopal Ram 962 963  
 Mungul Pershad v Gria Khant 78 212  
 Muniapan v Balayan 546  
 Muniappa v Subramania, 693  
 Municipal Board of Agra v Asharji Lal  
     84  
 Municipal Commissioner of the Suburbs  
     of Calcutta v Mahomed Ali 264  
 Municipal Corporation v Shakur 344  
 Municipal Council of Tanjore v Umanala  
     30  
 Municipal Officer v Ismail Hajee 1249  
 Municipal Officer Aden v Abdul Kareem  
     1272  
 Munisami v Munisami 135 399  
 Munisami v Subbarayar 219  
 Munisamy v Abbu 1007  
 Munishi v Munishi 152  
 Muniswami v Pajaratnam 1260  
 Muniswami Mudali v Meenakshi 346  
 Munna Lal v Collector of Shahjahanpur  
     164  
 Munna Lal v Padma Kishan 748  
 Munna Lal v Sarat Chunder 914  
 Munna Singh v Gajadhar Singh 766  
 Munni Babu v Hunwar Kamta 440  
 Munni Ram v Bishen Perka 1060  
 Munni Ram v Sheo Churn 1032  
 Munnu v Kunja Behari 1060  
 Munnu Lal v Ghulam Abbas 849  
 Munni v Colzar 829  
 Munshi v Karmon 593  
 Munni v Munni 397 764  
 Munni Dinesh Prasad v Shankar  
     343  
 Munshi Lal v Pam Narain 746 749  
 Munshi Lal v Iamasis 1013  
 Munshi Jaghnath v Hazarilal 6  
 Munshi Rai v Rup Narain 100  
 Munshi Ram v Radha 800  
 Murari v Suba 23 26 27  
 Murari Lal v E. V David 248 261  
 Murari Rao v Balvanth Dikshut 1002  
     1001  
 Marigeya v Hayat Saheb 108  
 Murli Das v Achut Das 60  
 Muridhar v Anand Rao 748  
 Muridhar v Nawab Saifid Muhammad  
     731 734  
 Muridhar v Parsharam 930  
 Muridhar v Vishnudas 922  
 Murray v East Bengal Mahajan Flotilla  
     Co Ltd 79  
 Murray v Epson Local Board 494 496  
     496  
 Murray v Langford 1266  
 Murnetta v South American Co 259  
 Murti v Bhola Ram 103 440 444  
 Murugappa v Ponnusami 780 1006  
 Murugesu v Annamalai 82  
 Murugesu v Jattaram 280  
 Murugesu v Jotharam 616  
 Murugesu v Ramasami 910  
 Murugesu v Venkata 120  
 Murugesan v Manickavasala 69  
 Musa v Manilal 103  
 Musahab v Innayatullah, 440 923  
     924 925 }  
 Musala v Rammayya 85  
 Musammam v Musammam 242 243  
 Musammam Bibi v Paras Nath 318  
     748 749  
 Musammam Bodha v Ram Chandra 553  
 Musammam Bol Kaur v Shub Das 895  
 Musammam Dhanwanti v She Shankar  
     348  
 Musammam Fatima v Raza Ali 777  
 Musammam Gulab v Syed Gaj 661  
 Musammam Gulab Kuer v Syed Mohamed  
     80  
 Musammam Hurmoozi v Musammam  
     Aysha 343  
 Musammam Chander v Musammam  
     Dulhan 1003  
 Musammam Jilali v Abdul Pahman 140  
 Musammam Lakshpati v Daulat Singh  
     791  
 Musammam Janakbati v Maharaja  
     dhuraj 730

Musammatt Lorandi v Mst Nihal 629  
 Musammatt Madho v Hazari Mal 155  
 Musammatt Sartaj v Vahadco 333  
 Musleha v Ram Narain 1007  
 Musamat Bhagwanta v Dewan Zamir  
 638 661  
 Musamat Hafizan v Abdul Karim  
 833 976  
 Musamat Ram Dei v Musammatt  
 Bahu Ram 818  
 Musammatt Saban v Shahabul 984  
 Mussan v Thavara 57  
 Musst Dhunesh v Oolfat 145  
 Must. Fakrums a v Moulvi Izaru 1000  
 Must Abodeja v Ghulam Nabi 1194  
 Must Sumitra Kuer v Bam Hair 1011  
 Mustafa Khan v Phulja Bibi 1196  
 Muthammal v Secretary of State for  
 India 74  
 Muthappa v Muthu 450 451 452 458  
 Muthaya v Allan 10.  
 Muthia v Orr 973  
 Muthiah Chetti v Palaniappa 207 719  
 722  
 Muthiah Chettiar v Karuppan Chetti  
 14.  
 Muthiah v Govinddas 656  
 Muthu Chettiar v Lodd Govindas 661  
 Muthu Krishna v Ayvasami 959  
 Muthu Kumarasami v Muthusami 767  
 Muthu Kumarasami v Kuppasami 992  
 Muthu Venkatarama v Official Receiver  
 198  
 Muthu Vija v Venkatchallam 900  
 910  
 Muthukaruppa v Parya 139 308  
 Muthukutti v Achu Nayakan 1173  
 Muthunarasana v Balakrishna 654 656  
 Muthuraman v Krishna 219  
 Muthusami v Natesa 652  
 Muthuswami v Kalyani 1026  
 Muthuvijaya v Chockalingam 408  
 Muttalagiri v Muttayar 119  
 Muthiah v Govinddoss 806  
 Muttia v Appasami 773  
 Muttia v Virmammal 141  
 Muttu Pershad v Ram Pershad 228  
 Muttu Chetti v Muttan Chetti 47  
 Muttu Karuppan v Sellan 307  
 Muttuchidambara v Karuppa 185  
 Muttumura v Queen Empress 265  
 Muttuvayyengar v Kudalalagayyengar  
 185

Mutual Society *In re* 569  
 Mutusami v Prince Alagia 109  
 Muzaffar Ali Khan v Parbat 866  
 Muzhar Hossein v Bodha 318  
 Muzhur v Deno Bundo 996  
 Myers v Defryes 130  
 Mylne v Koor 539 603  
 Mylapore v Leo Kay 501

## N

N K R R M Chetty v Subraya 740  
 741  
 Nabibhai v Dayabhai 148  
 Nabin Chandra v Mirtunjoy 168  
 Nabin Chandra v Frankrishna 1011  
 1013  
 Nachiappa v Subbier 703  
 Nachikalai v Aiyakannu 61  
 Nachiamma v Subramonian 175 178  
 Nachimai v Subramaniam 146  
 Nadarmuni v Veerabhadra 159 163  
 Nadiar Chand v Chunder 1018  
 Nadir v Wali 626  
 Nadirshaw v Purnhottamdas 647  
 Nafar Chandra Pal v Shukur 301 303  
 Nagabhata v Nagappa 184  
 Nagabhushanam v Ramachandra 695  
 Nagamoney v Janakiram 1247  
 Naganada v Krishnamurti 604  
 Naganna v Pattabiramayya 344  
 Nagappa v Venkat Rao 823  
 Nagar Mal v Ram Chand 666 668  
 Nagaruru v Tangatur 991  
 Nagendra Kumar v Nabin Mandal 602  
 604  
 Nagendra Lal v Fani Bhushan Das 721  
 Nagendra Nath v Eraligool 1241  
 Nagendrabala v Tarapada 433  
 Nagesh v Gururao 306  
 Nageshwar v Bheswar 469  
 Nagiah v Seshamma 613  
 Nagindas v Ghelabhai 200 989 990  
 Nagindas v Nilaja 1508  
 Naginlal v Official Assignee 29 251  
 252  
 Nagu v Salu 296  
 Nada v Rajendra 158  
 Nagar v Bhaskar 771  
 Nashubai v Narayanacharya 457  
 Nauk v Balvant 963  
 Naumudin v Magiruddin 790

- Nainappa v Chiklabharam 32  
 Nainukh v Gajanand 311  
 Nainsukh v Umada 1179  
 Najan v Salematamed 227  
 Najumunnessa v Nacharaddin 14 719  
 723  
 Najrud din v Albert Pusch 1185  
 Najm un Nisa v Amin 422  
 Nakimo v P mba 877  
 Nakta Pam v Chiranjil Lal 73  
 Nalinakshya v Masakshar 11 399 400  
 Nalini Kanta v Hari 548  
 Nalla v Mahomed 81 83  
 Nallaperumal v Sakul 1 6  
 Nallistamby v Jonnusami 81 86  
 Nallavadiva v Subramania 1031  
 Nalluri v King Emperor 607  
 Nalum v Ari hussaym 1247 1248  
 Nam Narain v Lakshu 46  
 Namagiri v Muthu Velappa 487 500 50  
 Namavaya v Hadir Ammal 450 451  
 45  
 Nambia v Sudalai Muthu 120  
 Namubai v Daji Gound 933  
 Namuna Bibi v Ro ha Niah 710  
 Nan Karay v Kollitaw 50  
 Nana Kumar v Colam Chunder 729  
 732  
 Nanabhai v Janardhan 969 966  
 Nanak Chand v Jivan Mal 51  
 Nanak Chand v Pam Chand 790  
 Nanak Chand v Chheda Lal 694  
 Nanakchand v Telukdye 210  
 Nana v Sheku 287  
 Nanchand v Nithu 130  
 Nand Comar v Cour Sunkar 286  
 Nand Kishore v Aldur Rahman 514  
 Nand Kishore v Ahmad 59  
 Nand Kishore v Farooq Mian 746  
 Nand Kishore v Ram Colam 3 1050  
 Nand Kishore In the matter of the petition 1006  
 Nand Kishore v Badan Singh 224  
 Nand Kishore v Sultan 760  
 Nand Kumar v Ramyiban 69  
 Nand Kumar v Bilas Ram 136  
 Nandlal v Kisanlal 106 303  
 Nand Ram v Fakir Chand 1010 1166  
 1171 1174 1178  
 Nand Ram v Jam Irsad 506  
 Nanda Kishore v Pam Colam 393  
 397 1040  
 Nand Lal v Raghunandan 79  
 Nand Lal v Jan Janan 95 1051 10 9  
 1064 1061  
 Nandalal Mullick v Janchanan 1060  
 1061  
 Nandan v Kenney 10  
 Nandi Lal v Jorendra 769 771  
 Nandkumar v Bilas Ram 62 693  
 Nando Lal v Chutterput 604  
 Nandoo Singh v Bahut Singh 790  
 Nandram v Babaji 910  
 Nandram v Bhopel Singh 314  
 Nandram v Nemchand 1184 1180  
 Nanibala v Ichhamosee 94  
 Nanibala v Jamni 884  
 Nanjappa v Canapathi 280  
 Nanjunda v Nallakruppan 31  
 Nanku Irsad v Kamta Prasad 925  
 Nannhi Jan v Bhuri 3  
 Nannu Lal v Bhagwan D 767  
 Nannu v Nazim 3  
 Narain v Binash 980  
 Narain v Chiranjil 10 7  
 Narain v Durga 201  
 Narain v Gurbal ah 94  
 Narain v Kolu Ram 91 1071  
 Narain v Jorendra 46  
 Narain Das v Faiz Shih 71  
 Narain Das v Italli 867  
 Narain Das v Ldham Singh 860  
 Narain Das v Kotumal 107  
 Narain Das v Lamchandra 210  
 Narain Das v Ram Chander 760  
 Narain Das v Sheo Din 91 792  
 Narain Singh v Bichan Singh 379  
 Narain v Nakhani Lal 889 890  
 Narainbhai v Narobankar 610  
 Narandas v Shantilal 811 816 1050  
 Narasavva v Venkata 141  
 Narasimha v Langachari 187 39  
 Narasimha I a v Ryots of Pedda  
 mamidipalli 310  
 Narasimha v Subbarayudu 728  
 Narasimha v Zamindar of Tiruvur  
 630  
 Narasimha Chari v Ari hnamachariar  
 31  
 Narasimhulu v Adappa 196  
 Narasimhulu v Noota 419  
 Narasimma v Anantha 194  
 Narasimma v Kristna 27  
 Narasinga v Govinda 286  
 Narasimha v Lakshimpati 863  
 Narayan v Bhatji 1907  
 Narayan v Illa u 614

Narayan v Bhagubin 120  
 Narayan v Ganaji 911  
 Narayan v Gopal —  
 Narayan v Hari 502 590  
 Narayan v Jankibai 963 1222  
 Narayan v Krishnaji 24  
 Narayan v Laxmibai 1033  
 Narayan v Nagindas 309  
 Narayan v Nimbi 47  
 Narayan v Rasulkhan 227  
 Narayana v Sagunabai 182  
 Narayan v Secretary of State 102 103  
 201 204  
 Narayan v Shamrao 439  
 Narayan v Sono 622  
 Narayan v Umbar —17  
 Narayan v Vaudeo 27  
 Narayan v Venkatacharva 15  
 Narayana v Bivari 297 399  
 Narayana v Chengalamma 937  
 Narayan v Gopalakrishna —9  
 Narayana v Kalliana Sundaram 217  
 753  
 Narayana v Kandasami 440  
 Narayana v Kumaram 71  
 Narayana v Lakshmana 41  
 Narayana v Muthu 1034 1038  
 Narayana v Papayya 910  
 Narayana v Shankunni 504  
 Narayana v The Cochín Sircar 206 257  
 Narayana v Venkatakrishna 391  
 Narayanamma v Ramayya 394  
 Narayanamurthi v Acharya 273  
 Narayanan v Arunachellam 1041  
 Narayanan v Cheria 514  
 Narayanan v Kannaniamal 74  
 Narayanan v Theva Amma 153  
 Narayanasami v Natesa 11 400  
 Narayanasami v Ooru 296  
 Narayanaswami v Chellapallai 529  
 Narayanrao v Balkrishna 718  
 Narayanrao v Jethervahu 503  
 Narayan v Amgauda 747  
 Narayan v Gopal 7  
 Narayan v Vukunt 649  
 Narayana v Ilangasami 639 640  
 Narayana v Seshapier 157  
 Narbadashankar v Kevaldas 980  
 Narendra v Abdul Hakim 333  
 Narendra v Abov Charan 512  
 Narendra v Gopal 112 130  
 Narendra v Jogendra 866 871

Narendra v Rakhaldas 339 371 543  
 761 762  
 Narendra Nath v Radha Charan 1017  
 Nareesh v Krishna 126  
 Narhar v Krishnaji 172  
 Nariman v Hasham 330  
 Nariman v Municipal Corporation of  
 Bombay 421  
 Narinda Bahadur v Akhadim Husain 934  
 Narindar Singh v King 524 532  
 Narinjan v Kirpal 268  
 Narinjan Singh v Charn Das 306  
 Naro v Pamchandras 47 51  
 Naro Hari v Angurnabai 590  
 Narottam v Mohanlal 1011  
 Narpat v Har Gayan 621  
 Narrondas Dhanji In the matter of  
 1253 1257  
 Narsa Peddi v Hajee Tar Mahomed  
 1254  
 Narsey Tokersey & Co v Sachindranath  
 864  
 Narsing v Partap 928  
 Narsing Das v Pashlan 547  
 Narsinggirji Manufacturing Co v  
 Budanabeb 497  
 Narsingh v Sheikh Jahu 871  
 Narsingh v Sheo Prasad 359  
 Narsingh Das v Ajodhya 1193  
 Narsingh Das v Mangal Dubey 449  
 Narsingha v Lalji 183  
 Narsingrao v Bando 172 910  
 Narsingrav v Lakshmanrao 17  
 Narsinh v Vaman 433  
 Nash v Layton 536  
 Nassartani v Kharadji 119  
 Nasse In the matter of 715  
 Nataraja v Pamaswamy 219 222  
 Natesa v Kannammal 786  
 Natesa v Venkatarama 41 1013  
 Natesa v Venkataramayyan 222  
 Natesa Chetti v Vengu 823  
 Natha v Dhunbaji 93 708  
 Natha v Jodha 15  
 Natha v Schiller 196  
 Natha Singh v Chunilal 441  
 Natha Singh v Jodha Singh 523 579  
 Nathmal Mauram 236 237 238  
 Nathu v Amrao Singh 303  
 Nathu v Banna 304  
 Nathu v Badhu 51 445  
 Nathu v Keshowji 23

- Nathu v Lmedial 957  
 Nathu Lal v Paghubir Singh 354  
 Nathu Lal v Paghubir Singh 1054  
 Nathu Mal v Muhammad Shafi 1193  
 Nathu Wilson v McAfee 7  
 Nathubhai v Bai Ujan 937  
 Nathubhai v Narayanacharya 455 459  
 Nathuji v Lalbhai 30  
 Nathuni Ram v Mosammat Sheo Koer 817 818  
 National Bank of India Ltd v Chuznari 659  
 National Coal Co v Kshitish Bose 396  
 National Engineering Co v Rattan 116  
 National Insurance Co Ltd v Nissim 131  
 Natraja v The South Indian Bank 693  
 Nattu v Annangara 52  
 Natwarlal v Sasoon & Co 700  
 Naubat Singh v Baldeo Singh 312 1012 1029  
 Nauratan v Wilford 341  
 Navajee v Adm Cen of Madras 621  
 Navalkar v Sarojini 344  
 Navirahoo v Narotamdas 1210 1239  
 Navirahoo v Turner 1247  
 Navroji v Distur Kharsedji 275 32 370  
 Nawab v Duni Chund 517  
 Nawab v Ianjaba 74  
 Nawab Bahadur v Harish Chandra 857  
 Nawab Behram Jung v Haji Sultanah 299 900  
 Nawab Khajeh Habibullah v Kaviraj 190  
 Nawab Nazim v Heeralal 530  
 Nawab Sayid v Herbert 837 838  
 Nawab Shiva ul Mulk v Umur Ul Umra 13  
 Nawab Wazir v Shashu Bhuhan 899  
 Nawal Singh In the matter of the petition of 339  
 Nawaz Ali v Ali 36  
 Nawazi Begam v Dalfaroz Begam 43  
 Nawbut v Mallesh 43  
 Nazaire Co In re 327  
 Nazar Husain v Kersi Mal 1030  
 Nazim v Alul Hamid 990  
 Nazim v Irasononaram 94  
 Nazir Husain v Nihal Chand 829  
 Nazirunni Sa v Asifa 2  
 Neale v Gordon Lennox 14 15  
 Neckram v Bank of Bengal 561  
 Neel Kristo Dev v Beer Chandra 31  
 Neelakantagiri v Venkatachallam 732  
 Neelaveni v Narayana 542 1002  
 Nehora v Radha 589 590  
 Neki v Chhajee 1033  
 Nellaiyappa v Thangama 280  
 Nelliappa v Punnaitanam 271  
 Nelson v Bridport 90  
 Nemagauda v Paresha 33 20  
 Nema Chand v Deno Nath 700 756 761  
 Nemchand v Savaichand 28  
 Nemchand v Hevalchand 884  
 Nensukhgavri v Rajabally 702 703  
 Nepal Chandra v Niroda 540  
 Net Lal v Sheikh Karim 177 760  
 Neti Rama v Venkatacharulu 212 282  
 New v Burns 83  
 New Fenix Compagnie v General Accident Insurance Corporation 834  
 New Fleming Co v Kessowji 528  
 Newby v Sharpe 500 501 502  
 Newen In re 14  
 Newington v Levy 44  
 Newport Shipway & Co v Paynter 483  
 Niadar Mal v Biddulph 697  
 Niadar Mal v Patan Lal 374  
 Niadar Mal v Rannak Husain 548  
 Niamat Ali v Ali Reza 275  
 Niamuddin v Maniraddin 83 80  
 Niaz v Durga 506  
 Niaz Ali v Muhammad 1040  
 Niazullah v Nazir 5  
 Nicholas v Asphar 74  
 Nicholas v Evens 829  
 Nicholl v Wheeler 567  
 Nidamarthi v Thammara 1186  
 Nidha Lal v Collector of Bulandshahr 314  
 Nidhi Lal v Mazhar 87 89 114  
 Nihal Shah v Munt Malan 278  
 Nihal Singh v Hira 51  
 Nihal Singh v Khushhal Singh 1197  
 Nihal Singh v Sowaya 90  
 Nikanth v Balwant 312 514  
 Nil Madhub v Brojo Nath 49  
 Nilakanta v Imamshahib 766  
 Nilkant Banerji v Sureh Chandra 588 597

Nilkant v Vidya Narasimha 1037  
 Nilkanta v Co to 200  
 Nilkanth v Ramkrishna 271  
 Nilkunto v Hurro 197  
 Nilmoni v Taranath 4  
 Nilmoni Singh v Kirta Chunder 332  
 Nilmonv v Bireswar 171  
 Nilo v A urbad 22  
 Nilo v Govind 50  
 Nilo v Rama 720  
 Nilratan v Abdul 300  
 Nilratan v Ram Ruttan 162  
 Nilu v A urbad 898  
 Nilvaru v Nilvaru 73  
 Nimbaji v Vadia 231  
 Ningappa v Gowdappa 602  
 Ningappa v Shivappa 102  
 Ningawa v Pamappa 410  
 Niranjan v Afzal 788  
 Niranjan Singh v Tulsi Ram 108  
 Niranka v Atul 490  
 Nirbhai Das v Ram Kumar 333  
 Nirman v Phulman 49  
 Nirod v Chamathkarini 904  
 Nirode Nath v Amullay 744  
 Nisar Ali v Ali Ali 300  
 Nishadiney v Kalli 101  
 Nishikanta v Umar Lal 314  
 Nistarini Dassi v Nando Lal 89 86  
 109 400 840 1244  
 Nittala Achayya v Nittala Yellamma  
 108  
 Nittomoye v Soobul 561 573  
 Nityamoni Dasi v Madhu Sudan 1040  
 Nityanand v Juggat 766  
 Nityananda v Gajapati 79  
 Nityananda v Sri Radha 934  
 Nirath Singh v Bhukhi Singh 303  
 Nazam of Hyderabad *In re* 341 838  
 Nazamuddin v Abdul Aziz 1024  
 Nazam ud Din v Ahmad 38  
 Nazam ud din v Bohra 914  
 Nazam ul Haq v Muhammad 269  
 Nobel's Explosives Co v Jones & Co  
 500  
 Nobin Chunder v Buroda 102  
 Nobin Chunder v Romesh Chunder 126  
 Nobo v Poyzbux 41 42  
 Nanoo Singh v Anand 440  
 Noor Ali v Koni Meh 136  
 Noor Mahammad v Noor Muhammad  
 709  
 Noor Mahomed v Bilasram 237 238

Norburi Natzo & Co v Griffiths 417  
 Norendra v Kamal Basini 2  
 North W P Club v Sadullah 421  
 North Western Ry Co v Rair Dhanishp  
 Lal 252  
 Norton's Settlement Re 118  
 Notan Das v Lachhman 608  
 Nouring Rai v Latif 135  
 Nowroji v Deccan Bank 904  
 Nripendra Nath v Jhumak 918  
 Aritya & Jorit 1061  
 Nugendrachunder v Sreemutty Kaminee  
 60  
 Nundeeput v Alexander 296 730  
 Nundo v Bidhoo 71 72  
 Nundo v Banomali 414 453  
 Nundo Lal v Nistarini 15  
 Nur Ahmad v Altaf Ali 207  
 Nurdin v Secretary of State 984  
 Nur Habi v Nawaz Khan 520  
 Nurumiah v The Ganges Sugar Works  
 Ltd 321  
 Nuruman v Ambica 308 512  
 Nursey v Harrison 1007  
 Nursingh v Nuffer 1174  
 Nurud Din v Pran Krishan 1030  
 Nusrat Ali v Sakina Begam 161  
 Nusseerooddeen Biswas v Ujjul Biswas  
 833 996  
 Nusserwanjee v Meer Mynoodeen 1168  
 Nusservanji v Shahjodi Begam 900  
 Nusservanjee v Elenora 109 1267  
 Nusservanji v Gordon 406 900 906  
 Nusur Mohomed v Hazbat 473  
 Nuzhatuddin v Mirza Kurratulain 77  
 Nuzur Ally v Ojoodhyaram 984



Oakes *In re* 977  
 Oakes & Co Ltd v Discarcis 201  
 Obhoy v Hury Churn 434  
 Official Assignee v Bidyasundari 481  
 512  
 Official Assignee of Madras v Aiyu  
 D kshithar 59 68 157  
 Official Assignee of Madras v Mary  
 Dalgaums 200  
 Official Assignee v Pamalingappa 1253  
 Official Receiver v Chettiappa 217  
 378  
 Official Receiver v Nagaratna 617 940



Pattakara v Pangsami 174  
 Patto Kumari v Upendra Nath 1173  
 1180  
 Pauliem v Pauliem 332  
 Paya v Koramel 1003  
 Payana v Pana Lana 438 439 440 443  
 Payidanna v Lakshminarasamma 216  
 Payne v British Time Recorder Co  
 408 411 412 447  
 Pearce Mohan v Pachunath 642  
 Pearce v Shama Churn 603  
 Peary Lal v Allahabad Bank 159  
 Peary Lal v Chand Charan 156  
 Peary Lal v Ambica 71 72  
 Peary Choudhury v Sonoo Das 394  
 Peary Lal v Chand Charan 163 210  
 Peary Lal v Komal Kishore 118  
 Peary Lal v Peary Lal 247  
 Peary Mohun v Anunda 174  
 Peary Mohun v Iomesh 156  
 Peary Mohan v Narunda Nath 433  
 Peary Mohun Das v Western 249 250  
 Pechayee v Vallamuthu 746  
 Pedda Subbaraya v Canga 931  
 Peddapalavam v Peddapalavam 1166  
 Pedro v Jalbhoy 723  
 Peck v Curney 131  
 Peck v Pay 50  
 Pell v Gregory 949  
 Pelly Ex parte 523  
 Pemberton v Hughe 85  
 Penn v Lord Baltimore 95  
 Perava v Venkayamma 723  
 Perival v Collector of Chittagong 610  
 Peria v Karappanna 812  
 Periasami v Seetharama 183  
 Periatamili v Vellaya 638 641  
 Periya Mivana v Subramania Iyer 919  
 Perish Petroleum Maat of Egypt v Den  
 24  
 Perse v Perse 364  
 Pertal Chunder v Mohen Iranath 300  
 Pertab Narayan v Triloki 60  
 Peru v Penno 195  
 Perumal v Karuppan 816  
 Perumal v Kaveri 91  
 Perumal v Perumal 802  
 Perumal v Thirumalarayogarumathi  
 Ltd. 844  
 Perumalla v Perumalla 780 786 807  
 1107  
 Perumbra v Subrahmanian 1010

Peruri v Gullapudi 260 1191  
 Pestonjee v Mirza 417  
 Pestonji v Abdool 444  
 Pestonji v Collector of West Khandesh  
 1220  
 Pestonji v Jamsedji 617 948  
 Pestonji v Manockjee 1167  
 Pestonji v Queen Insurance Co 333  
 Petha Perumal v Chilambaram 1256  
 Pethaperumal v Murugandi 70  
 Pettachi Chettiar v Chinnatambiar 769  
 Phanundra v Pramatha 840  
 Phanundra v Pramatha Nath 354 836  
 Pherozsha v Sun Mill Ltd 398  
 Phillips v Phillips 412 480 481 482  
 484 491 511 955  
 Phuran v Bahoran 1178  
 Phomom Singh v A J Wells 714  
 Phul Chand v Chand Mal 197  
 Phul Chand v Narsingh 748  
 Phul Chand v Shankar 374  
 Phul Kuar v Hashmatullah 609  
 Phul Kumari v Ganshyam Misra 722  
 21  
 Phulli v Dobi Parshad 867 868  
 Phulwanti Kunwar v Janeshwar 875  
 Phundee v Jangi Nath 35 525  
 Piara Ram v Kesho Nath 452  
 Pirri v Khali Pam 444  
 Piari Lal v Hanif un Nabi 217 378  
 Piari Lal v Madan Lal 312 611 1054  
 Piari Lal v Nand Pam 75  
 Pich v Subbarayar 49  
 Pichamma v Sreeramulu 604  
 Pichayo v Sivaganai 356  
 Pichayyanar v S. Sanyangar 135  
 Pierce Leslie v Irumal 143 148  
 Pigot v Ali Mahammad 120  
 Pilcher v Hind 41  
 Pinapati v Pinapati 406 410  
 Pini v Poner ni 976  
 Piran Pillai v Jitendriya 921  
 Pirbhu v Pimp Singh 142  
 Pirbhay The Bombay Baroda & Central  
 India Ry Co 1249  
 Piro v Richardson 531  
 Piroj Shah v Qurb Shah 311 354  
 Pirjude v Pirjude 30  
 Pirthi Lal v Jewahir 619  
 Pitapur Raja v Buche 43  
 Pita v Chunilal 227 747 748  
 Pitamber v Damodar 663

- Pitam Lal v Balwant Singh 400  
 Pitam Mal v Sadiq Ali 1163  
 Pitam Singh v Tota Singh 639  
 Pitamber Lal v Dodee Singh 543  
 Pitambur v Pam Jov 510  
 Pitan Lal v Balwant Singh 392  
 Pitchakkuttiya v Doraiswami 643 63  
 83  
 Pitchayya v Rattamma 431  
 Pitchi v Bharata 70  
 Pittapur Raja v Suriya Pau 436 439  
 440  
 Pivari Lal v Churamani 733  
 Pleader of the High Court *In re* 14  
 462  
 Pleaders In the matter of two pleaders  
 462  
 Plummer v May 537  
 Pogo e v Fukurooddeen 660  
 Polker v Kunhamad 73  
 Ponnaya v Jungala 867  
 Ponnusami v Damodar 102  
 Ponnusami v Letchmanan 641 660  
 Ponnusami v Srinivasa 899  
 Ponnusami v Doraisamy 665  
 Poonammal v Iamamirida 441  
 Pooroo Chunder v Sassoon 237  
 Pooroba hi Pal v Bhoobun Chunde Dey  
 262  
 Pore h Nath v Anath Nath 769  
 Poromanand v Kheppoo 638  
 Portugal The 1266  
 Potita v Narasinga 1165  
 Pow v Davis 416  
 Prabhakar Bhat v Vishwambhar 514  
 Prabhat v Emperor 1259  
 Prabhu Narain v Saligram 4  
 Prabhulingappa v Gurunath 79  
 Prafulla Nath v Satya Bhusan Das 447  
 Prafulla v Bhabani 297  
 Prag Narain v Kamakhia Singh 374  
 Prag Narain v Kamakhia 390  
 Pragdas v Dawlatram 1246  
 Pragdas v Girdhardas 292 820 827  
 828  
 Praggi v Govind 22 28  
 Praggi Lal v Maxwell 527  
 Prakasa v Yelamarti 209  
 Prakas Singh v Allahabad Bank 643  
 644  
 Pramatha Chandra v Khetra 917  
 Pramatha Nath v Bhuvan Mohan 61  
 Pramatha Nath v Khetra Nath 972  
 Pran Krishna v Prasanna 302  
 Pran Kristo v Collector of Moorsheda  
 bad 891  
 Pran Kumar v Darpohari 1249  
 Pran Nath v Mohresh Chandra 166  
 Irunal v Goculdas 1243  
 Prasada Nayudu v Viravva 722  
 Ira anna v Ibrahim 767  
 Irasannamayi v Baikunath 985  
 Pratapa v A E L Mission 210 236  
 Iratapa v Simji 55  
 Pratab Singh v Beni Pam 152  
 Iratchett v Drew 976  
 Pravat v Amulya 429  
 Prayagdosajivaru v P Srirangachary  
 Iuvuru 273  
 Prayag Dosa v Tirumala 272  
 Prayag Raj v Sidhu Prasad 769  
 Prem Chand v Mohkoda Devi 138 140  
 Prem Lal v Sumbhoonath 979 1043  
 Prem Nath v Chatrapal 175  
 Irem Sukh v Indro Nath 558  
 Iremchand In the goods of (21 Cal  
 484) 334 1017 1020  
 Premchand In the goods of (21 Cal  
 832) 832 833  
 Premji v Ghulam 104  
 Iremji *In re* 689  
 Premmoyi v Freonath 13 784  
 Premsul Das v Udairam 578  
 Preston v Luck 960  
 Preston Banking Co v Allusup 397 400  
 Price v Crouch 330  
 Price v Price 568  
 Price v Strange 13  
 Prithusingi v Umed ingi 81  
 Prithi v Jamshad 79  
 Probhas Kumar v Nithar Lal 1052  
 1053  
 Probhat v Hari 419 421  
 Probode Chunder v Dowey 952  
 Prokash Chandra v Adlam 973  
 Promode Nath v Harishee 602  
 Promotha Nath v Mohini 220 955  
 Iromotha Nath v Saurav 768  
 Prosanno Chandra v Kristo 177  
 Prosanno v Baidya 1012  
 Prosonnomoyi v Sreenauth 233 235  
 Prosunno Kumar v Kali Das 151 159  
 756  
 Irosunno Kumar v Golab Chand 59  
 Irotab v Brojanath 7  
 Irotab Chunder v Arathoon 289  
 Irotab Chunder v Pearv 678

Protab Chandra v Sarat Chandra 710  
 907  
 Protap Chunder v Ianoty 762  
 Puddephatt v Leith 229  
 Puidomonee Dossee v Muthooranath  
 212  
 Pudmanab v Chunli Dat 678  
 Purnadin v Moidinsa 1171  
 Pukhray v Jamsetji 398 793 794  
 Pufanada v Baruthu 510  
 Pulin v Mahendra 530 807  
 Pellen Chetty v Iamulinga Chetty 206  
 Punamchand v Mollison 255  
 Punordeo v Ram Sarup 3  
 Punch Durr v Mani 73  
 Punchanada v Baithunatha 36  
 PUNCHANAN v Dwarakanath 3  
 PUNCHANAN v Shib Chunder 93 9  
 1 10  
 Punnithavelu v Bhashyam 803 804  
 899 901  
 Punjab Akhbarat Press Co v Ogilvie  
 1900  
 Punjab Akhbarat & Land Press Co v  
 Ogilvie 270 297  
 Punjab Mutual Hindu Family Relief  
 Fund v Sardari 108  
 Punjab National Bank v Uma Dutt  
 470 1000  
 Punjab Singh v Ramautar 760  
 Purn Chand v Sheodas Rai 549  
 Purn Chand v Jodh Raj 106  
 Purn Chandra v Rawan Das 160  
 Purn Mal v Dina Nath 149  
 Purn Mal v Janki Pershad 314  
 Purn Mal v Kramt Singh 954 958  
 Purnchand v Surendra, 240  
 Purnanandas v Vallabdas 606  
 Purnachandra v Lejoy 866  
 Purna v Nalini 470  
 Purna v Nil Madhub 870 807  
 Purna v Raik 520  
 Purna Chandra v Dhono Kristo 116  
 Purna Chandra v Manobeni Dori 770  
 Purnama v Ram Prasad 734  
 Purnhottam v Atmaram 439  
 Purnhottam v Balvant 194  
 Purnhottam v Hargu 333  
 Purnhottam v Kala 431 434 435  
 Purnhottam v Mahadu 18, 345  
 Purnhottamdas v Iamgopal 1174  
 Purnhottamdas v Surajbharthi, 233 234  
 237 731 740

Purnhottam v Hargu 990  
 Purnhottam v Rukhrishna 184  
 Purnhottam v Pandurang 403  
 Purnhottam v Rajbai 10  
 Putali v Tulji 70  
 Puthia v Vekth 89  
 Puttappa v Virehadappa 107  
 Puttu Lal v Dayanand 270  
 Puttu Lal v Parbati 18  
 Pyari v Kedar Nath 409 431  
 Pyari Mohan v Kala Khan 1030 1006  
 Pydel v Chathappan 390 390

## Q

Qadri v Fazal 807  
 Qaim v Agra 18  
 Qaim Ali v Bhagwanta 984  
 Qazi v Mankumar 303  
 Qazi Muhammad v Lachman 812  
 Qazi v Ram Kishen 398 399  
 Queen Empress v Abdul 4 83  
 Queen Empress v Bapuji 645  
 Queen Empress v Byramji 260  
 Queen Empress v Ganga Ram 1218  
 Queen Empress v Krishna 408  
 Queen Empress v Mutturaman 640  
 Queen Empress v Pillai 645  
 Queen Empress v Sri Churn 3  
 Queen Empress v Tilak 3  
 Queen Empress v Tribhovan 30  
 Queen Empress v Virappa Chetty 605  
 Queen Empress v Zakari ud din 265  
 Quilter v Heatly 571  
 Qurban Ali v Ashraf Ali 207 209

## R

R v Nabalpur 63  
 R v Katie Chunder 3  
 R v R 299 1905  
 R R O O Chettyar v Ma Sein Lin  
 703  
 Rabbaba v Noorjehan 317 434  
 Ralchholme v Smith 978  
 Rabibhai v Rahimabai 836  
 Rabindra v Abdul 947  
 Rachappa v Shidappa 111  
 Rachawa v Shrivajogappa 307

Rachha v Upendra 502  
 Radha Binode v Sri Sri Gopal 55  
 Radha v Kamal 1009  
 Radha v Monohur 40  
 Padha v Radha 371  
 Padha v Tula 81  
 Padha Charan v Kailash 152  
 Padha Charan v Nan Singh 370 371  
 Radha Kant v Debendra 516  
 Padha Kant v Mammatt Parbati 612  
 644.  
 Radha Kishen v Collector of Jaunpur  
 147 318 319 1011  
 Radha Kishen v Hem Chandra 157  
 Radha Kishen v Radha Pershad 446  
 Radha Kishun v Khurshed Hossain  
 52 56 89 1019  
 Padha Krishn Das v Bal Krishn  
 Chand 33 1033  
 Radha Krishn Das v Rai Krishn  
 Chand 330  
 Radha Krishna v Ram Bahadur 682  
 Radha Krishna v Sundaraswami  
 326  
 Radha Krishn v Swaminatha 322  
 1033  
 Padha Krishn Gopal v Lakshmi Nara  
 yan 860  
 Radha Krishn v Muthusami 52  
 Radha Kunwar v Reoti Singh 328 89  
 Radha Nath v Chand Charan 622  
 Radha Pershad v Ram Permeswar  
 128  
 Padha Prasad v Lal Sabeel 43 70 142  
 150 216 540 794  
 Padha Paman v Pran Nath 547  
 Padhabai v Anant Rao 59 63  
 Radhakisan v Balvant 198  
 Padhakishun v Khurshed Hussain 949  
 Radhakrishna v Rama Kamini 1012  
 Radhakrishna v Swaminatha 323  
 Radhakrishna v Venkata 1011 1012  
 Padhakrishna Iyer 178 884  
 Padharaman v Surnomoyi 621  
 Radhashyam Das v Runga Sundari  
 868  
 Radhe Lal v East India Railway 849  
 Radhe Lal v Mulchand 70 815  
 Radhey Shyam v Bihari Lal 132  
 Rafikunnessa Bibi v Tarun Churn 913  
 Paganath Prasad v Jamuna Prasad  
 26

Raghavulu v Pellati 277 278  
 Raghavendra v Yalgurad 528  
 Raghavendra v Gururao 1194  
 Raghbir v Mst Sohan 390 790  
 Ragho v Daud 899  
 Ragho v Dyband 617  
 Ragho v Hanmati 776  
 Ragho Praud v Mewa Lal 892  
 Ragho Salvi v Balkrishna 899 901  
 Ragho Vinayak v Sheikh Daud 899  
 Raghonath v Gobindnaram 103 107  
 Raghu v Mahant 1054  
 Raghu Nath v Dyed Samad 509  
 Raghu Ram v Deokali 747  
 Raghubans Puri v Jyoti Swarupa 515  
 Raghubans Sahai v Phool Kumari 249  
 Raghubar v Jwala 455  
 Raghubar v Gokaran 79  
 Raghubar v Kesho 270  
 Raghubar Singh v Jai Indra Bahadur  
 Singh 155 158 163 378 385 940  
 991  
 Raghbir Singh v Jodha Singh 626  
 Raghunada v Govinda 345  
 Raghunandan v Badan Singh 650  
 Raghunandan v Jadunandan 396 1011  
 1012  
 Raghunandan v Parmeshwar 903  
 Raghunandan v Ram Charan 343 773  
 Raghunandan v Ram Sunder 517  
 Raghunath v Deputy Commissioner 334  
 Raghunath v Gangaram 613 660  
 Raghunath v Ganpatji 628 678  
 Raghunath v Issur Chunder 67  
 Raghunath v Janardhan 23  
 Raghunath v Kondiba 684  
 Raghunath v Mst Rampari 1031  
 Raghunath v Nilu 10 987  
 Raghunath v Sarosh 159 453 711  
 Raghunath v Shamo Koori 10 1030  
 Raghunath Das v Sundar Das 13 212  
 213 216 669  
 Raghunath Prasad v Jamuna Prasad 52  
 Raghunath Prasad v Sarju Prasad  
 934  
 Raghunath Rai v Birdhi Chan 1181  
 Raghunath Singh v Sheo Pratap Singh  
 78  
 Raghunath Sukul v Ramrup 1165  
 Raghunatha v Venkatesa 663 797  
 Raghunathaswamy v Gopaul Rao 325  
 Raghurbar v Bhikys 868

- Rahim v Srinivasa 78  
 Rahim Ali v Ibul Chand 170  
 Rahim Bakhsh v Amiran Bibi 406  
 408 449  
 Rahim Bux v Al Iul Hader 712  
 Rahimbhoy v Turner 318 321 322  
 414 559  
 Rahimuldi v Loll Mesh 155  
 Rahimunnessa v Sheikh Halim 836  
 Rahim v Jadunandan 479  
 Rahmat Karim v Abdul Karim 925  
 Rahmat Ullah v Dharam Singh 817  
 Rai Amrita Nath v Abhoy Charan 1035  
 Rai Bahadur v Ram Bahadur 663  
 Rai Charan v Biswa Nath 503  
 Rai Charan v Debi Prasad 376  
 Rai Charan v Kumul Mohun 69  
 Rai Kashi Nath v Kailas Singh 790  
 79  
 Rai Narain v Newton 103  
 Rai Radha Krishna v Bisheshwar Sahay  
 73 74  
 Rai Saheb v John 91  
 Rai Sham Kisen v Damar Kumar  
 Debi 174  
 Raj Bahadur v Narayan Prasad 796  
 Raj Chandra v A D O C Ray 516  
 Raj Chunder v Canga Da 799  
 Raj Coomary v Pree Madhub 899  
 Raj Kishen v Radha Madhab 215  
 Raj Kisto v Nobacc 23  
 Raj Koomar Singh v Sahelzada 264  
 Raj Krishna v Bipin 69  
 Raj Kumar v Sheo Narayan 94  
 Raj Lakshmi v Kalyajani 111  
 Raj Narain v Ananga 539 541  
 Raj Singh v Farmanand 93  
 Raja Copal v Taj Mahomed 540  
 Raja Copala v Pamanujachariar 160  
 Raja v Jankitas 96  
 Raja Bahadur v Rajeevappa 443 444  
 Raja Rajasunder v Sarat Kumari 939  
 939  
 Raja Dhamra v Dukkapatnam 315  
 Raja Okullav v Sheth Chetram 973  
 Raja Har Narayan v Chundhrain  
 Bhawanant Kuar 1169 1171 1173  
 Raja Jasahichandra v Bhulaneswar  
 937 938  
 Raja Joyt v Jadu 1018  
 Raja Kumara v Thatta 74  
 Raja of Bolbils v Suryanarayana 73  
 Raja of Kalabasti v Iyann 177  
 Raja of Luttapur v Secretary of State  
 300  
 Raja Peary Mohan v Manohar 9 294  
 622  
 Raja Rajeswara v Arunachalam 1034  
 Raja Rajeswara v Tiruneelakantam  
 223  
 Raja Ram v Chunnalal 744 917  
 Raja Ram Tewari v Luchmun 451  
 Raja Iammad v Velusami Tevar 78  
 Raja Ranjit v Bisunta 59  
 Raja Pangit Simha v Bhagabutta 32  
 Raja Saheb v Sub Collector 346  
 Raja Sishikanta v Raja Sarat Chandra  
 40 620 621  
 Raja Setrucherla v Jeypore 139  
 Raja Shyam v Raj Kumar 979  
 Raja Simhadra v Pamachundrudu 68  
 Raja Singh v Koodip 374 376  
 Raja Sir Mohammad v Qazi Pamzun  
 Ali 933  
 Raja Sree Nath Roy v Secretary of  
 State 331  
 Raja Valad v Krishnabhat 27  
 Raja Wazir v Bhikari Pam 752 753  
 Raja Wazir v Rani Jagadamba 1041  
 Rajacharya v Chemanna 309  
 Rajada v Chulla 877  
 Rajagopala v Pamanujachariar 107  
 673 674 675  
 Rajagopala v Sublamal 295  
 Rajagopala v Tirupathis 115  
 Rajagopala v Vardaraja 30  
 Rajagopalachariar v Bhaskarachariar  
 23  
 Rajah Ali v Amir Hossain 996  
 Rajah Enact v Rance Iowahun 1271  
 Rajah Kotakal v Malabar Timber &  
 Co 1243  
 Rajah of Karvetnagar v Venkata Peddi  
 243  
 Rajah of Kalahasti v Venkata Iri 610  
 611  
 Rajah of Iamnad v Iamanathaswami  
 42  
 Rajah of Iamnad v Seetharam 1240  
 Rajah of Venkatacharya v Sarga 384 400  
 Rajal Parthasraditya v Rajah R. Narish  
 970  
 Rajah Venkata Ramayya v Veeraswami  
 331  
 Rajah Vurmah v Ravi Vurmah 194

- Rajammal v Tyaru 974  
 Rajani v Ajmaddin 80  
 Rajani v Kali 999 1006  
 Rajani v Raja Jvoti 800 805 806  
 Rajani v Rajabala 341 342 350  
 Rajaram v Central Bank of India 52a  
 115  
 Rajaram v Ganesh 198 303  
 Rajaram v Raghubansman 712  
 Rajaram Bhagvat v Jibai 804  
 Pajarathna v Pamachandra 660  
 Rajaratnam v Sheikh Hasambi 152  
 Rajrup Singh v Pangolam 176  
 Rajbana v Asharan 759  
 Rajendra v Biswarup 55  
 Rajendra v Gopal 1031  
 Rajendra v Nal Ratan 747  
 Rajendra v Prabodh 668  
 Rajendra Kishore v Mathura Mohan  
 10 165  
 Rajendra Lal v Atal 813 817  
 Rajendra Nath v Mahes Lata 1003  
 Rajendro v Chunder Mohun 190  
 Rajendro v Jan Meah 469  
 Rajendro Nath *In re* 1239  
 Rajerav v Nanarav 145  
 Rajeswara v Hari 642  
 Rajendra Narain v Sundara Bibi 180  
 201  
 Rajit Pam v Katesar 493 1010  
 Rajitagnipathv v Bhanani 79  
 Rajjo v Lalman 626  
 Rajjo Kuar v Debi Dial 406 449  
 Rajkshi v Gopi Nath 1013  
 Rajkeshwar Prasad v Mahommad  
 Tahuman 921  
 Rajkishore v Bhabatosh 349 722  
 Rajkishore v Ram Ghulam 866  
 Rajkishori Koer v Madan Mohan Singh  
 516  
 Rajkumar v Pam Kshelawan 816  
 Rajkumar v Rameshwar 319  
 Rajkumar Lal v Jukaran 939  
 Rajkumari v Arityakali 809  
 Rajlakshmi v Katayam 90 112  
 Rajmal v Hanmant 250  
 Rajmal v Maruti 7 36 1188 1197  
 Rajrajeshwarashram v Svaruptanand  
 tirtha 996  
 Rajrup v Abdul 510  
 Rajuchunder v Ramgati, 782  
 Rajunder v Bijai 15  
 Rajundernarain Rai v Bijai Govind  
 Sing 335  
 Rajwant Prasad v Ram Ratan 348  
 Rajwanta v Shiam 933  
 Rak Kumar v Allimaddi 42  
 Rakhal v Adwya 875  
 Rakhal v Ashutosh 10  
 Rakhal Chandra v Bai Kuntha 830  
 Rakhal Doss v Heera 41  
 Rakhmabai v Mahadeo 815  
 Raidu Singh v Sanwal Singh 1013  
 Ralegh v Goschen 429 501  
 Ralia v Amir 441  
 Ralla v Manglan 1055  
 Ralla Ram v Raj 533  
 Ralli v Gau Hin 840  
 Ram Adhar v Narain Das 168  
 Ram Adhin v Ram Bharose 602 604  
 Ram Adhin v Ram Lot 171  
 Ram Autar v Devki 315  
 Ram Bahadur v Radha Krishen 1040  
 Ram Bahadur v Ram Shankar 302  
 Ram Baran v Bhagwati 1055 1057  
 Ram Bhaj v Ram Das 212  
 Ram Bilas v Lal Bahadur 304  
 Ram Bilas v Nityanand 271  
 Ram Chand v Chhajjee Ram 398  
 Ram Chand v Durga Prasad 50  
 Ram Chand v Pitam Mal 957  
 Ram Chand v Sham Parshad 381  
 Ram Chandra v Ali 421  
 Ram Chandra v Mudeswar 715  
 Ram Chandra v Secretary of State for  
 India 1015  
 Ram Charan v Raghubir 602  
 Ram Charan v Bulaqi 628 630  
 Ram Charan v Hamid 1251 1259  
 Ram Charan v Kishore Lal 120  
 Ram Charan v Reazuddin 75  
 Ram Charan v Sheobarat 239  
 Ram Chunder v Dhurmo 200  
 Ram Chunder v Hamiran 154  
 Ram Chunder v Madho 44  
 Ram Churn v Protap 267  
 Ram Coomar v Collector of Beerbhoom  
 15  
 Ram Coomar v Shushee 762  
 Ram Coomar Coondoo v Chunder Kunto  
 Mookerjee 131 833  
 Ram Das v Badri Narain 280  
 Ram Das v Dubri Koeri 63  
 Ram Das v Panna Devi 984  
 Ram Das v Secretary of State 891

Ram Daval v Madan 76  
 Ram Daval v Meenu Lal 163  
 Ram Daval v Sher Singh 516  
 Ram Dhan v Karam Singh 1180  
 I am Dhan v Prag Narain 1037  
 Ram Dhani v Lalit Singh 96  
 Ram Dial v Ram Das 73 160  
 Ram Din v Bhup Singh 6  
 Ram Din v Kalka 94  
 Ram Ditta v Amar Singh 1196  
 Ram Dival v Mohammad 424  
 I am Dyal v Nurhurry 51  
 Ram Faqir v Bindschri Singh 36 66  
 69  
 Ram Charib v Shankar 311  
 Ram Copal v Har Kishen 44 78  
 I am Copal v Chintamon 354  
 Ram Copal v Khali Ram 160  
 I am Copal v Shamskhatoon 300 301  
 303  
 Ram Govindha v Mungeer Lam 70  
 Ram Gulam v Durga Iershad 8  
 I am Gulam v Sham Sahai 875  
 Ram Harak v Iam Lal 411  
 Ram Het v Pam Iatan 93  
 Ram Jas v Babu 314  
 I am Jatan Lal v Rambit Singh 900  
 Ram Jawaya Mal v Devi Ditta Mal  
 118  
 Ram Kamal v Ahmed Ali 988  
 Ram Kinkar v Sthiti Ram 669 671  
 I am Harpal v Rup Kuar 6 7 9 121  
 142  
 Ram Kishan v Hanshan 93  
 I am Kishun v Jatadhari 639  
 I am Kishun v Ialta Singh 100 346  
 I am Kriana v Vithal 63  
 Ram Kumar v Chartered Bank 96  
 Pam Kumar v Muhammad 34 3  
 I am Kumar v Ram Gaur 766  
 I am Kumar Lal v Raja Mukund Sahi  
 80  
 Pam Labhaya v Hartar Singh 91  
 I am Labhaya v Mukendamal 103 63  
 Ram Lagan v Ram Birick 400  
 I am Lal v Rama Sundari 645  
 I am Lal v Bhola Nath 101  
 Ram Lal v Chhab Nath 36  
 I am Lal v Deoraj 1166  
 Ram Lal v Harpal 66  
 I am Lal v Kabul Singh 1000  
 Ram Lal v Kalka Irsad 100  
 Lal Lal v Ladhey Lal 146

Pam Lal v Iatan Lal 1060  
 Ram Lal v Sid Chand 90  
 I am Lal v Tula Ram 47  
 Pam Manohar v Lal Bahari 11 3  
 I am Mehr v Iah Pam 304  
 Ram Narai v Brij Binker Lal 241  
 I am Narain v Annoda 4 1 403  
 Ram Narain v Baij Nath 1178  
 Ram Narain v Bandi Iershad 901  
 Ram Narain v Besheshar 57  
 Pam Narain v Dwarkanath 762 769  
 I am Narain v Harnam Das 1041  
 Ram Narain v Jagdeo 604  
 I am Narain v Muhtab 766  
 I am Narain v Mina 91  
 Pam Narain v Mahanian 270  
 Ram Narain v Parmeshwar 118  
 Pam Narain v Ram Kishen 478  
 Pam Narain v Shew Bhunjan 166  
 Ram Narain v Umroo Singh 280  
 Ram Narayan Singh v Adhindro Nath  
 335  
 Ram Larka h Das v Anand Das 985  
 Ram Pershad v Bhurosa 808  
 Ram Iershad v Jagannath 150  
 Ram Fer had v Rajunder 1017  
 Ram Iertab v Madho Rai 906  
 Pam Ieri v Kallu 300 1000  
 I am Irsad v Anandji 808  
 I am Irsad v Asa I am 1050  
 Ram Irsad v Bhikari Das 909  
 Ram Prasad v Jagtamba 883  
 Ram Prasad v Mahabir 55 56  
 Ram Prasad v Musst Ajanasia 1000  
 Ram Irsad Mala In re 300  
 Ram Irsad v Mast Fulpati 310  
 Ram Irsad Singh v Benares Bank 902  
 Pam Irsad v Anandji 860  
 Pam Ranjan v Indra Narain 923  
 I am Rao v Rustumkhan 28  
 Pam Rattan v Bhuri 69  
 Pam Rattan v Ram Datar 171  
 Ram Ratun v Sheo Nandan 563  
 Ram Ravji v Pralhad las 110  
 Ram Rup v Khadiru 22  
 Ram Ruttun v Land Mortgage Bank  
 40  
 I am Sahai v Ahmali Begam 51  
 I am Sahai v Gaya 66  
 Ram Sahai v Madan Lal 346 606  
 Ram Sahay v Kumar Lachmi 516  
 Ram Saran v Chatar Singh 43 677

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Ram Saran v Gurdhari Lal 353                              | Ramacharya v Anantacharya 96 797<br>1245 |
| Ram Saran v Radha 349 811                                 | Ramachandraray v Noorulla Sahib 308      |
| Ram Sarup v Bharat Singh 726                              | Ramados v Hanumantha 272 278             |
| Ram Sarup v Dalpat 76                                     | Ramakka v Negasam 373 622                |
| Ram Sarup v Dasrath 170                                   | Ramakrishna v Balakrishna 640            |
| Ram Sarup v Gaya Prasad 354                               | Ramalinga v Paghunatha 32                |
| Ram Sarup v Jaswant Rai 321                               | Raman v Bacha 47                         |
| Ram Sarup v Moti Ram 788 796                              | Raman v Gopila 982                       |
| Ram Sarup v Narain Da 932                                 | Raman v Gopalachari 106 107              |
| Ram Sarup v Shah Lafafat 877                              | Raman v Kunhayan 760                     |
| Ram Sarup v Sital 626                                     | Raman v Secretary of State 90            |
| Ram Dewal v Lambar 783 791                                | Paman Nayar v Krishnan 1009 1011         |
| Ram Shankar v Ganesh Prasad 900                           | Ramasona v Venkatanarayana 48            |
| Ram Singh v Ganga Ram 300                                 | Ramana v Babu 174                        |
| Ram Singh v Salig Ram 347 749                             | Ramanada v Minatche 786 806              |
| Ram Singh v Sham Parshad 351                              | Ramanadan v Pulikutti 504                |
| Ram Singh v Warren Singh 13                               | Ramanadhan v Narayanan 1062              |
| Ram Subhag v Narasingh 900                                | Ramanand v Chhotey Lal 183               |
| Ram Sukh v Pam Sahai 18                                   | Ramanand v Jai Ram 151                   |
| Ram Sukh Das v Ghulam 510                                 | Ramanathan v Arunachellam 216 425<br>992 |
| Ram Sukh Das v Tota Ram 660                               | Ramalinga v Gokulda 125                  |
| Ram Sukhal v Maharajah Kesho Prasad<br>1002               | Ramalingam v Subrahmanya 1025            |
| Pam Sunder v Jai Karan 82                                 | Ramanathan v Doraiswami, 386             |
| Ram Sunder v Pam Dheyan 962                               | Ramanathan v Kalimuthu 84                |
| Ram Tahal v Sule hwar 958                                 | Ramanathan v Karuppayya 154              |
| Ram Ugram v Achraj Nath 1194                              | Ramanathan v Levvai 159                  |
| Rama v Bhagchand 73                                       | Ramanathan v Mohideen 174                |
| Rama v Govinda 286  | Ramanathan v Subramanya 232 240<br>331   |
| Rama v Krishna 84   | Ramanathan v Vankatachellam 11<br>728    |
| Rama v Shivram 24   | Ramani v Narayanaswami 114 115           |
| Rama Aiyar v Venkatachella 816                            | Ramanjulu v Aravamudu 438                |
| Rama Ayyan v Sreenivasa 641                               | Pamanuja v Devanayaka 406 407<br>448     |
| Rama Rao v The Paja of Pittapur<br>430 434                | Pamanuja v Rangeswami 539                |
| Rama Peddi v Appaji Reddi 934                             | Ramanujam Chetty v Padmanabham<br>932    |
| Rama Sheno v Hallagna 86                                  | Pampat v Habib Ullah 575                 |
| Pama Varma v Ramannayar 194                               | Pamappa v Bharna 1055                    |
| Ramabhabra v Hadriyasami 160                              | Pamappa v Ekambara 721                   |
| Ramachandra v Abdul 656                                   | Pamappa v Ganpat 103                     |
| Ramachandra v Chaitana 292                                | Ramaraya v Sherbott 635                  |
| Ramachandra v Devu 125                                    | Ramasamayyan v Virasami 903              |
| Ramachandra v Haji Kasim 770                              | Ramasami v Bagrathi 177                  |
| Ramachandra v Keshav 100                                  | Ramasami v Chinnam 626                   |
| Ramachandra v Parameshwaran 268                           | Ramasami v Kal 345                       |
| Ramachandra v Sri Raja Bhujanga 623                       | Pamasami v Karuppan 36                   |
| Ramachandra v Srinivasa 746                               | Ramasami v Marudai 71                    |
| Ramachandra v Subramanya 655                              | Ramasami v Narayanasami 114 1009         |
| Pamachandra v The President of<br>Vakils Association 1271 | Ramasami v Venkatasami 129               |
| Ramachandram v Neelambar 33                               | Ramasamy v Orr 1019                      |
| Ramachari v Duraisami 863                                 |  |



Ramasamy v Subramania 620  
 Pamaswami v Alamelu 70  
 Pamaswami v Ayyalu 979  
 Pamaswami v Doraiswami 868  
 Ramaswami v Kam Swaramma 155  
 Ramaswami v Vallappa 723  
 Ramaswami v Muthayya 151  
 Pamaswami v Muthu 345 349  
 Pamaswami v Padamunayya 13 734  
 Pamaswami v Subbaraya 825 938  
 Pamaswami v Sundara 136 913  
 Pamaswami v Tyajaraja 582  
 Ramaswami v Vvthinatha 45 47 51 435  
 Pamaswami Naidu v Ayyalu 977  
 Ramaswami v Murada 71  
 Pamaswami v Iyagaraja 532  
 Pamaswami Venkatarama 1186  
 Ramatbai v Peria 223  
 Ramava v Rangayya 602  
 Pamayya v Bapayya 1189  
 Pamayya v Krishnamurti 659 660  
 Pamayya v Subbarayudu 984  
 Pamayyengar v Krishnayyengar 268  
 Ramayyar v Pamayyar 641  
 Rambhat v Shankar 110  
 Pambu Jhavar v Bankey 381  
 Rambrohm v Buns 57  
 Pamchaibar v Bechu 754  
 Pamchand v Goverdhandas 318 319  
 Pamchand v Jana 684  
 Pamchand v Maula Balhsh 58  
 Pamchand v Pama Nand 984  
 Pamchandar v Ganapatram 108  
 Pamchandar v Jai Mal 399  
 Pamchander v Mohendro Nath 145  
 Ramchandra v Balbhum 73  
 Ramchandra v Balmukund 992  
 Ramchandra v Belya 741  
 Ramchandra v Gajanan 163 439  
 Ramchandra v Ganesh 120  
 Ramchandra v Haji Kassim 3 1009  
 Ramchandra v Hanmanta 813 908  
 Ramchandra v Keshav 100  
 Ramchandra v Krishnaji 184  
 Ramchandra v Lodha 441  
 Ramchandra v Madhav 11 540  
 Ramchandra v Malkappa 57  
 Ramchandra v Narasimhaacharya 70  
 Ramchandra v Narayan 5  
 Ramchandra v Radha 126  
 Ramchandra v Pakhmasai 744 74  
 Ramchandra v Ramchandra 77  
 Ramchandra v Shrinivas 73

Ramchandra v Shripatrao 799 904  
 Ramchandra v Sono 1015  
 Ramchandra v Vasudev 502  
 Ramchandra v Venkiah 887  
 Ramchandra v Mahadev 1238  
 Pamchandra Das v Joti Prasad 866  
 Pamcharan v Raghurur 539  
 Ramchabaibar v Bechu 202  
 Pamdaz v Official Liquidator 1017  
 Pamdaz v Vazirsahel 56  
 Pamdaz v Dhanpat 105  
 Pamdaz v Kannamal 669  
 Ramdayal v Jankidas 64  
 Ramdeo v Ganeshrarain 818  
 Ramdeo v Pokhiram 526  
 Ramdhan v Fajballab 606  
 Pamdhani v Rajrani 731 737  
 Pamdhari Singh v Permanund 527  
 Pamdoyal v Jonmenjoy 432  
 Pamendra Nath v Brajendra Nath 405  
 411 412 413 416 447 448 449 1253  
 Pamesh Chandra v Emperor 607  
 Ramesh Chandra v Karunamoyi 1173  
 1185  
 Rameshar v Pajdhan 119  
 Pamesh handra v Maharaja Birendra  
 205 882  
 Rameshra v Kalpa 1019  
 Pameshur v Sheodin 1013  
 Pameshur Singh v Sheodin 115 1009  
 Pameshwar v Dwarka Prasad 1054  
 Pameshwar v Lala 392  
 Rameshwar Singh v Chuni Lal Shaha  
 976  
 Pameshwar Singh v Hitendra Singh 180  
 Pameshwar v Siddeshwar 1035  
 Rameshwardhari v Sadhu 517  
 Pameswari Dassee v Doorga Dass 669  
 Pameswar v Dilu 141  
 Rameswar v Mohd Hossein 933  
 Rameshwar Per had v Pam Bahadur  
 Singh 877  
 Ramgobind v Thakur Dayal 1291  
 Ramgopal v Dharendra 493  
 Ramgopal v Narendra Nath 338  
 Ramgopal v Joharmall 317  
 Ramgulam v Chintaman 622  
 Ramgulam v Sheo Deonarain 543  
 Pam Deka v Brojo Nath 908 1021  
 Ramiah v Gopalier 902  
 Ramireddi v Subbareddi 71  
 Ramp v Alafshan 434  
 Ramp v Ellis 129

- Ramji v Giani 400  
 Ramji v Koman 900  
 Ramji v Pandharinath 73 900  
 Rampibun v Oghore Nath 582  
 Ramjidas v Howe 260 1191  
 Ramji Das v Ajudhua 1007  
 Pamji Lal v Karan Singh 640 921  
 Ramji Ram v Saligram 971  
 Ramjiwan v Chand Mal 200 1006  
 Ramkinkar v Akhil Chandra 430  
 Pamkian Singh v Mohammad 1208  
 Ramkisen Lal v Manna Kumari 1033  
 Ramkor v Gangaram 300  
 Ramkrishna v The President of the Ven  
 gurla Municipality 307  
 Ramkrishna v Vinayak 163 904  
 Ramkrishnama v Bhagamma 91  
 Ramkumar v Halikumar 130  
 Ramlal v Deodhari Ra 520 526 53  
 Ramlal v Kanchand 114 267 313  
 319 321 1194 1197  
 Pamnand v Jai Pam 104  
 Pamnaran v Bandi Pershad 161  
 Ramnath v Matungince 530  
 Ramnath v Parabhu Daval 570  
 Pampada v Kanaai Pai 103  
 Pampal Singh v Abdul Hamid 708  
 Rampersad v Juggernath 1171  
 Ramphul v Durga 1046  
 Ramphul v Ram Baran 141  
 Pamprasad v Mohanlal 1190  
 Pamprasad v Shrinivas 132 433  
 Rampratab v Fooliba 1246  
 Rampratab v Gavrishankar 431 794  
 801 860 1246  
 Rampratap v Durgaprasad 1181  
 Rampurtab v Premasuk 104 107 1245  
 1248  
 Pamratan Sukul v Mussamat Nandu  
 301  
 Ramrup v Ramdhan 279  
 Ramrup Das v Mohunt 340  
 Ramsahay v Kumar Lachmi 390 391  
 Ramsami v Srinivasa 694  
 Pamsaran Mandar v Mahabir Sahu 500  
 Pamsebuk v Ramlal 432  
 Pamsingh v Baluba 996  
 Ramsumaran Prasad v Shyam Kumari  
 60  
 Ramu Aiyar v Palamappa 720  
 Ramu Aiyar v Sanlara Aiyar 90 91  
 Ramu Rai v Dayal Singh 146  
 Ramvien v Veerappudayam 294  
 Ramyad v Rambildas 320  
 Ramzan v Gerard 188  
 Ramzan v Nabi Buk 1019  
 Ranchhod v The Municipality of Dakor  
 49  
 Ranchhod v Secretary of State 582  
 Ranchod v Bezant 890 896  
 Ranchordas v Bai Kasi 132 133  
 Randell v Thompson 1191  
 Rance Annapurni v Swaminatha 977  
 Rang Lal Singh v Ravaneshwar 703  
 Ranga v Narayana 73  
 Ranga v Rajagopala 873  
 Rangacharya v Guru Reoti 814  
 Rangam Lal v Jhandu 1020  
 Rangammal v Sevugan 714  
 Ranganatha v Hanumantha 392  
 Panganatha v Srinivasa 682 723  
 Rangasami v Muttusami 1174  
 Rangasami v Periasami 212 217  
 Rangasami v Ranga 194  
 Rangasami v Varadappa 266 271  
 Rangasami Nadan v Subbaraya 52  
 Rangasamy v Chinnasamy 277  
 Rangasamy v Jelli Bodi 901 903  
 Rangasamy v Thirupati 141 164  
 Rangasayi v Mahalakshamma 1037  
 Rangaswami v Krishnaswami 420  
 Rangaswamy v Appaswamy 47  
 Rangayya v Nanjappa 445  
 Rangayya v Parthasarathi 902  
 Rangayya v Patnam 66  
 Rangayya v Subramama 450  
 Rangi Ram v Gangu 211  
 Rangji v Bhaji 10 644 1046  
 Rango v Mudiyeppa 72 73  
 Rango Jairam v Balakrishna 696  
 Rango Lal v Wilson 93  
 Rangoon Botatoung Co v Collector of  
 Rangoon 288 1271  
 Rani Amrita v Munshi 841  
 Rani Bisani v Minor son of Madho Singh  
 345  
 Rani Beni Prasad v Edal Singh 726  
 Rani Kashori v Raja Ram 66  
 Rani Lalun v Behari 126  
 Rani Jotirmoyee v Paghunath 905  
 Ranji v Bhaji 10  
 Ranjit v Bissay 1174  
 Ranjit Singh v Bunwari Lal 683  
 Ranmalsangji v Kundankuwar 141  
 Raoji v Anant 790

Raoji Ranchod v Vishnu 4  
 Raoji v Bansulal 748  
 Raoji v Laxmibai 324 328 329  
 Raojibhai v Dabhyabhai 1185  
 Rapaport v Hallianji 571  
 Rarichan v Manakkal 865 871  
 Raru Kult v Mamad 1056  
 Rasbotham v Shropshire Union Rail  
   ways and Canal Co 563  
 Rash Behari v Hemanta 1051  
 Rash Behary v Bhowani Churn 962  
 Pashbehary v Surnomovee 156  
 Rashid un nissa v Muhammad 155  
   210 860 867 870  
 Rasik v Kumar Jyotish 868  
 Rasik Lal v Bidhu Mukhi 3  
 Rassam v Budge 480 494 496 521  
 Rasu v Kattara 353  
 Rasul Jehan v Ram Surun 510  
 Rasul Karim v Pirubhai 967  
 Ratanbai v Shankar 603  
 Ratanchand v Damji 935 1055 1056  
 Ratanchand v Gobind 1241  
 Ratan Chand v Secretary of State 103  
 Ratan v Khatoo 143  
 Ratan Lal v Bala Parshad 712  
 Ratan Lal v Muhammad 817  
 Ratanbai v Narayandas 508  
 Ratanlal v Bai Gulab 654  
 Ratcliffe v Evans 482  
 Rathnasabapathy v Gopala 441  
 Rati Ram v Barhmajit 722  
 Ratna Mala Dasi v Kamakhya 896  
 Ratnakar v Chamra 910  
 Rattan Chand v Ram Kishan 61  
 Ratnam v Annamalai 803  
 Ratnam v Nataraja 784  
 Ratnagiri Pillai v Yava Ravethan 96  
   100  
 Ratnaswami v Ratnammal 825 827  
 Ratti Ram v Kundan Lal 113  
 Rattan v Bishan 07  
 Rattonbai v Chabildas 864 865  
 Ravi Varma v Koman 183  
 Ravinandan v Jagannath 751  
 Ravji v Mahadev 428 900  
 Rayala v Ramudu 444  
 Raynor v Mussoorie Bank 155  
 Re Fazoo v Sultan Ahmed 746  
 Rees v Richmond 493  
 Read v Brown 103  
 Reasut v Hadjee Abdoolah 1052  
 Pebati v Harish Chandra 493

Rebels v Pebells 868  
 Reference In the matter of 595  
 Refaat v Bibi Tuwaif 135  
 Reg v Nantamram 17  
 Rego v Philip 437  
 Reid v Cupper 579  
 Reid Hewitt & Co v Joseph 130  
 Rekhhab Das v Mt Sheobai 70  
 Remfrv v Shillingford 949  
 Renga v Gnanaprakasa 790  
 Rengasami v Subburoya 935  
 Republic of Peru v Wegulin 255  
 Revji v Sakaram 884  
 Rewa Mahton v Ramkishan Singh 217  
   665 666  
 Rewan v Jankee 587  
 Reynell v Sprye 565  
 Rhimbar v Mariam 345  
 Rhoda v Sugden 529  
 Rhodes v Swithen Bank 283 387  
 Richardson v Government 334  
 Richard on v Mayor of Oxford 410  
 Riddell v Earl of Strathmore 477  
 Riding v Hawkins 504  
 Rifaat v Bibi Tawaf 547  
 Rikhai Rai v Sheo Pujan Singh 13 784  
 Riki Ram v Sheo Iershan 934  
 Rikhi Pam v Durga Dass 424  
 Risheshar Kuar v Hari Singh 750  
 Rishikesh v Manik Molla 767  
 Roberts v Harrison 1174  
 Poberts v Manett 490  
 Roberts v Oppenheim 567 511  
 Roberts v Owen 484  
 Robindra v Jogendra 1168 1172  
 Robinson v Lord Byron 967  
 Robinson v Pickering 961 974  
 Rock v Pursell 494  
 Rodashwar v Mantroop 129  
 Rodger v Ashutosh 973  
 Rodger v Comptoir d'Escompte de  
   Paris 374 375 376  
 Rodricks v Secretary of State 247 1248  
 Rogers & Co v Lambert & Co 561  
 Rohilkhand Bank v Row 296  
 Rohmoni v Zamiruddin 1021  
 Rohini Kumar v Kusum Kamini 893  
 Rohni Singh v Hodding 375  
 Romanayakudu v Boya 207  
 Romdoyal v Ramdeo 530  
 Romesh v Monundra 7 10 997  
 Romnath v Goggoode 473  
 Romesh Chunder v Huru Mondal 3

Roop Chand v Sardar Khan 437 790  
 Poop Lal v Belani 158  
 Poop Lal v Lakshmi Das 296  
 Roopchand v Haji Hussein 472  
 Roope v Pravee Lal 30  
 Roper Re 398  
 Roshan Lal v Lallu 717  
 Roshan Lal v Muhammad 206  
 Roshan Singh v Mata Din 642  
 Ross v Pitambar 300 351  
 Ross v Secretary of State 30 246  
 Ross v Woodford 837  
 Ross & Co v Scriven 493 521 574  
 532 533  
 Roselle v Buchaman 484  
 Roulet v Fetterle 266 949  
 Royal Insurance Co v Akhoy Coomar  
 1034  
 Royzuddi v Kali Nath 940  
 Ruben v Grant 490 496  
 Ruckmani v Veerasami 76 787  
 Pudd Pe 398  
 Pudar Prasad v Bai Nath 300 518  
 Pudra v Krishna 194  
 Pudra v Mathura 315  
 Rudra Prasad v Mathura Prasad 1182  
 Rugghan Prasad v Dhanno 276  
 Pughobur v Maina Koer 1178  
 Puhul Amin v Shankar Lal 863  
 Pukam v Tarachand 539 602  
 Rukhanbai v Adamp 820  
 Pukha v Mewa Lal 1024 1025  
 Pukhminbai v Venkatesh 520 62  
 Pukmani v Veerasami 866  
 Pundra Pratap v Sarda 619  
  
 Pukman Devi v Shib Devi 410  
 Pukmani v Krishnamachary 153  
 Pukhmini v Dhondo 56  
 Rukhmini v Rayaji 66  
 Pukminmayi v Paran Chandra 7, 11  
 1001  
 Pulu Singh v Sanwal Singh 312 1254  
 Purnsey v Peade 580  
 Pun Bahadur v Bajrungi 10 339 661  
 Pun Bahadur v Lucho Koer 41 64, 66  
 71  
 Pun Bahadur Case 40  
 Rungachariar v Rungasami 24  
 Rungo v Mudiyeppa 71  
 Rungrat v Siddhi Mahomed 835  
 Runjit Singh v Bunwari Lal 682 683  
 Rup Chand v Bunyad 425

Rup Chand v Dasodha 862 866  
 Rup Jaun Bibee v Abdul Kadir 1024  
 Rup Naram v Pamavee 142  
 Rup Naram v Sheo Prakash 136 171  
 Rup Pam v Fa al Din 540  
 Rup Pam v Harphul, 125 511  
 Rup Singh v Mukhraj 10 987  
 Rupali v Kalyan Singh 106  
 Rupanrai v Subh Karan 184  
 Russell v Russell 1192  
 Russicklal v Jadubram 833  
 Rustomjee v Frederic Gaebele 973  
 Rustomji v Kessowji 600 1000  
 Rustomji v Nurse 780  
 Rustomji v Official Liquidator 290  
 Rustomji v Vinayak 766 767  
 Rutnassar v Hurrish Chunder 125  
 Rutter v Tregent 522 579  
 Ruttonsey v Pooribai 825  
 Ryall v Sherman 602  
 Ryrie v Shivshankar 565 566 569

## S

S A S Chettyar v S A R A. Firm  
 243  
 S American Co Re 292  
 Saadatmand v Phulkuar 321 726 752  
 Sabal Singh v Salik Pam 303  
 Sabapathi v Thandavaraya 763 769  
 Sabapathi v Perumal 840 841 842  
 Sabapathy v Subraya 1003  
 Sabapathy v Vanmahalinga 825 826  
 Sabbu v Ponambala 767  
 Sabhajit v Sri Gopal 156  
 Sabhapathi v Lakshmi 1246  
 Sabhapathi v Narayanasami 288 312  
 995 335 713  
 Sabitri v Savi 393 810 990  
 Sabitri Thakurani v Savi 990  
 Sabu v Dharam 1165  
 Saccharin Corporation Ltd v Chemi  
 sche Fabric Von Heyden Aktienges  
 ellschaft 649  
 Saccharin Corporation Ltd v Wild  
 447  
 Sacha Prasad v Amarnath 153 165  
 677 678 679  
 Sachioyda v Hironomyee 868  
 Sachitanand v Radhapat 156  
 Sachs v Sheilman 485 486

- Sada v Brij Mohan 307  
 Sada Kaur v Buta Singh 9 517  
 Sadagopa v Raghunatha 655  
 Sadagopa Chari v Krishnamachari 424  
 Sadagopa Chariar v Krishnamoorthy  
 Rao 53 321  
 Sadagopachariar v Rama Rao 29  
 Sadak Ali v Samed Ali 21  
 Sadaka v Mahomed Hayath 1259  
 Sadanand v Parashram 529 530  
 Sadar Ali v Dahmuddin 289  
 Sadar Singh v Amar Singh 345  
 Saddruddin v Bani 441  
 Sadashiv v Jayants 140  
 Sadashiv v Maruti 15  
 Sadashiv v Narayan 161 165  
 Sadashiv v Trumbuck 868  
 Sadasiva Pillai v Ramalinga 2  
 Sadasukh v Baijnath 128  
 Sadayappa v Ponnappa 907  
 Saddo v Bani 71  
 Sadek Ali v Samad Ali 722  
 Sahdeo v Kusum 100  
 Sadho v Abhenandan 159 165 227 756  
 Sadho v Hawat 371  
 Sadhu v Dharendra Nath 515  
 Sadhu v Kuppen 46  
 Sadik Husam Khan v Hashim Ali Khan  
 83  
 Sadiq Ali v Anwar Ali 801 1204 1206  
 Sadiq Husam v Lalita Prasad 378 309  
 Sadler v Great Western Railway Co  
 419  
 Sadogopa v Sellama 660  
 Sadu v Pam 420 719  
 Safitannessa v Megh Lal 354  
 Saarmal v Lachmisan 615  
 Sagar v Mafjaddin 378  
 Sah Wan Mull v Kanagasabapathi 156  
 707  
 Sahadara v Nabin 308  
 Sahadeo v Deo Dutt 400  
 Saharabi v Ali 721  
 Sahdeo v Ghasiram 160 669  
 Sahdeo Singh v Melhu Singh 1185  
 Sahib & Co v Adamsa 809 813  
 Sahib Ji v Piru 390  
 Sahib Thambi v Hamid 80 424  
 Sahibzadi v Muhammad 40  
 Sahodra v Bageshwar 627  
 Sahu Bisheshar v Chandu Lal 923  
 Sahu Nand Kishore v Shadi Ram  
 99  
 Sahu Nandlal v Sahu Dharam 1 1  
 Saibai v Balkrishna 593  
 Sailabala v Gadadhar 999  
 Sailendra Nath v Ramsundar 106  
 Sain Ditta v Nur Ahmad 228  
 Sait Siva v A E L Mission 239  
 Saiyid Ali v Ali Jan 271  
 Sajedur Raja v Baidyanath 131 419  
 Sajedur Raja v Gour Mohun 267 269,  
 20 27,  
 Sajjad v Ishaq 320  
 Sajjad Ali v Jagmohan 1031  
 Sajjadi v Dilawar 358  
 Sakalchand v Ambaram 1173  
 Sakarlal v Bai Parvati 678  
 Sakarlal v Parvatibai 179  
 Saleena Bibi v Stephens 330 352  
 Sakhalchand v Velchand 135 136  
 Sakharan v Gangaram 119  
 Sakharan v Ganu 272  
 Sakharan v Padmakar 470  
 Sakharan v Sadashiv 7 204  
 Sakharan v Vishram 93  
 Sakina v Ganesh 141 173  
 Sakina v Gauri 40  
 Sakina Bibi v Ganesh 173  
 Sakunbai v Shrinibai 874 877  
 Saklat v Della 81 1037  
 Sakunbai v Ganpat 1031  
 Sakumari v Magneeram 385  
 Sakyahani v Bhavani 119 780  
 Salakshi v Lakshmayee 190  
 Salaluddin v Afza Begum 866 988  
 Salam Chand v Bhagwan Das 341  
 Salamchand v Joogul Kishore 368  
 Salaman v Warner 319  
 Salar Beg v Hotayya 543  
 Saldanha v Hart 996  
 Salig Ram v Chaba Mal 104  
 Salig Ram v Muradan 913  
 Salig Ram v Lampi Lal 305 1221  
 Salima Bibi v Sheikh Muhammad 103  
 406 408 449 1010  
 Salig Pam v Bassao Mal 23  
 Salleh Mahomed v Nathoomal 1177  
 Salvarayan v Amalorpavanadam 553  
 Sama Rayar v Annamalai 81  
 Samanta v Lokenath 93  
 Samar Singh v Deonandan 915  
 Samarapuri v Parry & Co 365 366  
 Samarendra v Birendra 31  
 Samayya v Subbamma 1002  
 Sambasiva v Veera 548  
 Sambasiva v Tydinadaswami 74,

- Sambhutta v Bhagwati 979 983  
 Sami v Krishnaasami 693  
 Sami v Gopal 100  
 Samibai v Premji 820  
 Samin Hasan v Piran 998  
 Saminatha v Pajagopala 430  
 Saminatha v Venkatasubha 10  
 Saminathan v Swamiappa 933  
 Sandaner v Asser 1176  
 Sanders v Hamilton 487  
 Sanderson v Birth Theatre Co 415  
 Sandhu v Hussain 161 163  
 Sangappa v Gangappa 24  
 Sangli v Mookan 841  
 Sanjappa v Shivbasawa 99  
 Sanjivi v Ramasami 150  
 Sankali v Murlidhar 310 90  
 Sankara v Devaki 70  
 Sankara v Gopala 667  
 Sankara v Subraya 447  
 Sankaralinga v Kandasami 213  
 Sankaralinga v Official Receiver 908  
 Sankaralinga v Ratnasabhapati 469  
 Sankaran v Atchutan 144  
 Sankaran v Ambu 663  
 Sankaran v Daraki 863  
 Sankaran v Kanara 640  
 Sankaran v Parvathi 430  
 Sankaran v Paman 634  
 Sankararama v Padmanabha 120  
 Sankumani v Ikoran 119  
 Sankunni v Narayanan 223  
 Sankunni v Vasudevan 394  
 Sannamma v Radhabhaya 150  
 Sant Lal v Ramji 760  
 Sant Prasad v Bhawan 309  
 Sant Pam v Ram Chand 979  
 Sant Sahai v Chuttai 381  
 Sant Singh v Gulab Singh 790 791  
 Sant Singh v Mubarak 348  
 Santa Singh v Ralla Singh 85  
 Santi Lal v Paj Narain 370  
 Santok Chand v Emperor 974  
 Sanwal Das v Bimillah 710  
 Sanwal Das v Collector of Fatah 140  
 Sanwal Singh v Satrupa 339  
 Sanyasi v Artaswaro 70  
 Sanya v Krishnadhan 318 61 851  
 Sanyasi Charan Mandal v Krishnadhan 318  
 Sanyasi v Yerrannaidu 822 875  
 Sarabjit v Raj Kumar 681  
 Sara Bi v Hamid 399  
 Sara Chandra v Bibhati 81  
 Sarada Sundari v Gangahari 1026  
 Saradendu v Gosta 220 730  
 Saral Chand v Mohun Bibi 430 504  
 Sarala v Kamashala 721  
 Sarala Das v Jogendra 934  
 Sarangapani v Narayanasami 1007  
 Saran v Bhagwan 153  
 Saranjan v Ram Behal 11 388 389  
 Saraspur Manufacturing Co v B B & C I Ry Co 433  
 Saraswati v Golap Das 167 993  
 Saraswati v Moti 10  
 Saraswati v The Land Acquisition Deputy Collector 345  
 Sarat v Rajkumar 1190  
 Sarat v Ram 838  
 Sarat Chand v Mohun Bibi 501  
 Sarat Chandra v Apurba 973  
 Sarat Chandra v Bibhati 871  
 Sarat Chandra v Bisweswar 390  
 Sarat Chandra v Dimodar 546  
 Sarat Chandra v Forman 109  
 Sarat Chandra v Maihar Stone and Lime Co 800 802 1258  
 Sarat Chandra v Nabapiet 918 1240  
 Sarat Chandra v Nani Mohan 778 779  
 Sarat Chandra v Subasheni 381  
 Sarat Chandra v Tarek Chandra 29  
 Sarat Chandra v Tarini Prosad 721 777  
 Sarat Krishna v Bisweswar 371 443  
 Sarat Singh v Gulab Singh 790  
 Saratmani Debi v Batta Krishna 154 176  
 Saravana v Arunachallam 242  
 Saravana Pillai v Sesha Reddi 1021 1022  
 Sarbhadhicary *In re* 1239  
 Sardar Ali v Dahmuddin 330 1201  
 Sardar Begam v Meher Chand 723  
 Sardar Shah v Mst Sardar Begam 785  
 Sardar Sinchji v Ganpat 200  
 Sardari Lal v Pam Lal 790  
 Sardarmal v Hirdenath 441 445  
 Sardarni v Ram Patton 10 167 228  
 Sardarmal v Aransayal 107  
 Sardarni v Pam Harnam 390 674  
 Sardhari v Hukum Chand 1220 1221  
 Sardhari Lal v Ambika Pershad 710 713 715 718

Saratoola v Rajkumar 161  
 Sarjan Bibi v Ashanula 163  
 Sarju v District Judge of Benares 740  
 Sarju v I am Sarap 782  
 Sarju v Thakur 653  
 Sarju Prasad v Bindehari 220  
 Sarju Prasad v Sitaram 370  
 Sarkies v Bundho Bacc 212  
 Sarlun v Rahaman 31  
 Saroda v Harendra 746  
 Saroda Churn v Mahomed 217  
 Saroda Prasad v Luchmeeput 144  
 Saroj v Jatindra 1163  
 Saroj v Mahendra 334  
 Sarojini v Lakhu Priva 42 46 49 52a  
 Saroop Chunder v Troylokhonath 639  
 Saruti v Kun Behari 440  
 Sarup v Khem Lal 67  
 Sarvi Begam v Pim Chandar 47  
 Sisha Ayyar v Nagarathna 993  
 Sashikanta v Sirat Chandra 136  
 Sasirama v Meherban 715 754 937  
 Sasimohan v Hari Nath 59a  
 Sasivarama v Arulanandam 170  
 Sasi Sekhare hwar v Jasit Mohan 1166  
 Sassoon v Gusto Behari 1930  
 Sati Churn v Anoopurna 231  
 Satauda v Satapa 898  
 Satchidananda v Nritta Nath 499  
 Sathappa v Subramanian 320 431  
 Sathappayyar v Periasami 269  
 Sathu Kanar v Ramaswami 133  
 Sati Nath v Ratanmani 997  
 Satindra Nath v Shuva 721 724  
 Satis Chandra v Hashem Ali 871  
 Satish Chandra v Ahara Prasad 539  
 540  
 Satish Chandra v Nishi Chandra 167  
 Satish Chandra v Porter 734  
 Satish Chandra v Rakhal 347  
 Satischandra v Paliram 7 1188  
 Satish Chander v Thomas 733  
 Satish Chandra v Satish Kanta 840  
 Satish Ranjan v Mercantile Bank of  
 India 923  
 Satku v Ibrahim 262 264  
 Sato Koer v Gopal Sahu 352  
 Sattayya v Soundarathachu 464  
 Satto v Amar Singh 390  
 Satu v Hanmantrao 535  
 Satwaji v Sakharlal 135 136  
 Satya Charan v Medhub 207

Satya Kinkar v Raja Prasad Singh 290  
 Satya Kumar v Satya Kirpal 129  
 Satya Narayan v Industrial Bank 1221  
 Satya Narayan v Govind 776  
 Satya Narayana v Venkata 1271 1275  
 Satya Panjan v Sarat Chandra 13  
 Satyabadi v Harabati 52a 69  
 Satyabhambai v Ganesh 808  
 Satyanarayana v Venkata 336  
 Satyanarayana Moorthi v Butchayya  
 821  
 Satyendra Nath v Narendra 535  
 Satyendra Nath Ray v Kustura Kumari  
 613  
 Satyendra Nath v Charn Chandra 761  
 Saudamini v Behary Lal 681 893  
 Saunders v Jones 401 487 463 556  
 Saurendra Mohan v Hurruk Chand 726  
 Saurindra Nath v Mritunjay 10 167  
 729  
 Savago v Snell 943  
 Savalappa v Devchand 1170  
 Savan v Ramanatha 1253  
 Savarimuthu v Anthurusu 308  
 Savarimuthu v Alegiam 90  
 Savi v Savitri 319  
 Savitri v Ramji 315  
 Savitri v Savi 1006  
 Savitri Thukarain v Savi 288  
 Saw v Baggah 10 834  
 Sawan Mal v Shih Dyal 766  
 Sawan Singh v Mothu 1012  
 Sawmy Rao v Official Assignee 449  
 446  
 Saya Bva v Maung Kyaw Shun 331  
 Saya Hatie v Ma Pra Sa 617  
 Saya Lye v Kundinnya 1958  
 Sayad Abdul v Ghulam 427  
 Sayad Hahum v Huseinsha 26  
 Sayad Hussein v Collector of Kaira 269  
 270 280  
 Sayad Mir Nawab v Hardeo 789  
 Sayad Muhammad v Fattch Muhammad  
 588  
 Sayad Mahomed v Thakurlal 1207  
 Sayad Nyamtula v Nana 114 306  
 Sayad Zain v Kalabhai 1186  
 Sayadkhan v Davies 696  
 Sayed Sulman v Bontala 440  
 Sayma Bibi v Madhusudan 314 315  
 Sayyad Jiaul v Sitaram 676 780  
 Sayyed v Dost 282

Schnabacher *Pe* 424  
 Scott v Brown Doering & Co 490  
 Sebright v Hanbury 559  
 Secretary of State v Bejov Kumar 1000  
 Secretary of State v Bhagurathibai 894  
 Secretary of State v Bhagwanthi 833  
 Secretary of State v Bombay Landing Co 249 8 2  
 Secretary of State v British India Steam Navigation Co 1-71  
 Secretary of State v Cockcroft 30 246  
 Secretary of State v Fazal 1041  
 Secretary of State v Gajanan 251  
 Secretary of State v Gulam Rasul 246 251  
 Secretary of State v Hari 246  
 Secretary of State v Hughes 30  
 Secretary of State v Jawahir Lal 789 800  
 Secretary of State v Jehangir 312  
 Secretary of State v Jillo 7 857  
 Secretary of State v Judah 190  
 Secretary of State v Kalekhan 249 250  
 Secretary of State v Lown Karan 133  
 Secretary of State v Mahant 500  
 Secretary of State v Marjum 13-  
 Secretary of State v Mathurabhai 510  
 Secretary of State v Moment 30 246  
 Secretary of State v Narayan 8 3 894  
 Secretary of State v Narsibhai 319  
 Secretary of State v Nataraj 514  
 Secretary of State v Nundun Lal 180  
 Secretary of State v Perumal 248  
 Secretary of State v Raj Kumar 200  
 Secretary of State v Rajlucky 250  
 Secretary of State v Ramnatha 290  
 Secretary of State v Shrimati 683  
 Secretary of State v Syed Ahmed Badsha 61  
 Secretary of State v Tripurna 180 893  
 Secretary of State v Upendra 984  
 Secretary of State v Venku 891  
 Seeni Nadan v Muthusami 139 140 392  
 Seetani v Nenku 723  
 Seethai Ammal v Narayan 9-7  
 Seligmann v Young 483  
 Sellappa Goundan v Masa Naiken 870  
 Sennaji v Pannaji 33 954  
 Seodoyal v Johannull 851  
 Serajul Huq v Abdul Rahman 415

Seru Mohan v Bhagoban 772  
 Sessa Ayyar v Nagarathna 997  
 Seshadri v Krishnan 938  
 Seshadri v Nataraj 206  
 Seshagiri v Askur Jung 1246  
 Seshagiri v Hanumantha 863  
 Seshagiri v Nawab Askar 104 10- 834 1206  
 Seshagiri v Rama Rau 1245  
 Seshagiri v Shrinivasa 671  
 Seshamma v Chennappa 4-7  
 Seshamma v Suryanarayana 814  
 Seshamma v Venkata Rao 794 801  
 Seshan v Veera 432  
 Seshayya v Subayya 812 813  
 Seshayyengar v Jainudin 906  
 Seshgiri v Manjappa 324 328  
 Set Umedmal v Brinath 151 217 734  
 Sethchand v Durga 1-8  
 Seth Chand Mull v Purshottam 901  
 Seth Dooly Chand v Manuji 1160  
 Seth Gokul Das v Murlu and Zahm 126  
 Seth Jaidayal v Ram Sahai 2-8  
 Seth Shapurji v Shankar 178  
 Sethna v Hemingway 509  
 Sethuram v Vasanta 874  
 Sethuramasami v Syed Mir Hussein 740  
 Setrucharlu v Maharaja of Jeypur 97 113  
 Sett Munni Lal v Gainsford 200  
 Seturatnam v Venkatachala 310  
 Setal Jeranchod Bhogilal v The Dakore Temple Committee 273  
 Sevugan v Krishna 800  
 Sew Bux v Shib Chunder 233 235 352 353  
 Sewaram v Bajrangdat 107  
 Sewduti loy v Sree Canto 9-8  
 Sha Karamchand v Ghelabhai 6-0  
 Shabbar v Abbas 790  
 Shahuuddin v Dromoorat 1007  
 Shafiq un nissa v Shaban Ali 334  
 Shah Fareed v Sheo Charun 737  
 Shah Mahbun Lal v Sree Kishen Singh 130 314  
 Shah Mehdi Hasan v Ismail Hasan 860  
 Shah Muhammad v Rahmullah 1182  
 Shah Asim v Girdhari 158  
 Shah Vealchand v Lieut Liston 396  
 Shahab Din v Miran Baksh 1003



Shahab Din v Siraj ud-din 397  
 Shahasaheb v Sadaashiv 430 432 897  
 901 903  
 Shahebzadee v Ferguson 17 248 249  
 Shahzad Singh v Hanuman Rai 226  
 Shaik Abdul Karim v Thakurdas 868  
 8 0  
 Shaik Atham v Davud 12 83 84  
 Shaik Muhammad Nasrulla v Sheikh  
 Muhammad Shukurulla 888  
 Shaik Saheb v Mahomed 70 603  
 Shaikh Kamar ud din v Jawahir Lal  
 212  
 Shaik Niamat v Shaik Jahl 640  
 Shaikh Moosa v Shaikh Essa 3  
 Shaikh Mahomed v Sheikh Abdul Pa-  
 him 1196 1197  
 Shaikh Moheecooddeen v Shaikh Ahmad  
 960  
 Shaikh Muhammad v Chulhai Mahto  
 539 602  
 Shaikh Sujay v Sakai Rai 871  
 Shailajananda v Umeshanunda 267  
 Sham Chand v Bhayaram 779 801  
 975  
 Sham Charan v Chowdbry Debya Singh  
 864  
 Sham Kishore v Shoshubhoosun 508  
 0  
 Sham Lal v Amar Prasad 15  
 Sham Lal v Ghasia 866  
 Sham Lal v Mian Kunwar 1184  
 Sham Lal v Modhusudan 178  
 Sham Parshad v Ram Chand 381  
 Sham Sundar v Muhammad 913  
 Sham Sundar v Munshi 747  
 Shama Charan v Kasi Naik 64  
 Shama Churn v Prosunno 38  
 Shama Dass v Hurbuns 11  
 Shama Kanta Chatterji & Co v Kusum  
 1248  
 Shama Sundram v Abdul Latif 1166  
 Shambhu v Kanhaya 866  
 Shambhu Nath v Satish Chandra 620  
 622  
 Shamchand v Bhayaram 78  
 Shamchandra v Bhikamchand 1243  
 Shamji v Poonja 190  
 Shamray v Nilaji 141 346  
 Shamsheer v Isare Lal 304  
 Shamsunder v Anath Bandhu 141  
 Shamu Patter v Abdul Kadir 394 390  
 591  
 Shankar v Dattaraya 670  
 Shankar v Ganpat 939  
 Shankar v Hardeo 619

Shankar v Narainha 319  
 Shankar v Radha 539  
 Shankar v Ramchandra 1188  
 Shankar v Umabai 196  
 Shankar Baksh v Bulwant Singh 1058  
 Shankar Baksh v Daya Shankar 540  
 Shankar Das v Amarchand 1196  
 Shankar Das v Behari Lal 629 979  
 Shankar Sarup v Mejo Mal 52 241 242  
 Shankara v Hanma 24 26  
 Shankarapa v Danapa 617  
 Shankarbhai v Soonabhai 1049  
 Shankarbhai v Motilal 790 791 792  
 Shankarbhai v Somabhai 307  
 Shankarbhat v Sakhrambhat 890  
 Shankarlal v Dakore Temple Committee  
 421  
 Shankerbhai v Motilal 790  
 Shanker Bharati v Narainha 826  
 Shanker Ban v Ram Doo 342 887  
 Shanker v Gangaram 619 621 623  
 Shanks v Secretary of State 634  
 Shanmuga v Narayana 863  
 Shanmuga v Ramanathan 141  
 Shanmuga v Subbayya 393 409 425  
 Shanmugan v Ianchali 441  
 Shanmuka v Arunachalam 415 453  
 Shanran Bibi v Abdus Samad 888  
 Shantmurti v Narayan 748  
 Shanto Chunder v Nain Sukh 766 769  
 Sharat Chunder v Kartick Chunder  
 876  
 Shard In the matter of 302  
 Sharfu v Mirkhan 15  
 Sharfunnessa v Nazni 894  
 Sharif v Haidar 503  
 Sharifa v Mune Khan 29 779  
 Sharoda Moyee v Wooma Moyee 689 754  
 Sharup Chand v Lat Das ee 1052  
 Shashi Bhusan v Hari Narain 804  
 Shauran v Abdus 342  
 Shavakshaw v Tyab Haji Ayub 820  
 Shaw v Smith 509  
 Shayam Karam v Collector of Benares  
 1703  
 Sheikh Ahmed v Shahzada 652  
 Sheikh Budan v Ramchandra 79 141  
 Sheikh Ibrahim v Rama Iyer 903  
 Sheikh Ismail v Rajab Rawther 218  
 Sheikh Maula Bux v Raghubar 706  
 Sheikh Mohammed Maracayar v Ranga-  
 sami 1012

- Sheikh Abdul v Shib Lal 903  
 Sheikh Elahi Bux v Nawab Lal 644  
 Sheikh Hasan v Mahomed 816  
 Sheikh Ha u v Ram Kumar 64  
 Sheikh Kallu v Nadir Bakhsh 541 553  
 Sheikh Kaloo v Bholanath 150  
 Sheikh Karoo v Parneshwar Rao 180  
 Sheikh Khoorshed v Nubbee 06  
 Sheikh Mania Bux v Paghubar 00  
 706  
 Sheikh v Whatab 623  
 Sheikh Mohammad v Mahtab 19 141  
 673  
 Sheikh Nasir v Emperor 673  
 Sheikh Nasir v Muhammad 100  
 Sheikh Suleman v Shivram 306  
 Sheldon Re 061  
 Shelley Bonnerjee v Raj Chandra Datt  
 943  
 Sheo Babu v Udit Narain 1190  
 Sheo Charan v Taj Bhai 104  
 Sheo Darhan v Beni Chaudhri 922  
 Sheo Dat v Sheo Shankar 1189  
 Sheo Denu v Tulshu 90 91  
 Sheo Kumar v Naraindas 441  
 Sheo Mangal v Musammatt Hulsa 79  
 Sheo Narain v Churni Lal 107 930  
 Sheo Narain v Nur Muhammad 769  
 772  
 Sheo Narain v Parmeshwar 60  
 Sheo Nath v Ram Din 314 315  
 Sheo Nath v Sukh Lal 876  
 Sheo Pargash v Nawab Singh 150  
 Sheo Parshad v Indore Malwa United  
 Mills Ltd 031 1191  
 Sheo Prasad v Behari Lal 899  
 Sheo Prasad v Hira Lal 177  
 Sheo Prasad v Kastura Kuar 343  
 Sheo Prasad v Lall 106 170 608  
 Sheo Prasad v Muhammad 227  
 Sheo Prasad v Premna Kunwar 755  
 Sheo Pargash v Bhoop Narain 672  
 Sheo Ratan v Lappu Kuar 1002  
 Sheo Patan v Sheo Sahai 38 51 4 6  
 Sheo Shankar v Churni Lal 666  
 Sheo Shankar v Jaddo Kunwar 904  
 Sheo Sharan v Mohabir Pershad 527  
 Sheo Tahal v Sheodan Rai 899  
 Sheoambar v Lallu 1009  
 Sheoambar v Deodat 816 1169  
 Sheobaran Singh v Bhagwan Sahi 441  
 Sheobodh v Shiva 337  
 Sheodan v Balkaran 306  
 Sheodeni v Ram Saran 937  
 Sheodhvan v Bholanath 754  
 Sheodial v Durga Kuar 108  
 Sheodihal v Bhawan 163 379  
 Sheogobinda v Dhanukdhar 762  
 Sheonandan v King Emperor 1220,  
 1221 1249 1264  
 Sheonaram v Churni Lal 156  
 Sheonath v Ramnath 314  
 Sheoparan v Ramnandan 38 65  
 Sheopat Rai v Haral Chand 140 646  
 Sheopujan v Maharaja 302 305 504  
 Sheoran v Copal 714  
 Sheoraj v Kameshar 78  
 Sheorant v Thakur 298  
 Sheorania v Bharat Singh 863  
 Sheoratan v Ram Pargash 204  
 Sheorutton v Net Loll 758  
 Sheosagar v Sitaram 70 73  
 Shepherd v Robinson 14  
 Sheriff of Bombay v Hakimaji 251  
 Sher Ali v Mangu 604  
 Sher Singh v Thakur Das 118  
 Sher Singh v Daya Ram 79  
 Sher Singh v Diwan Singh 315  
 Sher Singh v Sri Ram 190  
 Shew Prasad v Ramchander 348 351  
 352 350  
 Shiam v Banarsi 1008  
 Shiam Behari Lal v Rup Kishore 226,  
 764  
 Shiam Katan v Collector of Benares 175  
 Shiam Lal v Dhanpat Pat 1003  
 Shiam Lal v Guraj Kishore 735  
 Shiam Lal v Musammatt Lall 423  
 Shiam Lal v Nathe Lal 216  
 Shiam Lal v Parshottam Das 1175,  
 1196  
 Shiam Narain v B B & C I Ry 108  
 Shiam Sunder Lal v Kaiser Zaman  
 Begam 376 378  
 Shiba Durga v Gopi 171  
 Shibba Mal v Rup Narain 1204 1206  
 Shibu Halder v Gupta Sundari 93 97  
 Shib Chandra v Lakh Priya 40 47  
 Shib Charan v Jaghu 71 72  
 Shib Dass v Kali Kumar 937  
 Shib Deo v Ram Prasad 60 493  
 Shib Dutta v Sheikh Karim 793  
 Shib Krishna v Satish Chunder 1173  
 Shib Kristo v Miller 947  
 Shib Kristo Daw & Co v Satish Chan-  
 dra 1180 1183 1184  
 Shib Kumar v Sheo 133

Shub Kunwar v Sheo Prasad 717  
 Shub Lal v Chaturbhuj 1184  
 Shub Narain v Bepin Behary 146  
 Shub Singh v Gandharo Singh 321  
 Shub Singh v Mukat Singh 764  
 Shub Singh v Sita Ram 693  
 Shubchandra v Dulchen 1000  
 Shiba Durga v Gopi 101  
 Shubcharan v Ratiram 1171  
 Shubkrishna v Abdool 502  
 Shubo Rout v Baban Rout 3 63 64 65 69  
 Shibu v Chandra Mohan 75  
 Shibu Haldar v Gupi Sundari 93 97  
 Shudaya v Satappa 175  
 Shuddapa v Irava 302  
 Shudlingappa v Shankarappa 702  
 Shudnath Singh v Shaikh Saberuddin 711  
 Shudnath Singh v Shaikh Saberuddin 711  
 Shudramappa v Gurushantappa 1006 1008  
 Shields v Wilkinson 302  
 Shile chandra v Bechari 1000  
 Shipwright v Clements 398  
 Shirokuli v Mahabliya 823  
 Shirin v Akhbar Khan 753 760  
 Shital v Gaya 812  
 Shitawa v Bhimappa 841  
 Shiv v Kanhaya 116  
 Shiv Dat v Moti Ram 116  
 Shiv Dayal v Muhammad 384  
 Shiv Dev Singh v Jai Pam 900  
 Shiva v Jaru 526  
 Shiva v Joma 339 341 340 343 301  
 Shiva v Rani Prayag 320  
 Shivabavava v Sangappa 304  
 Shivabhanjan v Secretary of State 30 246  
 Shivaganga case 60  
 Shivaji v Vithal 101  
 Shivapa v Dod Nagaya 306 718  
 Shivapa v Shivpanch 398  
 Shivappa v Ramchandra 1006  
 Shivayyagappa v Govindappa 823  
 Shivbai v Lasso 217 378 379 380 381  
 Shirji v Hemraj 107  
 Shirlal v Jani Ram 717  
 Shirlal v Tauram 207  
 Shivdayal v Aheta 463  
 Shirlal v Apaji 991  
 Shirlal v Jumalal 130 142 399  
 Shirlingappa v Chandbasappa 207 211 780  
 Shirlingappa v Shidmalappa 145 146  
 Shirnath v Sheikh 908  
 Shivram v Jivu 166

Shivram v Narayan 00  
 Shivram v Ravji 215  
 Shivram v Sakharan 183  
 Shivubai v Shiddeshwar 444  
 Shohrat v Bridgman 135  
 Shohrat v Ghulam 304  
 Shooljanund v Peary 194  
 Short v Pickering 973  
 Shoshemulhi v Nobin Chunder 1194 1196  
 Shree Krishna Dos v Chandook Chand 341 343  
 Shreemati v Savi 394  
 Shri Kant v Jag Sah 980  
 Shridhar v Babaji 54  
 Shridhar v Ganpati 684  
 Shridhar v Ganu 040  
 Shridhar v Muguram 972 974  
 Shridhar v Narayan 51  
 Shridharan v Puramathan 827  
 Shriman v Goswami 81  
 Shrimant Sayaji Maharaj v Madhav rao 257  
 Shrimant v Smith 604  
 Shrinivas v Chanbasapagowda 437  
 Shrinivas v Gurunath 180  
 Shrinivas v Hari 711  
 Shrinivas v Shuddika 718  
 Shrinivas v Jagadevappa 226  
 Shrinivas v Wazi 972  
 Shripadhat v Rama 57  
 Shripat Pra ad v Lakshmidas 271  
 Shuma Dass v Hurbuns 553  
 Shumbhoo Nath v Luckynath 240  
 Shunmugum v Moidin 971 978  
 Shuroop Chunder v Amirannissa 96  
 Shyam Chand v Land Mortgage Bank 198  
 Shuttrughon v Hokus 29  
 Shyam Lal v Ram Narain Lal 549  
 Shyam Mandal v Satinath 7 135 047 669 6 0 999  
 Shyam Sundar v Bajpati 991  
 Shyama v Debendra 308  
 Shyama Charan v Mirinmayi Debi 00  
 Shyama Charan v Irohad 1185  
 Sia Pam v Mohabur 975  
 Sib Kumari v Secretary of State 098  
 Sibt Ahmad v Amina 863  
 Sibta v Bhagohi 223  
 Sidde hwar Is re 1221  
 Sidhanath v Ganesh 7 303  
 Sidheswar v Harihar 141 306

- Sidheswar v Abhoveswar 974  
 Sidheswar v Goshan, 766 768  
 Sidlingappa v Hirasa 219  
 Sidlingappa v Shankarappa 706  
 Sikandar v Baland 339  
 Sikandar Khan v Balind Khan 1055  
 1060  
 Simbhunath v Golap Singh 769  
 Simmonds v Dunne 475  
 Simon v Hakim Mahomed 948  
 Simson v McMaster 1044  
 Sinclair v James 498  
 Singa Paja v Pethu Paja 921  
 Singa Reddi v Madava Rau 4 3  
 Singa Reddi v Subba Reddi 810  
 Singaria v Chinnabbi 720  
 Singaram v Brinavasa 268  
 Sincer Manufacturing Co v Baijnath  
 848  
 Sincer Manufacturing Co v Yar Mubum  
 mad 849  
 Sinnana v Muthupalan 36  
 Sinnappan v Arunachalam 206 207  
 Sinu v Santho 175 666  
 Sir Prodoot Kumar v Bal Gobinda 1005  
 Sir Ralph Borys case 479  
 Sir Pameshwar Singh v Hitendra 975  
 Sir Tukoirao v Sowlabai 1250  
 Sirajulhaq v Khadim 997  
 Sita Pam v Amir Begum 35 57  
 Sita Ram v Bhawan 1168  
 Sita Ram v Janki Pam 732 741  
 Sita Pam v Madho Lal 73 626  
 Sita Pam v I sm Chandra 104  
 Sitab Chand v Hader 618  
 Sitabai v Laxmihai, 94  
 Sital v Clement Pobson Co 144 145  
 701  
 Sital v Lal Bahdur 820  
 Sital Prasad v Asho Singh 901 903  
 Sital Prasad v Jagdeo 381  
 Sital Prasad v Messrs Clement Robson  
 & Co 674  
 Sital Singh v Baijnath 918 921  
 Sitamma v Subraya 837  
 Sitanath v Basudeo 43  
 Sitara v Tulshi 604  
 Sitaram v Chimandas 500  
 Sitaram v Laxman 52a 53 54  
 Sitaram v Nanhu 302  
 Sitaram v Syad Surajul 626  
 Sitaram v Thompson 104  
 Sitaram Bhut v Sitaram Ganesh 23 27  
 Sitarama v Surya 1021  
 Sitaramaswami v Lakshmi 397 805  
 Sitaramayya v Gopalakrishnamma 670  
 Sithamalli v Ramenathan 575  
 Sitharama v Subramania Iyer 272 281  
 Siva v Aundo 73  
 Siva But In the matter of 366  
 Siva Prasad v Sreemati 439  
 Siva Prasad v Tricomdas 33  
 Siva Subramania v Nagappa 441  
 Sivadis v Birendra 74  
 Sivagani v Subrahmanya 10 11 167  
 727 728  
 Sivagammie v Gopalaaswami 884  
 Sivagiri Zamindar v Teruvengada 183  
 Sivagnana v Advocate General 284  
 Sivaprasad v Tricomdas 341 352 353  
 Sivarama v Somasundara 163  
 Sivaraman v Iburam 84  
 Sivaraman v Muthaya 410  
 Sivasemi v Ratnasami, 726  
 Sivasekanda v Raja of Jeypore 114 392  
 Sivathu v Ramasubayyar 899 901 902  
 Skipper & Co v David 252  
 Sm Sarajubala v Mohini 341  
 Smith v Allahabad Bank 196  
 Smith v Beaufort 666  
 Smith v Grigg Ltd 961  
 Smith v Indian Textile Co 110  
 Smith v Jeje 916  
 Smith v Ludha 1169  
 Smith v Tromp 15  
 Smurthwaite v Haunay 408 411  
 Soban v Baijnath 381 1044  
 Sobha v Turst 772 773 778  
 Sobhagchand v Bhuchand 769  
 Sohawan v Babu Nand 1021 1022  
 Sohan Singh v Riddick 106  
 Soura v Narayanrao 291  
 Soddalingam v Krishnaswami 286  
 Solomon v Jyotsna 836  
 Som Salla Bai v Gadadhar 1056  
 Somar Singh v Premder Kuer 1055  
 Somasundara v Kulandarvelu 58 59  
 Somasundaram v Administrator Gene  
 ral 1258  
 Somasundaram v Krishnasamy 653  
 Somasundaram v Vaithilinga 7 83  
 791 998  
 Somasundaram v Vadivelu 511  
 Somasundaram v Chokkalingam 79  
 3 6 330

Somasundra v Vaithalinga 7  
 Somayya v Subbamma 542 548  
 Somchand v Chhaganlal 283 341  
 Sornesh v Ram Krishna 73 913  
 Sonabai v Tribhovandas 833 834  
 Sonachalam v Kumaravelu 48 59  
 419 422 423 613 902 1206  
 Sonaram v Mohuram 762  
 Sonatun v Dino Nath 383  
 Sonatun Shah v Ali Newaz 923  
 Sonbat v Ahmedbhai 573 1253 1255  
 Sonu v Bahubai 439 441  
 Sonuram v R D Tata & Co 106 107  
 Sonu Singh v Behari Singh 937  
 Sonubai v Shivajirao 1002  
 Soobul Chunder v Russick Lal 212 624  
 Sooklal v Dal Chand 889  
 Soonabai v Tribhovandas 1256  
 Soonderlal v Goorprasad 409 539  
 Soorendro Nath In the matter of 366  
 Sooriah Row v Colaghery 510  
 Soorjomonee v Suddanund 38 40 69  
 Sorabji v Govind 209 210 233 734  
 Sorabji v Kala 236 237 238 243 709  
 750  
 Sorabji v Ramjilal 441  
 Sorabji v Rattonji 898 900 1242  
 Sornam v Tiruvazhuperumal 163  
 Soshu v Chandra 60  
 Soudamini v Gopal 1196  
 Soundaram v Sonnai 307 308  
 Sourendra Mohan v Hari Prasad 51 120  
 111  
 Sourendra Mohan v Murarilal 131  
 Sourendra Nath v Sm Tarubala 319  
 Sourendra Nath v Jatindra Nath 543  
 Sourendra v Arival 1007  
 Sourendra v Sromoni 802 803  
 Southwark Co v Quick 466  
 Sovachand v Hurry Bux 118  
 Sovani v Bhums 154  
 Sowdamini v Krishna 466  
 Sowker Kamurudeen v Noor Mohamed  
 43  
 Spear & Glass Works Ltd v Spear 400  
 Special Officer Salsette v Dosabhai  
 1271  
 Spedding v Fitzpatrick 480 481  
 Spedding v Nevell 416  
 Steedhar v Nilmoni 9  
 Steedharan v Kumbunni 499  
 Sree Krishna v Alumbur 144

Sree Krishna Doss v Chandook Chand  
 347  
 Sree Mahant Prayag v Raja of Kalashas  
 ti 234  
 Sree Mahant Prayag v Raja of Kalahasti  
 732  
 Sreelal Maganlal v Madan 1176  
 Sreemanchunder v Copalchunder 1017  
 1019  
 Sreemati v Secretary of State 1017  
 Sreemuth v Palaniappa 329  
 Sreemutty v Sreemutty 603  
 Sreemutty Doss v Pitamber 15  
 Sreenath v East Indian Ry Co 849  
 Sreenath Roy v Cally Doss 100 1241  
 Sri Bhavatu v Devrao 616  
 Sri Chund v Murari Lal 213  
 Sri Ganesbji v Lalita Prasad 621  
 Sri Gopal v Pirthi Singh 45 52 443  
 Sri Hanuman v Hashmura 329  
 Sri Mahant Govind Rao v Sita Ram  
 Kesho 588  
 Sri Mati Hemangirai v Haridas 394  
 Sri Poosapathi v Sri Rajah 341  
 Sri Ragbunadha v Sri Brozo Kishore  
 615  
 Sri Raja Subhadra v Isattipati 413  
 Sri Ram v Kesari Mal 902  
 Sri Ram v Sorabji 1189  
 Sri Ranga v Srinavasa 1000  
 Sri Sunker v Sidha 24  
 Sridhar v Jageshwar 161  
 Sridharan v Puramathan 292 820  
 Sridher Rao v Pam Jal 871  
 Srihari v Khutish Chandra 41  
 Srihary v Murari 146  
 Srihant v Huri Das 1021  
 Srihanti v Indupuram 419  
 Srimath Jaganatha v Kutumbarayudu  
 22  
 Srimati v Beni Madhab 974 975  
 Srimati v Khandendra Narayan 332  
 Srimati Prosonomoyi v Beni Madham  
 970  
 Srimati v Ratanmani 194  
 Srimati v Srimati 1247  
 Srimoti v Secretary of State 891  
 Srimotya v Leknath, 613  
 Srimut Pajah v Katama Natchiar  
 46 47 49  
 Srinibash v Kesho Prasad 167 386 977  
 931

- Srinivas v Kesho 10  
 Srinivasa v Ayyar 424  
 Sriniva a v Avvathora 74 746 748  
 Srinivasa v Kanthimathi 241  
 Srinivasa v Lakshmi 893  
 Srinivasa v Thiruvengada 24  
 Srinivasa v Official Assignee 118 301  
 1060 1062  
 Sriniva a v Pratapa 500  
 Sriniva a v Paghava 59 419 422  
 Sriniva a v Ramaswami 305  
 Srinivasa v Sami Rau 212  
 Sriniva a v Seetharamavvar 232  
 Sriniva a v Subbramaniam 996  
 Sriniva a v Vellayan 205 209  
 Sriniva a v Venkata 101 105 110 1244  
 Sriniva a v Yamunabai 595 935  
 Srinivasam v Pulkaman 997  
 Sriniva achariar v Appavoo 204 205  
 Sripat v Tirbani 100 151  
 Sripati v Bibhuti 977 980  
 Sripatiprasadji v Laxmidas 203  
 Srimulu v Lakshminarayana 871  
 Srisa Chandra v Triguna 60  
 St Gobain Chaunv & Croy Co v  
 Hoyermann's Agency 860  
 St Nazaire Co In re 397  
 Staunton v Chadwick 565  
 Stannard v Harrison 74  
 Stapylton v Scott 512  
 Steel v Roberts 1169  
 Steff v Andrews 1183  
 Steward v North Metropolitan Tram  
 ways Co 496 498 500  
 Stewart v Rhodes 399  
 Stokes v Grant 490  
 Stowell v Ajudhia 177 200  
 Strachan Pe 556 566  
 Stracy v Blake 15  
 Strauss v Francis 14 15  
 Striman Sadagopa v Krishna 24  
 Srinivasa v Srinivasa 276 282  
 Strong v Tappin 508  
 Stroud v Lawson 407  
 Struthers v Wheeler 840  
 Stuart Skinner v Orde 889  
 Studd v Mats 017  
 Stumore v Campbell & Co 665  
 Subasini v Ashutosh 817  
 Subal Chandra v Jatindra Mohan 982  
 Subba Rau v Rama Pau 96  
 Subba v Bala Chandra 315  
 Subba v Haji Badsha 960 965 967  
 Subba v Krishnamachari 620 1011  
 Subba v Rama 443  
 Subba Bibi v Maqbul 118  
 Subbaraja v Ranga 1019  
 Subbalakshmi v Ramanujam 914 922  
 Subbamma v Chennavva 163 380  
 Subbammal v Aiyudayammal 60  
 Subban Ali v Imami Bergam 59  
 Subbarao v Appadurai 1165  
 Subbaraya v Krishna 445  
 Subbaraya v Manika 780  
 Subbaraya v Ponnusami 933  
 Subbaraya v Sadashiva 1193  
 Subbaraya v Vedantachariar 26  
 Subbarayadu v Chenchuramayya 596  
 Subbarayadu v Pedda Subbarazu 750  
 Subbarayadu v Ramadasu 786 802  
 Subbarayan v Natarajan 174  
 Subbarayudu v Lakshminarasamma  
 745  
 Subbarayudu v Verram 378 379  
 Subbaraju v Venkataramaraju 821  
 Subbaya v Saminadayyar 782 705  
 Subbayan v Thoppai 747  
 Subbayar Bros v J K Munuswami  
 Aiyar and Sons 803 804  
 Subbayya v Krishna 200  
 Subbayya v Pachayya 290  
 Subbayya v I am 1015  
 Subbi v Ramkrishna 60  
 Subbiah v Bala 889  
 Subbiah v Ramanathan 79 139  
 Subbiah v Subramania 1177  
 Subbiar v Moideen 720  
 Subbuthayammal v Chidambaram 10  
 661  
 Subedar v Jagat 300  
 Subba Bibi v Hara Lal 220  
 Subhana v Krishna 141  
 Subjoo Das v Balmukund 383  
 Subramania v Achuta 726  
 Subramania v Balasubramania 52  
 898  
 Subramania v Chollalinga 207 702  
 Subramania v Corera 613  
 Subramania v Krishna 755  
 Subramania v Krishnaswamy 271 281  
 Subramania v Kumara Velu 153 160  
 Subramania v Rajeswara 79  
 Subramania v Subramania 400

Subramania v Swaminatha 392  
 Subramania v Vairinatha 142 140  
 Subramania v Varadajulu 547 553  
 Subramania Aiyar v Nuthra Chettiar 23  
 Subramania Ayyar v Sellammal 396 398  
 Subramanian v N. L. M. Chettyar 701  
 Subramanian v Panjamma 145  
 Subramanian v Raja Rajeswara 874  
 Subramanian v Raja of Ramnad 355 991  
 Subramanian v Veerabadran 1024  
 Subramaniam v Vykunda 741 753  
 Subramanian v Lutchman 978  
 Subramanyan v Hurry 530  
 Subramanyam v Narsimham 724  
 Subrao v Mahadevi 903  
 Subudhi v Singi 189  
 Suchand v Bilaram 744  
 Sudamdiki Coal Co v Empire Coal Co 1242 1243 1244  
 Sudarshan Das v Pam Prasad 19  
 Sudhansu *In re* 321  
 Sudharam v Sudharam 23  
 Sudhindu v Durga 453  
 Sudhir v Rameswar 570  
 Sudindra v Budan 141 154  
 Suganchand v Mulchand 107  
 Suganchand v Kanappa 1063  
 Suhuj v Ram Pershad 740  
 Sukkeena v Haj e Mahomed 237  
 Suja Hoosein v Monohur Das 171 671  
 Sukalbutty v Babulal 313  
 Sukh Dial v Bhopi 56  
 Sukh Lal v Bhukhi 75 813  
 Sukha v Paghnath Das 120  
 Sukhdeo v Lachman 504 511 868  
 Sukhdeo v Sheo Ghulam 296  
 Sukhdeo Das v Pito Singh 395 396  
 Sukhi v Ghulam Safdar Khan 903  
 Sukhlal v Eastern Bank Ltd 950  
 Sukhu v Ram Lotan 604  
 Sukhram Das v Nazar Muhammad 136  
 Suklya v Suklal 902  
 Sukumari v Gopi Mohan 129  
 Sukumari v Mugneram 384  
 Suleman v Shaikh Ismail 263  
 Sulleman v Joosub 1003  
 Sulleman v The New Oriental Bank Corporation Ltd. 1053  
 Sultan v Hardiyah 808

Sultan v Savalayammal 653  
 Sultan Kuar v Guzari Lal 705  
 Sultan Muhammad v Sheo Prasad 1167  
 Sultan Singh v Murl Dhar 320  
 Sultanat Jahan v Sunder Lal 33  
 Suman Singh v Deonandan 920  
 Sumbhu Nath v Sorjmoni 331  
 Sundar v Habib Chick 996 997 1056  
 Sundar v Musammal Kumari 793  
 Sundar Bibi v Bisheeshar 334 1022  
 Sundar Bibi v Raj Indar 201  
 Sundar v Dinanath 66  
 Sundar Jha v Bansman Jha 408  
 Sundar Koer v Chameshwar 1271  
 Sundar Kuar v Chandreshwar 613  
 Sundar Mall v Upendra Nath 1008  
 Sundar Nath v Mallu 460  
 Sundarsham Das v Pam 141  
 Sundar Singh v Bholu 52  
 Sundar Singh v Doru Shankar 171 347  
 Sundar Singh v Ghasi 150 711  
 Sundar Singh v Krishna Mills Co Ltd 930  
 Sundar Singh v Nighaiya 314  
 Sundar Singh v Pam Saran 961  
 Sundra v Sakharan 61  
 Sundara v Sivalingam 445  
 Surendra v Bhai Lal 93  
 Sundara v Ratnavelu 327  
 Sundara v Venkata 766 769  
 Sundara Bai v Tirumal 1242  
 Sundarabai v Jayavant 127  
 Sundaralinga v Ramasami 332  
 Sundaram v Musa 318 745 746 749  
 Sundaram v Nuthuramalinga 984  
 Sundarambal v Jogavanagurukkal 827  
 Sundarasan v Viswanada 786 803  
 Sunder v Chhitar 57  
 Sunder Dass *In re* 242  
 Sunder Koer v Pat Sham Kishen 933  
 Sunder Koer v Chandishwar 321  
 Sunder Spinnar v Makan Bhula 472  
 Sunderlal v Raghunathan 958  
 Sundram v The Queen 29  
 Sunkari v Mudaragaddi 207  
 Superior Bank Ltd. v Budh Singh 160 761  
 Suppi v Kunhi 967  
 Suppu v Govindacharyar 1179  
 Suradhan v Sitoo 141  
 Suraj Deo v Partab Pat 7  
 Suraj Din v Mahabir Prasad, 190  
 Suraj Narain v Jagbati 939

Suraj Narain v Ratan Lal 222  
 Suraj Prasad v Standard Life Insurance Co 439  
 Suraj Singh v Phul Kumari 321  
 Surajdeo Narayan v Partap Pal 7 11 1003  
 Surajmal v Horniman 18 28 296  
 Surajmal v Mane Ichand 246  
 Surajman v Anjore 168  
 Surajpal Pandey v Utim Pandey 100  
 Suramma v Surianarayana 940  
 Surapati v Pam Narayan 326  
 Surendra v Garu 744  
 Surendra Narain v Gopi 166  
 Surendra Kumar v Sushil Kumar 975  
 Surayya v Surya Rao 1025  
 Surender Nath v Brojo Nath 58  
 Surendra v Aghore 666 871  
 Surendra v Bhari Lal 93  
 Surendra v Hemangini 575  
 Surendra v Raghunath 1021  
 Surendra Mohini Amareesh Chandra 709  
 Surendra Narain v Bhai Lal 502  
 Surendra Nath v Dwarka Nath 324 326 328 334  
 Surendra Nath v Jatindra Nath 396  
 Surendra Nath v Thripura 803  
 Surendra Nath v Keshab Lal 384  
 Surendra Nath v Raghunath Das 998  
 Surendra Nath Banerjee v The Chief Justice and Judges of the High Court of Bengal 394  
 Surendra Prasad v Atabuddin 516  
 Surendro Keshub Poy v Durgasoondery 980  
 Surendro v Doorga Soondery 707  
 Suresh Chandra v Shitika Kanta 1268 1269  
 Suresh Chunder v Ambica Churn 1166  
 Suresh Chunder v Jugut Chunder 867 868  
 Suresh Chunder v Kristo Ragini 1048 1049  
 Surty v Chettyar Firm 334  
 Suruj Mull v Hudson 107  
 Surujdeo v Partap 11  
 Surja v Chandra 425  
 Surja v Reid 620  
 Surjan Singh v Prag Das 233  
 Surjya v Jaynarayan 540  
 Suryanarayana v Sree Raja Venkata 349

Suryamoni v Kali Kanta 298  
 Surnamoyi v Ashutosh 720  
 Surno Moyee v Dakhin 730 7 2 758  
 Surnomoyee v Maharajah Suttreschunder, 326  
 Surta v Gunga 399  
 Surty v T S Chettyar Firm 103, 1052  
 Surut Soondari v Proconno Coomar 841  
 Surya Datt v Jamna Ditt 379  
 Surya v Jogendra 933  
 Surya Kanta v Tarak Nath 394  
 Surya Narain v Kunja Behary 1060  
 Sushil v Annada 504  
 Susya Pillai v Ayakanna Pillar 789  
 Sutherland (Duke) v British Dominions Land Settlement Corporation 558  
 Sutherland v Singhee Churn 565  
 Suttva v Colap 973  
 Swaminatha v Kumareswami 424  
 Swaminatha Odayar v Thiagaraja swami 172  
 Swamintha v Vaidyanath 178  
 Swamirao v Collector of Dharwar 876  
 Swamirao v Hashinath 18 637 639  
 Swamirao v Valentine 153 380  
 Swanston v Lishman 570  
 Swinfen v Lord Chelmsford 15  
 Swiss Bank Corporation v Boehmische Industrial Bank 694  
 Syad v Collector of Kaira 272  
 Syad Amir v Sheikh Masleudin, 867  
 Syamalados v Subbaya 171  
 Syed v Bibi 271 279  
 Syed Qazi v Lachman 388  
 Syed v Subhan 1256  
 Syed Abdul v Badaruddin 393  
 Syed Ali v Adib 286  
 Syed Hossein v Chettyar 311 903  
 Syed Khan v Syed Ebrahim 334  
 Syed Hashif v Ganga Baksh 730  
 Syed v Mahomad 345  
 Syed Emam v Raj Coomar Dass 937  
 Syed Tuffuzzool v Rughoonath 195 196 692

# T

T Wang v Sonawangd 1167  
 Tadepalli v Nawab Sayed 110  
 Tadepalli v Siram 738  
 Taff Vole Railway Co v Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants 421



Taj Singh v Jahan Lal 79 608  
 Taja v Devi 796  
 Tajammul v Banwari Lal 304  
 Tajeshwar Duth v Lakhan Prashad 871  
 Talamand v Fatch Din 927  
 Talewar Singh v Bhagwan Das 300 582  
 Tallapragada v Boorugapalli 154  
 Tambi Reddy v Devi Reddy 386 643  
 Tameshar v Thakur Prasad 10 146 608 661  
 Tamiz Banoo v Nand Kishore 181  
 Tamizunnissa v Syed Mohammad 60  
 Tamman Singh v Lachhmun 603  
 Tanaji v Shanker 993  
 Tancred v Mullick 1046  
 Tandavamarthi v Durgamba 171  
 Tani v Hari 154  
 Tani v Tarachand 30  
 Taniram v Gajanan 917  
 Tankun v U che si 395  
 Tansukh Rai v Sri Gopal 939  
 Tapesri v Deokinandan 220  
 Tapesri Lal v Deoki 732  
 Tapiram v Sadu 501  
 Tapp v Jones 699  
 Taqui Jan v Obaidulla 863  
 Tara v Arun 302  
 Tara v Basiruddi 347  
 Tara Lal v Sarobar Singh 709  
 Tara Prasanna v Nilmoni 156  
 Tarack Nath v Protonno Coomar 3  
 Tarack Nath v Bhubaneswar 937  
 Tarack Nath v Snat 207 208  
 Taramoni Das Re 131  
 Tarangini v Raj Krishna 178  
 Tarapada v Srimati Bagala 434  
 Tarasundari v Beharilal 602  
 Tarini Charan v Kedar Nath 30 590 59 04  
 Tarinee Churn v Hunsman 408  
 Tarruck v Divendro 603  
 Taru Bala Das v Surendra Nath 14  
 Tarubala v Surendra 870  
 Taruck Chunder v Panchu 438  
 Tarsadi v Bai Kashi 693  
 Tasaddal v Ahmad 730 702 704 757  
 Tassadduq v Hayatunnissa 314  
 Tassaduq v Kashi Ram 331 10  
 Tata Iron & Steel Co Ltd v Baidyanath 63  
 Tata Iron & Steel Co v Chief Revenue Authority 1271 1272

Tata Iron and Steel Co Ltd v Chief Revenue Authority of Bombay 1209  
 Tatya v Hathibhai 1192  
 Tawker v Harsookdoss 1255  
 Tavahji v South British Insurance Co 131  
 Taylor v Batten 568  
 Taylor v Collier 857 8 8  
 Taylor v Neate 976  
 Taylor v Russel 900  
 Tej Pam v Hersukh 1220  
 Teja v Tika Pam 923  
 Tejpal v Nathmull & Co 1095  
 Teppur v Mahomed 119  
 Tejram v Kusaji 199  
 Tehehar Krishna v Moti Chand 113 760  
 Tekait Krishna v Surendra 932  
 Tej Singh v Ghosi Ram 1165 1181 1186  
 Teller v Colam 982  
 Templeton v Laurie 30 98 128  
 Templeton v Russell 400  
 Teneria Modenna Franco Espanola v New Zealand Insurance Co 569  
 Teneput v Sudersan Das 30  
 Thackersey v Hurlhum 421  
 Thakar Das v Narian 1171  
 Thakar Das v Pam Das 1171  
 Thakar Singh v Mt Uttam Kaur 61  
 Thakoor v Leelanund 780  
 Thakore v Thakore 49  
 Thakoredas v Lallubhai 821  
 Thakur v Jai hth 59  
 Thakur Barmha v Jiban Pam 770  
 Thakur Das v Kishori Lal 996  
 Thakur Din Pam v Haridas 464  
 Thakur Hanmant v Mt Jhamola 66  
 Thakur Magundeo v Thakur Mahadeo 71 72  
 Thakur Pershad v Kalka 10  
 Thakur Prasad v Fakirullah 78 169 100 371 372 042  
 Thakurmani v Dai Rani Kocri 432  
 Khakurdas v Joseph 703  
 Thakuri v Kundan 986  
 Khammaraju v Bap raja 1171 1178  
 Thamsundascen v Chetty 320  
 Than Singh v Chundun Singh 1061  
 Thanakoti v Muniappa 59  
 Thandavan v Vallama 51  
 Thathu v Konde 152 734 730  
 Thayar Ammal v Lakshmi 974  
 The Asia Ia re 1266

The *Henric Bjorn In re* 1266  
 The Justices of the Peace for Calcutta v  
   The Oriental Gas Co 1252 1253 1255  
 The Portugal *In re* 1266  
 The Two Ellens *In re* 1266  
 Thenal v Sokkammal 14, 827  
 Theyyavelan v Kochan 223  
 Thiaraviyam v Lakshmana 11 234  
   236 237 740  
 Thummappa v Balakrishna 105  
 Thurukumaresan v Subbaraya 629  
 Thurumalai v Ramavayar 383  
 Thiruvengada Theingar v Vaidinatha  
   1196  
 Thiruvengadaswami v Govindaswami  
   726 728  
 Thiruvengatasami v Pavadas Pillai 462  
   726 728  
 Thol v Leask 553  
 Tholappala v Venkata 26  
 Thomas v Moore 403 411 447  
 Thomas v Morgan 591  
 Thomson v Baskerville 899  
 Thompson v Birkley 482 483  
 Thompson v Calcutta Tramway Co  
   331 334 1033  
 Thompson v Peynolds 509  
 Thompson v The London County Council  
   412 418  
 Thorp v Holdsworth 476 521, 522 578  
   579 580  
 Thrikakat v Thiruthiyal 51  
 Ticumchand v Santoke Chand 963  
 Tika Pam v Daulat Pam 105 106  
 Tikai Chobay v Sheo Dayal 811  
 Tikai v Firm Sheo Dayal 349  
 Tikam Singh v Kishore 429 900  
 Tilak v Chakardhari 315  
 Tilakdhari v Kesho 333  
 Tilakram v Kodumal 33  
 Tildesley v Harper 496 497 504 522  
   578  
 Tiluck Chandra v Jasoda Kumar 528  
 Timappa v Manjamma 440  
 Timmana v Govind 184  
 Timmana v Mahabala 751  
 Timmaraju v Narasimha 619 620  
 Timmu v Deva 997  
 Tin Tin v Maung Ba 297  
 Tincouri v Shib Chandra 140 751  
 Tincowrie v Debendro Nath 144  
 Tincowry v Fakir Chand 821 1188  
 Tinkowri v Shib Chandra 96

Tipangavda v Ramangavda 748  
 Tirnal v Kanhaiya 1060  
 Tirthasami v Annappayya 372 605  
 Tirumal v Kanhaiya 1060  
 Tirumal v Syed Dastaghiri 716 917  
 Tirumalacharyulu v Ammisethi 868  
 Tirumalaisami v Subramanian 766 767  
 Tirupati v Narasimaba 441  
 Tirupati v Vissam 338  
 Tiruvambal v Manikkavachala 74  
 Tiruvangadial v Thiruvangadiab 703  
 Tiruvengada v Vythilinga 705  
 Tokhan v Udwant 383  
 Tokhan Singh v Girwar Singh 991  
 Toleman Re 862  
 Tomlinson v Broadsmith 857  
 Toolsa v Antone 179 694  
 Toolsee Dass v East India Ry Co 739  
 Toolsee Money v Sudevi 312, 995  
 Toponidhee v Sreeputtu 40 68  
 Toremull v Kunj Lal 838 1255  
 Tota Ram v Panna Lal 392  
 Totaram v Chhoturam 747  
 Tottenham Re 423  
 Town Bank v Rama 600  
 Townsend v Parton 478 480 482  
 Trailokya Nath v Jogendra Nath 622  
 Tredegar v Roberts 456 457 458  
 Tribhovandas v Abdulally 803  
 Tribhuwan v Sri Narain 13 784  
 Tribhuwandas v Jivanachand 674  
 Tribikram v Badri 1045  
 Triccam v B B & C I. Ry Co 832  
 Tricumdas v Gopinath 4 1024  
 Tricumdass v Khimji 269 280  
 Triloki v Pertab 44  
 Trimbak v Govinda 158  
 Trimbak v Hari 641 643  
 Trimbak v Lackshman 90  
 Trimbak v Nana 708 752  
 Trimbak v Ramchandra 747  
 Trimbak v Sakharam 899  
 Troylokhnath v Macleod 31  
 Tuhi Pam v Izzat Ali 746  
 Tukaram v Anantbhat 639  
 Tukaram v Babaji 642 644  
 Tukaram v Gunaji 197  
 Tukaram v Ramchandra 808  
 Tula Ram v Hariwan Das 118  
 Tulaji v Balabhai 703  
 Tuljaram v Alagappa 11 355 539 838  
   992 1032 1253 1255, 1256 1258  
 Tuljaram v Gopala 813

Tuljaram v Ramchandra 744 752  
 Tuljaram v Sitaram 465  
 Tulsa v Gairaj 306  
 Tulsī Persad v Benavet 333  
 Tulsī Ram v Daya Ram 603  
 Tulsī Ram v Ram Saran Da 518  
 Turnuklal v Kalyandas 204  
 Turner v Pestonji Fardunji 957  
 Turner v Ringwood Highway Board 26  
 Turnock v Sartoris 1191  
 Turquand v Fearon 484  
 Turquand v Wilson 590  
 Turton v Barber 566  
 Two Ellens the 1206  
 Tyaballi v Atmaram 694 713  
 Tyabji v Jetha 242 529  
 Tyabji Dayabhai & Co v Jetha Desji & Co 529  
 Tyabji & Co *Inte* 530  
 Tyebhai v Abdul Husain 1178

## U

U Ba Pe v U Po Sein 9  
 U E Maung v P A R P Chettyar Firm 808  
 U kala v Ma Hnin 153  
 U on Maung v Ebrahim 972  
 U Po Maung v U Jun Pe 273  
 U Po Nyun v Ma Pan Me 824  
 U Po Thein v O A O K R M Firm 719  
 Uchant v Basawan 811 817  
 Uderan v Hyderally 963  
 Udbai Chand v Nagin Singh 52  
 Udit Narain v Mathura Prasad 138  
 Udmī v Hira 424 788 995  
 Udoj Chand v Khetsidas 363 1256  
 Udojchand v P F Guzdar 324 328  
 Udwant v Tokhan Singh 141 142  
 Ugar Chand v Surajmal 101  
 Ugrah Lal v Radha Pershad 747  
 Ugrah Singh v Motihari Co Ltd 1-0  
 Ujir v Shadhai 302  
 Uma Churn v Gobind Chunder 710  
 Uma Sundari v Bindu 998  
 Umabai v Amritrao 703  
 Umabai v Bhaw Balvant 417 449  
 Umabai v Vithal 413 453  
 Umadi v Sri Raja Velugoti 752 759  
 Umakanta v Dino Nath 166

Umamaheswara v Singaperumal 183  
 Uman Kunwari v Jarbandhan 101-  
 Umapati v Sheikh Mastulla 866 871  
 Umassai v Alur 221  
 Umasundari v Bindu 135 399 908  
 Umamoyee v Jatan Bewa 658  
 Umatul Mehdi v Kulsoom 116 343  
 Umbica Churn v Bengal S & W Co 566 567  
 Umda v Niama 889  
 Umda Begam v Muhammad 441  
 Umed v Goman Bhaji 183  
 Umed v Jas Ram 201 217  
 Umed v Pir Saheb 443  
 Umed Ali v Salma Bibi 1015  
 Umed Khan v Daulat Ram 93  
 Umed Mal v Chand Mal 351 352  
 Umed Singh v Sobhag Mal 1166  
 Umersey v Shamsi 1168  
 Umes Chunder v Fatima 125 126 216  
 Umesh Chandra v Bibhuti 133  
 Umesh Chandra Kar In the matter of 265  
 Umeshananda v Mohendra 158  
 Umesh Chunder v Paj Bullubh 208 719  
 Umesh Chunder v Zahur Fatima 901 902 903  
 Ummatha v Cheria 48 49 50  
 Umrao Beg v Mukhtar Beg 653  
 Umrao Begum v Irshad Husain 332  
 Umrao Chand v Bindrabai 6 158  
 Umrao Singh v Hardeo 109  
 Umri v Shah Mohammed 1011 1012  
 Uncovenanted Service Bank v Abdul Bari 220  
 Union Bank of London v Manbey 558  
 United States of America v Wagner 254 255  
 United Telephone Co v Donohoe 578  
 Universities of Oxford and Cambridge v George Gill and Sons 407 414  
 Unni v Pocker 777  
 Unnikova v Umma 705  
 Upadhyay v Persidh Singh 6 7 1-1  
 Upendra v Biswaswar 178 129  
 Upendra v Janaki Nath 443 500  
 Upendra v Tara 456  
 Upendra Kumar v Sham Lal 789 790  
 Upendra Lal v Girindra Nath 1024  
 Upendra Nath v Bhupendra Nath 980  
 Upendra Nath v Bindeshri 1260  
 Upendra Nath v Dutt 440

Upendranath v Ku um 99 154  
 Upmann v Forester 130  
 Usil v Hales -  
 Uthuman v Nair 11 1013  
 Uttam Chand v Met Thakur 99  
 Uttam Chandra v Khetra Nath 99  
 Uttamchandra v Paj Kri hna 935  
 Uttamram v Kibordia 400  
 Uttamram v Thakorda 460  
 Uttupura v Emperor 314  
 Uzir v Haradeb Das 185  
 Uzir Ali v Sarai 1011

## V

V E A R M Firm v Maung Ba Kyin  
 723 724  
 Vadapalli v Dronamraju 718  
 Vadapuratti v Vallabha 73  
 Vadlal v Fulchand 1001  
 Vadiamudi v Venkataseshayya 279  
 Vaghoji v Camaji 143 1244 12  
 Vaidhinadasamy Ayyar v Somasundram  
 Pillai 39 639 706  
 Vaidyanatha v Eggia 201  
 Vaidyanatha v Swaminatha 267 268  
 276  
 Vaguntathammal v Valhamman 514  
 Vaikunt v Manjunath 70  
 Vaishno v Hemraj 1017  
 Vaishno Das v Tirath Das 701  
 Vaithilinga v Sadasiva 420 431  
 Vaithilinga v Somasundurum 328  
 Vaithinatha v Kuppu 1020  
 Vakatchand v Advocate General 428  
 Vakil of Azimgarh In the matter of  
 1239  
 Vakil of the High Court In the matter  
 of (40 Mad 69) 1239  
 Vakil In re (1928 A C 820) 1239  
 Vakil In re (1926 49 Mad 523) 1239  
 Vakil In the matter of (42 All 400)  
 1239  
 Valeswara v Muthukrishna 68  
 Valia v Anujani 199  
 Valia Kone v Marutha Veera 501  
 Vallabha v Madusudanani 3  
 Vallabhai v Chhotalal 117  
 Vallabhbhai v Chhotalal 393  
 Valli v Corporation of Madras 29

Valli v Mahomed 389  
 Vallubhai v Pangunni 742  
 Valluru v Kannamma 912  
 Vaman v Malbari 1061  
 Vaman v Municipality of Sholapur 420  
 Vamanacharya v Govind 7 294  
 Vamchand v Lakhmichand 963  
 Varada v Venkataratnam 213 319  
 Varajlal v Kastur 287  
 Varajlal v Ramdat 298 406 407 414  
 448 449 453  
 Varalal v Shomeswar 818  
 Varamma v Gopaladasaya 61  
 Varathayyengar v Krishnasami 51  
 Vardaji v Chandrappa 1317  
 Vartharaja v Sunkari 60  
 Vassonji v Ismailbhai 423 424  
 Vasudev v Bhavan 132 133  
 Vasudev v Damodar 308  
 Vasudev v Eknath 710 723  
 Vasudev v Kuleadi 414  
 Vasudev v Vamanji 24  
 Vasudev v Vishnu 643  
 Vasudera v Narayana 374 707  
 Vasudeva v Shadagopa 1041  
 Vasudeva Samier In re 1239  
 Vathuanatha v Vathialinga 1160  
 Vathilinga v Kalaperumal 118  
 Vatsalabai v Sambhaji 796  
 Ved v Wagle & Co 930  
 Vedapuratti v Vallabha 910  
 Vedavasi v Madura 105  
 Vedavyasa v Madura Hindu Labha  
 Nidhi Co 728 918  
 Veerabhadra v Vithinathaswami 902  
 Veerabadran v Nataraja 994 838  
 Veeradrani v Nataraja 830  
 Veerama Chinnai v Soma 420  
 Veerana v Mathukumara 91  
 Veerappa v Ponnayya 641  
 Veerappa v Ramasami 114 139 141  
 769  
 Veerappa v Sundaresa 462  
 Veerappa v Tindal 431 794  
 Veeraraghava v Muga Sait 84 117  
 Veeraraghavachariar v Advocate Gen  
 eral 271 273  
 Veeraraghava v Subba 804  
 Veerarayan v Ayya Kuttu 309  
 Veerasolkaraju v Papiiah 181  
 Veerchand v B B C C I Ry 200

Velappa v Chidambara 410 453  
 Velayuda v Sundara 68  
 Velavudam v Arunachala 114 306  
 Velchand v Bouchier 201  
 Vellazawmy Serrai v L Sivaraman  
 Serrai 318  
 Velli v Moudin 18  
 Velliappa Chettiar v Govinda Dass 1942  
 Velli Bharmal 71  
 Velli Bhimsey & Co v Bachoo 1260  
 1-68  
 Vellayan v Jothi 794  
 Velliappa v Subrahmanyan 120  
 Velu v Arumugam 716  
 Velu v Ghose 130  
 Velu v Krishnasami 1-3  
 Vemuri v Raja Varlagadda 663  
 Vengamuthu v Pandaveswara 28  
 Vengapayyan v Karimpanakal 1-8  
 Venkamma v Parthasarathi 1-1  
 Venkamma v Rangrao 10-2  
 Venkapa v Baslingapa 393  
 Venkat v Kunjappa 903  
 Venkata v Alakharajamba 866  
 Venkata v Andavolu 1-2 53  
 Venkata v Bhashyakarl 1-16 876  
 10-1  
 Venkata v Gunneswara 787  
 Venkata v Koran 639  
 Venkata v Krishna-sami 94 103 436  
 Venkata v Menda 939  
 Venkata v Panga 443  
 Venkata v Sama 41  
 Venkata v Thiagaraja 930  
 Venkata v Veena 1060  
 Venkata v Venkatarama 6 10 32 36  
 1-1  
 Venkata Krishnama v Krishna Rao 16-  
 8- 96  
 Venkata Narasimha v Court of Wards  
 33-  
 Venkata Sa Barod v Maksudan Das 117  
 Venkata Subba v Seetha Aiyar 96,  
 Venkata Subbarayudu v Sri Rajah  
 Krishna 10-6 1-60  
 Venkatachala v Rangiah 821 1018  
 1189  
 Venkatachala Pedda v Venkatarama  
 1-11 141  
 Venkatachalam v Ariyamperumal 67  
 Venkatachalam v Mahalashwamma 70  
 Venkatachallam v Veerappa 61-

Venkatachalapat v Subbarayudu 28  
 Venkatachalapati v Kameshwaramma  
 992  
 Venkatachalapati v Krishna 41  
 Venkatachellamyya v Nilkanta 732  
 Venkatanarayna v Iuvada 667  
 Venkatanarayna v Subbammal 13 61  
 779 781  
 Venkatanarasayya v Achemmah 894  
 Venkatanar Simba v Papammah 7-6  
 Venkatanarasimha v Subba Rao 2-0  
 273  
 Venkatanarasimha v Suranna 19  
 Venkatanarasimha v Suryanarayana  
 543  
 Venkatanarsammah v Pamiah 712  
 Venkatanarasu v Kotayya 314 1030  
 Venkatappa v Jalayya 219 2-3  
 Venkatappa v Thimma 102 827  
 Venkataraju v Ramanamma 71  
 Venkata ubba Rao v Vigneswaradu 64  
 719  
 Venkatarama v Nataraja 1-42  
 Venkatarama v Senthivelu 183  
 Venkatarama v The South Indian Bank  
 Limited 4  
 Venkataramanachariar v Meenatchisun-  
 dararamaier 1-1  
 Venkatarama v Venkata 439  
 Venkataramana v Kasturiranga 277  
 Venkataramana Iyer v Gompertz 902  
 Venkataiah v Natasimha 182 316  
 3 0 3 1  
 Venkatarangayya v Krishnasami 17-  
 Venkataratnam v Ranganayakamma  
 7-1  
 Venkataratnam v Vanamandra 36 77  
 Venkatasami v Stridavamma 979  
 Venkat ami Gurusam v Chanbasappa  
 740  
 Venkata ami Naik v Sivamu Mudali  
 139  
 Venkatasomeswara Pao v Lakshmana  
 swami 870  
 Venkatasubba v Manickammal 1-3  
 Venkata ubbaraya v Zamindar of  
 Karvetinagar 4  
 Venkatasubbayer v Krishnamurthy 548  
 Venkatasubbish v Lakshminarasimham  
 536  
 Venkata-subiah v Venkata Seharaya  
 207 710 9-3  
 Venkata wami v Kotilingam 640

Venkate a v Pamasam 515  
 Venkate h Oil Mills v Velmahomed 433  
 Venkateswara *In re* 7  
 Venkate wara v Shekari 333  
 Venkate-warlu v Lingayya 291  
 Venkatrao v Khimji 1242  
 Venkatrav v Madhavarav 25  
 Venkayya v Nara imma 56  
 Venkayya v Paghava 174  
 Venkayya v Suramma 59  
 Venkiteswaravran v Awatha 710  
 Venkobacharlu v Padhubayamma 55  
 291  
 Venku v Mahalinga 525  
 Venkubai v Lakshman 351 352  
 Venugopal v Venkatasubbiah 713 719  
 Venugopalachariar v Chinnulal 540  
 Veyndramuthu v Naya Nadan 161 163  
 164 76  
 Vibudhapriya v Yusuf 233 235 709  
 Vichuvavrangar v Se havranwar 399  
 Victoria Mills Co Ltd v Brij Mohan  
 Lal 525 526  
 Vidhyapurna v Vidyanidhi 937  
 Vidy v Jai 1031  
 Vidyavanti v Jai Dial 1031  
 Vigneeswara v Bapayya 937  
 Vijaya v Secretary of State 246  
 Vijaya v Venkatasubba 876  
 Vijayaang v Shivajirao 801  
 Vijendra v Sudhendra 886 887  
 Vilakathala v Vayalil 395  
 Vinayak v Dattatrya 45 52 931  
 Vinayak v Krishnarao 309  
 Vrajlal v Venkaaswami 735  
 Vinayak Narayan *In re* 768  
 Vinayakrao v Narotam 567  
 Vinayakrav v Devrao 773  
 Vir Singh v Bhola Singh 523  
 Vir Singh v Tirath Ram 334  
 Virabhadrappa v Chinnamma 601 603  
 Viranna v Sattiraju 745  
 Viragava v Varada 239  
 Viraraghava v Subbalka 638  
 Viraraghava v Venkata 160 733  
 Virarama v Annasami 173  
 Virchand v Kondu, 432 903  
 Virjiban Dass v Breeswar Lal 743 744  
 Virupaksha v Panganayak 995  
 Virupakshappa v Shudappa 874 875  
 Visalatchi v Sivasankara 174  
 Viscount Gort v Rowney 131 409 414  
 Vishnu v Ganesh 588

Vishnu v Krishnarao 111 112  
 Vishnu v Pagho 220  
 Vishnu v Ramling 41 52a  
 Vishnu v Rampratab 351  
 Vishnu v Yusuf 214  
 Vishvambhar v Vasudev 350  
 Vishvanath v Dhondappa 304  
 Vishvanath v Pandharinath 222  
 Vishvanath v Rambhat 277 353  
 Vishvanath v Virchand 32  
 Vishvambhar *In re* 333 334  
 Vishwanath v Kondrji 30,  
 Vishwanath v Lallu 142  
 Vishwanathan v Somasundaram 660  
 Visnu v Dattu 549  
 Visvanadhan v Arunichelam 703  
 Visvanatha v Somasundaram 538  
 Visvanathan v Ramanathan 399 400  
 Viswanadhi Reddi v Keymer 83  
 Visweswara v Nair 514  
 Viswanathan v Ma Aye 897  
 Vithal v Balkrishna 341  
 Vithal v Mahadev 655 657  
 Vithal v Sakhamam 179  
 Vithal v Sitabai 63  
 Vithal v Vithojurav 771  
 Vithaldas v Dattaram 876  
 Vithaldas v Hansraj 859  
 Vithaldas v Subraya 705  
 Vithaldas v The Hyderabad Spinning  
 and Weaving Co Ltd 576  
 Vithalrao v Vaghaji 94  
 Vithelings v Cundasawmy 1247  
 Vithoba v Mahadev 301  
 Vithu v Bhims 431 796  
 Vithu v Ganesh 145 146 147  
 Vithu v Narayan 444  
 Volkart v Subju 443  
 Von Hellfeld v Rechnitzer 852  
 Vora Isabail v Dautbhai 343  
 Vulcan Iron Works v Bishumbhur 962  
 Vyankat v Oncar 64 446  
 Vyankatesh v Ramchandra 821  
 Vyankatesh v Sakhamam 70  
 Vyankatesh Oil Mill v Velmahomed 427  
 852  
 Vyavan v Srinath 527  
 Vythilinga Vijayathammal 57,

## W

Wadhawa v Partab 500  
 Wadeer v E I Co 566,

- Waghela v Masludin* 1052  
*Wagstaff v Watson* 15  
*Wahid v Safat* 588  
*Wahidullah v Kanhya Lal* 514  
*Wahid un nissa v Giridhari* 758  
*Wahid un nissa v Gobardhan* 902  
*Wahid un nissa v Zamin* 33  
*Wahidunnissa v Kundan Lal* 11  
*Wajid Ali v Puran Singh* 784 790  
*Wala v Hira* 37  
*Wafayat v Ramlal* 787  
*Wali Mohammad v Mahlu* 792  
*Wali Muhammad v Bahawal Bakhsh* 1189  
*Wali Muhammad v Barkhurdar* 425  
*Wali Muhammad v Muhammad* 300  
*Wali Muhammad v Muhammad Bakhsh* 1019  
*Wali ul lah v Muhammad* 589  
*Walian v Hanke Behari* 867  
*Walji v Eby* 1180  
*Walker v Clements* 527  
*Walker v Sur* 421 422  
*Wall v Howard* 1254 1256 1259  
*Wallace v Jefferson* 566 570  
*Wallace v Wallace* 119  
*Wallingford v The Mutual Society* 483  
*Walsham v Stainion* 566  
*Walsingham's case* 479  
*Walter v Sptenhopff* 129  
*Walters v Green* 408  
*Waman v Balu* 29  
*Waman v Hari* 5 a 1052  
*Wansborough Paper Co v Laughland* 94  
*Wana v Natu* 634  
*Ward v Marshall* 566  
*Waryam Singh v Harnam Singh* 1012  
*Wasappa v Secretary of State* 30  
*Waterhouse v Barker* 53  
*Watkins v Dhunnoo Baboo* 864  
*Watkins v Laxminarayen* 1246  
*Watkins v Mahomed* 374  
*Watkins v Scottish Imperial Insurance Co* 109  
*Watson v Aga Mehmedee* 842  
*Watson v Collector of Rajahmhye* 70  
     " 809 810 813  
*Watson v Cave* 44  
*Watson v Dhonenbra* 50  
*Watson v Floyd* 17 201  
*Watson & Co v Ramchand Dutt* 691  
*Wavell v Mitchell* 900  
*Wavnes Merthy Co v Radford & Co* 496  
*Wazir Chand v Nathu Ram* 986  
*Wazir Khan v Kale Khan* 627  
*Wazir un nissa v Ilahi Bakhsh* 885  
*Weatherall v Eastern Mortgage & Agency Co* 976  
*Webb v Macpherson* 1034  
*Webb v Stenton* 692  
*Webster v Webster* 196  
*Weinberger v Inglis* 485  
*Weir & Co v McVicar & Co* 859  
*Weld v Hornby* 964  
*Weld & Co v Sher Mahomed* 1246  
*Weldon v Neal* 496 497 499 500  
*Weisbach Incandescent Gas Light Co v New Sunlight Incandescent Co* 560 583  
*Wentworth v Bullen* 823  
*West End Watch Co v Berna Watch Co* 587  
*West Pans Central Gold Mining Co v Rex* 478 477  
*Westgate v Crowe* 132  
*Weston v Peary Mohan Dass* 1239  
*Weymouth v Rich* 494  
*Wheeler v Le Marchant* 566  
*Whetham v Davey* 653  
*White v Spafford & Co* 574  
*Whitham v Whitham* 561  
*Whitney v Moignard* 478 479 495  
*Whitworth In re* 560  
*Whitworth v Darbshire* 457  
*Whyte v Ahrens* 486  
*Wigram v Cox Sons Buckley & Co* 700 855  
*Widding v Sanderson* 15 292 293  
*Wild v Southwood* 698  
*Willesford v Watson* 1191  
*Williams v Prince of Wales As Co* 572  
*Williams v Ramsdale* 487  
*Williams v Wilcox* 480  
*Williamson v L & N W Ry Co* 480  
*Willmot v Gardner* 155  
*Willmott v Barber* 158  
*Wills v Lovick* 490  
*Wilson v Church* 424  
*Winter v Attorney General* 30  
*Winter v Round* 107  
*Winter v Weev* 100 101  
*Winterbottom v Lord Derbs* 262  
*Wiskhi Pam v Alwal* 1011 1012  
*Wise v Jugbundoo* 996

Wittman v Oppenheim 129  
 Woller v N L R Co 566  
 Womda Khanum v Raj Roop 740  
 Womes Chander v Chundee Churn 293  
 Wood v Cox 479  
 Wood v Durham 479 493  
 Wooller v Clark 509  
 Wooma Churn v Teil 363  
 Woomatara v Unnopoorua 47 49  
 Woomesh v Barada 45 54  
 Woopendra v Nabin 539  
 Worcester City and County Banking Co v Firbank Pauling & Co 82 84  
 Worraler v Pryer 624  
 Worrior Commercial Bank v Kojas Maroop 188  
 Wright re Kurke v North 578 580

## Y

Yad Ram v Umrao Singh 900  
 Yad Pam v Sundar Singh 348 745 749  
 Yakkhanath v Manakkat 298  
 Yakub Ali v Durga 212  
 Yakub Ebrahim v Bai Pahimatbai 509  
 Yamike Kweku v Annor Adjaye 1168  
 Yaramati v Chundru 219  
 Yashvant v DeSouza 1046  
 Yatintra Nath v Hari 341  
 Yella Reddi v Syed Muhammad Ali 639  
 Yellappa v Ramchandra 217 638  
 Yeo Eng v Beng Seng & Co 628  
 Yeshvadbai v Janardhan 1243  
 Yeshwant v Govind 215  
 Yeshwant v Shankar 971 976 977  
 Yeshwant v Vithal 441 443  
 Yesu Pamji v Balkrishna 3  
 Yorkshire Provident Co v Gilbert 401 487  
 Young v Wright 15

Yule & Co v Mahomed Hossain 1047  
 Yusuf v Naza 1060  
 Yusuf Ali v Kasim Ali 910  
 Yusuf v Durji 55 291  
 Yusuf Beg v The Board of Foreign Mission of the Presbyterian Church 849  
 Yusuf Khan v Riasat Ali 1174 1180  
 Yusuf ud Din v Queen Empress 4

## Z

Zafaryag Ali v Bakhtawar Singh 275 421  
 Zaharia v Debia 36 37  
 Zahrah v Bhugwan 1017  
 Zahur Ahmad v Taslim un nissa 1181 1192  
 Zainah Bibi v Rohila 790 800  
 Zain ul abdin v Muhammed Asgar Ali 217 378 734  
 Zair Hussain Khan v Khurshed Jan 90 288  
 Zamindar of Ettiyapuram v Chidambaram 114 145 646  
 Zamindar of Pittapuram v Proprietors of Kolanki 44  
 Zamindar of Tunu v Bennayya 10 403  
 Zamindar of Vellur v Adinarayadu 138  
 Zamir v Daulat Pam 627  
 Zamiran v Fateh Ali 96 346 353  
 Zamorin of Calicut v Narayanan, 49  
 Zemindar of Karvetnagar v Trustee of Turumalai 212  
 Zendoolal v Kishorilal, 553  
 Zierenberg v Labouchere 482 484 485 486  
 Zinat un nissa v Pajan 51  
 Zipru v Hari 778  
 Zohra Bibi v Zobeda 981 1011  
 Zulekabal v Ebrahim 1244





# COMPARATIVE TABLE OF THE SECTIONS OF THE OLD AND THE NEW CODE

| C P Code<br>1882    | C P Code<br>1905                  | C P Code,<br>1882 | C P Code<br>1908 |
|---------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| 1                   | S 1                               | 33                | O 1 r 10 (4)     |
| 2                   | S 2                               | 34                | O 1 r 13         |
| 3                   | Ss 154 156 157 158                | 35                | O 1 r 12         |
| 4                   | S 4                               | 36                | O 3 r 1          |
| 4A                  | S 5                               | 37                | O 3 r 2          |
| 5                   | S 7                               | 38                | O 3 r 3          |
| 6 paras (c) and (d) | Omitted.                          | 39                | O 3 r 4          |
| 6 last para         | S 6                               | 40                | O 3 r 5          |
| 7                   | Cf S 4                            | 41                | O 3 r 6          |
| 8                   | S 8                               | 42                | O 2 r 1          |
| 9                   | Omitted.                          | 43                | O 2 r 2          |
| 10                  | Omitted                           | 44                | O 2 rr 4 5       |
| 11                  | S 9                               | 45                | O 2 rr 3 6       |
| 12                  | S 10                              | 46                | Cf O 2 rr 6 7    |
| 13                  | S 11                              | 47                | Cf O 2 rr 6 7    |
| Expln. VI           | S 14                              | 48                | S 26 O 4 r 1     |
| 14                  | S 13                              | 49                | Cf S 137         |
| 15                  | S 15                              | 50                | O 7 rr 1 2 4 5   |
| 16                  | S 16                              | 51                | 6                |
| 16A                 | S 18                              | 52                | O 6 rr 14 15 (1) |
| 17                  | S 20                              | 53                | O 6 r 15 (2) (3) |
| 18                  | S 19                              |                   | O 6 r 17 cf O 7  |
| 19                  | S 17                              | 54                | r 11             |
| 20                  | Omitted                           |                   | O 7 r 11 cf O 6  |
| 21                  | Omitted                           | 55                | r 18             |
| 22                  | Ss 22 23 (1)                      | 56                | O 7 r 12         |
| 23                  | Ss 22 23 (2)                      | 57                | O 7 r 13         |
| 24 paras 1 & 3      | Ss 22 23 (3)                      | 58                | O 7 r 10         |
| 24 para 2           | Omitted.                          | 59                | O 7 r 9          |
| 25                  | S 24                              | 60                | O 4 r 2          |
| 26                  | O 1 rr 1 4 (a)                    | 61                | O 7 r 14         |
| 27                  | O 1 r 10 (1)                      | 62                | O 7 r 15         |
| 28                  | O 1 rr 3 4 (b)                    | 63                | O 7 r 16         |
| 29                  | O 1 r 6                           | 64                | O " r 17         |
| 30                  | O 1 r 8 (1)                       | 65                | O 7 r 18         |
| 31                  | O 1 r 9                           | 66                | S 27 O 5 r 1     |
| 32                  | O 1 rr 8 (2) 10<br>(2) (3) (5) 11 | 67                | O 5 r 2          |
|                     |                                   |                   | O 5 r 3          |
|                     |                                   |                   | O 5 r 4.         |

## Comparative Table of the Sections of the Old and the New Code—contd

| C P Code<br>1882 | C P Code<br>1908  | C P Code<br>1882 | C P Code<br>1908 |
|------------------|-------------------|------------------|------------------|
| 68               | O 5 r 5           | 109              | O 9 r 14         |
| 69               | O 5 r 6           | 110              | O 8 r 1          |
| 70               | O 5 r 7           | 111              | O 8 r 6          |
| 71               | O 5 r 8           | 112              | O 8 r 9          |
| 72               | O 5 r 9           | 113              | O 8 r 10         |
| 73               | O 5 r 10          | 114              | C/ O 6 r 2       |
| 74               | O 5 r 11          | 115              | C/ O 6 rr 14 15  |
| 75               | O 5 r 12          | 116              | rr 16 17         |
| 76               | O 5 r 13          | 117              | O 10 r 1         |
| 77               | O 5 r 14          | 118              | O 10 r 2         |
| 78               | O 5 r 15          | 119              | O 10 r 3         |
| 79               | O 5 r 16          | 120              | O 10 r 4         |
| 80               | O 5 r 17          | 121              | O 11 r 1         |
| 81               | O 5 r 18          | 122              | C/ O 48 r 2      |
| 82               | O 5 rr 19 20 (1)  | 1 3              | O 11 r 3         |
| 83               | O 5 r 20 (2)      | 124              | O 11 r 5         |
| 84               | O 5 r 20 (3)      | 125              | O 11 r 6         |
| 85               | S 29 O 5 rr 21 23 | 1 6              | O 11 r 8         |
| 86               | O 5 r 22          | 127              | O 11 r 11        |
| 87               | O 5 rr 24 29      | 128              | O 12 r 2         |
| 88               |                   | 129              | O 11 rr 12 13    |
| 89               | O 5 r 25          | 130              | O 11 r 14        |
| 90               | O 5 r 26          | 131              | O 11 r 15        |
| 91               | O 5 r 30 (1) (2)  | 132              | O 11 r 17        |
| 92               | O 5 r 30 (3)      | 133              | O 11 r 18 (1)    |
| 93               | O 48 r 1          | 134              | O 11 r 18 (2)    |
| 94               | S 143 O 48 r 2    | 135              | O 11 r 20        |
| 95               | S 143             | 136              | O 11 r 21        |
| 96               | O 9 r 1           | 137              | O 13 r 10        |
| 97               | O 9 r 2           | 138              | O 13 r 1 (1)     |
| 98               | O 9 r 3           | 139              | O 13 r 2         |
| 99               | O 9 r 4           | 140              | O 13 rr 1 (2) 1  |
| 99A              | O 9 r 5           | 141              | O 13 r 4         |
| 100              | O 9 r 6           | 141A             | O 13 r 5         |
| 101              | O 9 r 7           | 14               | O 13 r 6         |
| 102              | O 9 r 8           | 142A             | O 13 r 7         |
| 103              | O 9 r 9           | 143              | O 13 r 8         |
| 104              | Omitted           | 144              | O 13 r 9         |
| 105              | O 9 r 10          | 145              | O 13 r 11        |
| 106              | O 9 r 11          | 146              | O 14 rr 1 2      |
| 107              | O 9 r 12          | 147              | O 14 r 3         |
| 108              | O 9 r 13          | 148              | O 14 r 4         |
|                  |                   | 149              | O 14 r 5         |

## Comparative Table of the Sections of the Old and the New Code—contd

| C P Code<br>1882                | C P Code<br>1908          | C P Code<br>1882              | C P Code<br>1908      |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|
| 150                             | O 14 r 6                  | 191                           | O 18 r 15             |
| 151                             | O 14 r 7                  | 192                           | O 18 r 16             |
| 152                             | O 15 r 1                  | 193                           | O 18 r 17             |
| 153                             | O 15 r 2                  | 194                           | O 19 r 1              |
| 154                             | O 15 r 3                  | 195                           | O 19 r 2              |
| 155                             | O 15 r 4                  | 196                           | O 19 r 3              |
| 156                             | O 17 r 1                  | 197                           | S 139                 |
| 157                             | O 17 r 2                  | 198                           | S 33 O 20 r 1         |
| 158                             | O 17 r 3                  | 199                           | O 20 r 2              |
| 159                             | O 16 r 1                  | 200                           | Cf S 137              |
| 160                             | O 16 r 2                  | 201                           |                       |
| 161                             | O 16 r 3                  | 202                           |                       |
| 162                             | O 16 r 4                  | 203                           | O 20 r 3              |
| 163                             | O 16 r 5                  | 204                           | O 20 r 4              |
| 164                             | O 16 r 6                  | 205                           | O 20 r 5              |
| 165                             | O 16 r 7                  | 206                           | O 20 r 7              |
| 166                             | O 16 r 8                  | 206 first and second<br>paras | O 20 r 8              |
| 167                             | O 16 r 9                  | 206 third para                | S 152                 |
| 168                             | O 16 r 10                 | 207                           | O 20 r 9              |
| 169                             | O 16 r 11                 | 208                           | O 20 r 10             |
| 170                             | O 16 r 12                 | 209                           | S 34                  |
| 171                             | O 16 r 14                 | 210                           | O 20 r 11             |
| 172                             | O 16 r 15                 | 211                           | S 2 (12) O 20<br>r 12 |
| 173                             | O 16 r 16                 | 212                           |                       |
| 174 }<br>175 }                  | O 16 rr 10 to 13<br>17 18 | 213                           | O 20 r 13             |
| 176                             | O 16 r 19                 | 214                           | O 20 r 14             |
| 177                             | O 16 r 20                 | 215                           | O 20 r 15             |
| 178                             | O 16 r 21                 | 215A                          | O 20 r 16             |
| 179                             | O 18 rr 1 2 (1)           | 216                           | O 20 r 19             |
| 180                             | O 18 rr 2 (2) (3) 3       | 217                           | O 20 r 20             |
| 181                             | O 18 r 4                  | 218                           | Cf S 35 (1) (2)       |
| 182                             | O 18 r 5                  | 219                           |                       |
| 183                             | O 18 r 6                  | 220                           |                       |
| 184                             | O 18 r 8                  | 221                           | O 20 r 6 (3)          |
| 185                             | O 18 r 9                  | 222                           | Cf S 35 (3)           |
| 185A first and se<br>cond paras | S 138                     | 223 first para                | S 38                  |
| 185A third para                 | O 18 r 7                  | 223 second and<br>third paras | S 39                  |
| 186                             | O 18 r 10                 | 223 fourth para               | S 41                  |
| 187                             | O 18 r 11                 | 223 fifth para                | O 21 r 4              |
| 188                             | O 18 r 12                 | 223 sixth para                | O 21 r 5              |
| 189                             | O 18 r 13                 | 224                           | O 21 r 6              |
| 190                             | O 18 r 14                 | 225                           | O 21 r 7              |
|                                 |                           | 226                           | O 21 r 8              |

## Comparative Table of the Sections of the Old and the New Code—contd

| C P Code<br>1882           | C P Code<br>1908            | C P Code<br>1882 | C P Code<br>1908 |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|------------------|
| 227                        | O 21 r 9                    | 262              | O 21 r 34 (5)    |
| 228                        | S 42                        | 263              | O 21 r 35        |
| 229                        | S 43                        | 264              | O 21 r 36        |
| 229A                       | S 4                         | 265              | S 54             |
| 229B                       | S 44                        | 266              | S 60             |
| 230 first para             | O 21 r 10                   | 267              | O 21 r 41        |
| 230 second para            | O 21 r 21                   | 268              | O 21 r 46        |
| 230 third and fourth paras | S 48                        | 269              | O 21 r 43        |
| 231                        | O 21 r 15                   | 270              | O 21 r 51        |
| 232                        | O 21 r 16                   | 271              | S 62             |
| 233                        | S 49                        | 272              | O 21 r 52        |
| 234                        | S 50                        | 273              | O 21 r 53        |
| 235                        | O 21 r 11 (2)               | 274              | O 21 r 54        |
| 236                        | O 21 r 12                   | 275              | O 21 r 55        |
| 237                        | O 21 r 13                   | 276              | S 64             |
| 238                        | O 21 r 14                   | 277              | O 21 r 56        |
| 239                        | O 21 r 26 (1) (2)           | 278              | O 21 r 58        |
| 240                        | O 21 r 26 (3)               | 279              | O 21 r 59        |
| 241                        | O 21 r 27                   | 280              | O 21 r 60        |
| 242                        | O 21 r 28                   | 281              | O 21 r 61        |
| 243                        | O 21 r 29                   | 282              | O 21 r 62        |
| 244                        | S 47                        | 283              | O 21 r 63        |
| 245                        | O 21 r 17                   | 284              | O 21 r 64        |
| 245A                       | S 66                        | 285              | S 63             |
| 245B                       | O 21 r 37                   | 286              | O 21 r 65        |
| 246                        | O 21 r 18                   | 287              | O 21 rr 66 70    |
| 247                        | O 21 r 19                   | 288              | Omitted.         |
| 248                        | O 21 r 22                   | 289              | O 21 r 67        |
| 249                        | O 21 r 23                   | 290              | O 21 r 68        |
| 250                        | O 21 r 24 (1)               | 291              | O 21 r 69        |
| 251                        | O 21 rr 24 (2) (3)<br>" (1) | 292              | O 21 r 73        |
| 252                        | S 5                         | 293              | O 21 r 71        |
| 253                        | Cf S 145                    | 294              | O 21 r 72        |
| 254                        | O 21 r 30                   | 295              | S 73             |
| 255                        | O 21 r 42                   | 296              | O 21 r 76        |
| 256                        | O 21 r 11 (1)               | 297              | O 21 r 77        |
| 257                        | O 21 r 1                    | 298              | O 21 r 78        |
| 257A                       | Omitted                     | 299              | O 21 r 79 (1)    |
| 258                        | O 21 r 2                    | 300              | O 21 r 79 (2)    |
| 259                        | O 21 r 31                   | 301              | O 21 r 79 (3)    |
| 260                        | O 21 r 32                   | 302              | O 21 r 80        |
| 261                        | O 21 r 34 (1) to (4)        | 303              | O 21 r 81        |
|                            |                             | 304              | O 21 r 82        |
|                            |                             | 305              | O 21 r 83        |

## Comparative Table of the Sections of the Old and the New Code—contd

| C P Code<br>1882 | C P Code<br>1908     | C P Code<br>1882 | C P Code<br>1908                                      |
|------------------|----------------------|------------------|---|
| 306              | O 21 r 84            | 340              | O 21 r 39 (5)   |
| 307              | O 21 r 85            | 341 }            | S 58  |
| 308              | O 21 r 86            | 343 }            | O 21 r 20   |
| 309              | O 21 r 87            | 343              | Repealed by the Pro<br>vincial Insolvency<br>Act 1907 |
| 310              | O 21 r 88            | 344—360A         |   |
| 310A             | O 21 r 89            |                  |   |
| 311              | O 21 r 90            | 361              | O 22 r 1  |
| 312              | O 21 r 92            | 362              | O 22 r 2  |
| 313              | O 21 r 91            | 363              | O 22 r 3 (1)  |
| 314              | O 21 r 92            | 365              | O 22 r 3 (1)  |
| 315              | O 21 r 93            | 366              | O 22 r 3 (2)  |
| 316              | S 65 O 21 r 94       | 367              | O 22 r 5  |
| 317              | S 66                 | 368              | O 22 r 4  |
| 318              | O 21 r 95            | 369              | O 22 r 7  |
| 319              | O 21 r 96            | 370              | O 22 r 8  |
| 320              | Ss 68 70 and 71      | 371              | O 22 r 9 (1) (2)                                      |
| 321              |                      | 372              | O 22 r 10   |
| 322              |                      | 372A             | O 22 r 9 (3)  |
| 322A             |                      | 373              | O 23 r 1  |
| 322B             |                      | 374              | O 23 r 2  |
| 322C             |                      | 375              | O 23 r 3  |
| 322D             |                      | 375A             | O 23 r 4  |
| 323              | The Third Schedule   | 376              | O 24 r 1  |
| 324              |                      | 377              | O 24 r 2  |
| 324A             |                      | 378              | O 24 r 3  |
| 325              |                      | 379              | O 24 r 4  |
| 325A             |                      | 380              | O 25 r 1 (1) (3)                                      |
| 325B             |                      | 381              | O 25 r 2  |
| 325C             |                      | 382              | O 25 r 1 (2)  |
| 326              |                      | 383              | O 26 r 1  |
| 327              |                      | 384              | O 26 r 2  |
| 328              |                      | 385              | O 26 r 3  |
| 329              | O 21 r 97            | 386              | S 76 O 26 r 4   |
| 330              | O 21 r 98            | 387              | O 26 r 5  |
| 331              | O 21 r 99            | 388              | O 26 r 6  |
| 332              | O 21 rr 100 101 103  | 389              | O 26 r 7  |
| 333              | O 21 r 102           | 390              | O 26 r 8  |
| 334              | O 21 rr 97 98        | 391              | S 78  |
| 335              | O 21 rr 97 99 103    | 392              | O 26 r 9  |
| 336              | S 55                 | 393              | O 26 r 10   |
| 337              | O 21 r 38            | 394              | O 26 r 11   |
| 337A             | O 21 r 40            | 395              | O 26 r 12   |
| 338              | S 57                 | 396              | O 26 rr 13 14.  |
| 339              | O 21 r 39 (1) to (4) |                  |   |

## Comparative Table of the Sections of the Old and the New Code—contd

| C P Code<br>1882 | C P Code<br>1908                 | C P Code<br>1882 | C P Code<br>1908    |
|------------------|----------------------------------|------------------|---------------------|
| 397              | O 26 r 15                        | 440              | O 32 rr 1 4 (2)     |
| 398              | O 26 r 16                        | 441              | O 32 r u (1)        |
| 399              | O 26 r 17                        | 442              | O 32 r 2            |
| 400              | O 26 r 18                        | 443              | O 32 rr 3 (1) 4 (2) |
| 401              | O 33 r 1                         | 444              | O 32 r u (2)        |
| 402              | Omitted                          | 445              | O 32 r 4 (1)        |
| 403              | O 33 r 2                         | 446              | O 32 r 9            |
| 404              | O 33 r 3                         | 447              | O 32 r 8            |
| 405              | O 33 r u                         | 448              | O 32 r 10 (1)       |
| 406              | O 33 r 4                         | 449              | O 32 r 10 (2)       |
| 407              | O 33 r 5                         | 450              | O 32 r 12 (1)       |
| 408              | O 33 r 6                         | 451              | O 32 r 12 (2) (3)   |
| 409              | O 33 r 7                         | 452              | O 32 r 12 (4)       |
| 410              | O 33 r 8                         | 453              | O 32 r 12 (5)       |
| 411              | O 33 r 10                        | 454              | O 32 r 13           |
| 412              | O 33 r 11                        | 455              | O 32 r 14           |
| 413              | O 33 r 15                        | 456              | O 32 rr 3 (2) (d)   |
| 414              | O 33 r 9                         | 457              | 4 (4)               |
| 415              | O 33 r 16                        | 458              | O 32 r 4 (1)        |
| 416              | S 79 O 27 r 1                    | 459              | O 32 r 11 (1)       |
| 417              | O 27 r -                         | 460              | O 32 r 11 (2)       |
| 418              | O 27 r 3                         | 461              | Omitted             |
| 419              | O 27 r 4                         | 462              | O 32 r 6            |
| 420              | O 27 r 5                         | 463              | O 32 r 7            |
| 421              | O 27 r 6                         | 464              | O 32 r 15           |
| 422              | O 5 r 27                         | 465              | O 32 r 10           |
| 423              | O 7 r 7                          | 466              | O 28 r 1            |
| 424              | S 80                             | 467              | O 28 r 2            |
| 425              | Omitted [See s u<br>sub sec (2)] | 468              | O 28 r 3            |
| 426              | O 27 r 8 (1)                     | 469              | O u rr 28 29        |
| 427              | O 7 r 8 (2)                      | 470              | 468                 |
| 428              | S 81                             | 471              | O 32 r 1            |
| 429              | S 82                             | 472              | O 32 r 2            |
| 430              | S 83                             | 473              | O 32 r 4            |
| 431              | S 84                             | 474              | O 32 r 5            |
| 432              | S 85                             | 475              | O 32 r 6            |
| 433              | S 86                             | 476              | O 32 r 3            |
| 434              | S 87                             | 477 }<br>478 }   | O 32 r 1            |
| 435              | O 29 r 1                         | 479              | O 32 r 2            |
| 436              | O 29 rr 2 3                      | 480              | O 32 r 3            |
| 437              | O 31 r 1                         | 481              | O 32 r 4            |
| 438              | O 31 r -                         | 482 }<br>483 }   | Omitted             |
| 439              | O 31 r 3                         | 484              | O 32 r u            |

## Comparative Table of the Sections of the Old and the New Code—contd

| C P Code<br>1882 | C P Code<br>1905    | C P Code<br>1882 | C P Code<br>1908 |
|------------------|---------------------|------------------|------------------|
| 485              | O 38 r 6            | 529              | O 36 r 3         |
| 486              | O 38 r 7            | 530              | O 36 r 4         |
| 487              | O 38 r 8            | 531              | O 36 r 5         |
| 488              | O 38 r 9            | 532              | O 37 r 2         |
| 489              | O 38 r 10           | 533              | O 37 r 3         |
| 490              | O 38 r 11           | 534              | O 37 r 4         |
| 491              | S 90                | 535              | O 37 r 5         |
| 492              | O 39 r 1            | 536              | O 37 r 6         |
| 493              | O 39 r 2            | 537              | O 37 r 7         |
| 494              | O 39 r 3            | 538              | O 37 r 1         |
| 495              | O 39 r 5            | 539              | Ss 92 and 93     |
| 496              | O 39 r 4            | 540              | S 96             |
| 497              | S 90                | 541              | O 41 r 1         |
| 498              | O 39 r 6            | 542              | O 41 r 2         |
| 499              | O 39 r 7            | 543              | O 41 r 3         |
| 500              | O 39 r 8            | 544              | O 41 r 4         |
| 501              | O 39 r 9            | 545              | O 41 r 5         |
| 502              | O 39 r 10           | 546              | O 41 r 6         |
| 503              | O 40 rr 1 to 3      | 547              | O 41 r 7         |
| 504              | O 40 r 5            | 548              | O 41 r 8         |
| 505              | Omitted.            | 549              | O 41 r 10        |
| 506              | The Second Schedule | 550              | O 41 r 13        |
| 507              |                     | 551              | O 41 r 11        |
| 508              |                     | 552              | O 41 r 12        |
| 509              |                     | 553              | O 41 r 14        |
| 510              |                     | 554              | O 41 r 15        |
| 511              |                     | 555              | O 41 r 16        |
| 512              |                     | 556              | O 41 r 17        |
| 513              |                     | 557              | O 41 r 18        |
| 514              |                     | 558              | O 41 r 19        |
| 515              |                     | 559              | O 41 r 20        |
| 516              |                     | 560              | O 41 r 21        |
| 517              |                     | 561              | O 41 r 22        |
| 518              |                     | 562              | O 41 r 23        |
| 519              |                     | 564              | Omitted          |
| 520              |                     | 565              | O 41 r 24        |
| 521              |                     | 566              | O 41 r 25        |
| 522              |                     | 567              | O 41 r 26        |
| 523              |                     | 568              | O 41 r 27        |
| 524              |                     | 569              | O 41 r 28        |
| 525              |                     | 570              | O 41 r 29        |
| 526              |                     | 571              | O 41 r 30        |
| 527              | O 36 r 1            | 572              | Cf S 13,         |
| 528              | O 36 r 2            | 573              |                  |



## Comparative Table of the Sections of the Old and the New Code—contd

| C P Code<br>1882 | C P Code<br>1908    | C P Code<br>1882 | C P Code<br>1908      |
|------------------|---------------------|------------------|-----------------------|
| 574              | O 41 r 31           | 617              | S 113 O 46 r 1        |
| 575              | S 98                | 618              | O 46 r 2              |
| 576              | O 41 r 34           | 619              | O 46 r 3              |
| 577              | O 41 r 32           | 620              | O 46 r 4              |
| 578              | S 99                | 621              | O 46 r 5              |
| 579              | O 41 r 35           | 622              | S 115                 |
| 580              | O 41 r 36           | 623              | S 114 O 47 r 1        |
| 581              | O 41 r 37           | 624              | O 47 r 1              |
| 582              | S 107 (2) O 22 r 11 | 625              | O 47 r 3              |
| 582A             | Cf S 140            | 626              | O 47 r 4              |
| 583              | Cf S 144 (1)        | 627              | O 47 r 5              |
| 584              | Cf S 100            | 628              | O 47 r 6              |
| 585              | Cf S 101            | 629              | O 47 rr 7 9           |
| 586              | S 102               | 630              | O 47 r 8              |
| 587              | S 108 O 4 r 1       | 631              | S 116                 |
| 588              | S 104 O 43 r 1      | 632              | S 117                 |
| 589              | S 106               | 633              | S 122                 |
| 590              | S 108 O 43 r 2      | 634              | S 118                 |
| 591              | S 105               | 635              | S 119                 |
| 592              | O 44 r 1            | 636              | O 49 r 1              |
| 593              | O 44 r 2            | 637              | S 128 (2) (1)         |
| 594              | O 45 r 1            | 638              | S 120 (1) O 48 r 3    |
| 595              | S 109               | 639              | S 120 (2)             |
| 596              | S 110               | 640              | S 131                 |
| 597              | S 111               | 641              | S 133                 |
| 598              | O 45 r 2            | 642              | S 135                 |
| 599              | O 45 r 3            | 643              | Omitted.              |
| 600              | O 45 r 6            | 644              | O 48 r 4              |
| 601              | O 45 r 7            | 645              | S 137                 |
| 602              | O 45 r 8            | 646A             | S 140                 |
| 603              | O 45 r 9            | 646              | Omitted.              |
| 604              | O 45 r 10           | 646B             | O 46 r 6              |
| 605              | O 45 r 11           | 647              | O 46 r 7              |
| 606              | O 45 r 12           | 648              | S 141                 |
| 607              | O 45 r 13           | 649              | S 136                 |
| 608              | O 45 r 14           | 650              | S 31 37               |
| 609              | O 45 r 15           | 651              | Omitted.              |
| 610              | O 45 r 16           | 652              | S 29                  |
| 611              |                     | 653              | S 122 129 130 and 131 |
| 612              |                     |                  | S 39                  |
| 613              | Omitted.            |                  |                       |
| 614              |                     |                  |                       |
| 615              |                     |                  |                       |
| 616              | S 112.              |                  |                       |

## CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE

OF

## PREVIOUS AND AMENDING ACTS

| Year | No of Act | Short Title                                      | How affected                      |
|------|-----------|--|-----------------------------------|
| 1841 | VIII      | Interpleader                                     | Rep Act X of 1877                 |
| 1847 | XII       | Defects in Civil Procedure                       | Act XII of 1873                   |
| 1850 | VIII      | Code of Civil Procedure                          | Act X of 1877                     |
| 1860 | IV        | Civil Procedure                                  | Act XVIII of 1901                 |
| 1861 | X         | Repealing Enactments relating to Civil Procedure | Act XIV of 1870                   |
| 1861 | XVIII     | Code of Civil Procedure                          | Act X of 1877                     |
| 1863 | IX        | Amending the Code of Civil Procedure             | Act X of 1877                     |
| 1864 | X         | Extension of Civil Procedure Code to Sindh       | Act VIII of 1868                  |
| 1877 | X         | Code of Civil Procedure                          | Act XIV of 1892                   |
| 1878 | XVIII     | Amending the Code of Civil Procedure             | Act VII of 1870                   |
| 1879 | XII       | Do do  | Act XIV of 1892                   |
| 1882 | XIV       | Code of Civil Procedure                          | Act V of 1908                     |
| 1908 | X         | The Code of Civil Procedure                      | Amndg Act I of 1914               |
|      |           |  | Act IV of 1914                    |
|      |           |  | Amndg and Replng Act X of 1914    |
|      |           |  | Amndg and Replng Act XVII of 1914 |
|      |           |  | Amndg Act XIII of 1916            |
|      |           |  | XIV of 1917                       |
|      |           |  | XVIII of 1919                     |
|      |           |  | XIV of 1920                       |
|      |           |  | XVI of 1920                       |
|      |           |  | XVIII of 1920                     |
|      |           |  | III of 1921                       |
|      |           |  | IX of 1922                        |
|      |           |  | XI of 1923                        |
|      |           |  | XVI of 1923                       |
|      |           |  | XIX of 1923                       |
|      |           |  | XX of 1923                        |
|      |           |  | I of 1926                         |
|      |           |  | VI of 1926                        |



## ADDENDA

P 7, S 2—Strike out from the last paragraph the words Again a finding have been overruled (f) and substitute the following —

**Findings on issue**—It was at one time held by the High Court of Bombay that a finding on a preliminary issue that a suit was not bad for misjoinder or that it was not barred by limitation or that the Court had jurisdiction to entertain a suit was in the nature of a preliminary decree and appealable as such *Sidhanath v Ganesh* (1913) 37 Bom 60 17 I C 461 *Narayan v Gopal* (1914) 38 Bom 392 399 23 I C 869 These decisions have since been overruled by a Full Bench of the same High Court and it has been held that a finding on an issue cannot be the subject of an appeal until it has been embodied in the judgment and the decree. It was accordingly held in that case that a finding that the questions in dispute were not caste questions and were not therefore outside the jurisdiction of Civil Courts do not amount to a preliminary decree and that no appeal lay from such finding *Chanmalsuami v Gangadharappa* (1915) 39 Bom 339 26 I C 883. It has similarly been held that a finding that the matter is not res judicata and that the trial can proceed is not a preliminary decree.

P 7 S —Strike out foot notes (e) and (f)

P 8 S —Strike out in the last paragraph the words The High Court of Bombay Gangadharappa (i) and substitute the following —

It was held at one time by the High Court of Bombay that a finding on a preliminary issue that a suit is not bad for misjoinder or that it is not barred by limitation or a decision that the Court has jurisdiction to entertain a suit was a preliminary decree *Sidhanath v Ganesh* (1913) 37 Bom 60 17 I C 461 *Narayan v Gopal* (1914) 38 Bom 392 399 23 I C 869. But these decisions have since been overruled by a Full Bench of the same High Court *Chanmalsuami v Gangadharappa* (1915) 39 Bom 339 26 I C 883. In the last mentioned case it was held that a finding that the matters in dispute are not caste questions and are not therefore outside the jurisdiction of Civil Courts does not amount to a preliminary decree from which an appeal can lie *Chanmalsuami v Gangadharappa* (1915) 39 Bom 339 26 I C 883. Similarly it has been held that a finding that a matter is not res judicata and that therefore the trial can proceed is not preliminary decree *Bharna v Bhamagarda* (1915) 39 Bom 421 28 I C 461 *Genna v Khuda Baksh* (1913) P P No 16 p 56 15 I C 563. Nor is a finding that the plaintiff is competent to maintain the suit brought by him *Kamini Dabhi v Promotha* (1914) 19 C W N 73 27 I C 317. Nor is a finding that a suit is not barred by limitation *Akhusi Ram v Tulsa Ram* (1917) P R No 7 p 23 39 I C 100. Nor is a finding that the defendant is not an agriculturist *Rupchand v Bhiglal* (1926) 28 Bom L R 307 94 I C 72 (26) A B 237. A finding that the defendant is an agriculturist within the meaning of the Dekhan Agriculturists Relief Act 18 9 is not by itself an adjudication which can be embodied in a preliminary decree though it may result in the plaint being returned for presentation to the proper Court *Dattatraya v Radhabai* (1911) 40 Bom 627 60 I C 883 *Gulabchand v Baliram* (1915) 39 Bom 423 28 I C 569 *Vamanacharya v Govind* (1923) 25 Bom L R 826 834 76 I C 1014 (24)

A B 33 [see O 7 r 10] An interlocutory order that a plaint should be stamped with a higher court fee than what it is stamped with does not amount to a preliminary decree *Mir Umar Ali v Nasibunnissa* (1911) F R No 82 p. 703 13 I C 400 None of these findings determines the rights of the parties with regard to all or any of the matters in controversy in the suit it merely enables the Court to proceed to inquire into the rights (1921) 40 Bom 67 at p. 634 60 I C 89; *supra*

P 17 S 2—Add the following in f n. (g) —

*Muthu Parimalinga v Shamsunga* (1906) 11 Mad 242 10 I C 804 (18) A M 175

P 80 S 13—Add the following as a separate paragraph before the paragraph headed Limitation —

The period of limitation for a suit on a foreign judgment is six years from the date of the judgment see Limitation Act 1908 Sch 1 art 117 The period begins to run even if an appeal is filed from the judgment *Hari Singh v Muhammad Saif* (1907) 8 Lah 54 10 I C 523 (14) A I 200

P 89 S 1—Add the following in paragraph 5 after f n. (i) —

Thus where in a suit for accounts the plaintiff values his claim at less than Rs 5 000 which is the maximum pecuniary jurisdiction of the Court in which the suit is filed and the amount found due on the taking of accounts exceeds Rs 5 000 the Court has the power to pass a decree for that amount *Krishnaji v Vaidal* (1909) 31 Bom 1 R 476 (29) A B 317

P 150 S 4—Add the following in f n. (i) —

*Chelliar Firm v Totto* (1921) 1 Rang 393 104 I C 121 (27) A R 216

P 159 S 47 3—Add the word his before the word << sharers

P 159 S 47 4—Strike out the words the decree holder

P 276 S 70—In paragraph 4 substitute the word any for the word and

P 227 S 70 1 6—Substitute the words The Collector again has no power for the words The Collector has no jurisdiction

P 227 S 70—Add the following in the beginning of the paragraph headed Revision —  
The High Court has no power to interfere in revision with an order made by the Collector even though such order may not be in accordance with the provisions of Sch III cl 1 of the Code *Krishna Das v Purneopal* (1908) 30 All 827 (28) A A 508

1 231 S 73 1 14—Add the following as a new paragraph —

Application for execution—The application for execution must be in the form prescribed by O 21 r 11 It has however been held that an application for execution though it may not contain all the particulars required by O 21 r 11 may yet be sufficient for the purposes of this section *Abdul Salam v Iccalhadra* (1906) 11 Mad 760 118 I C 72 (29) A M 73

P 231 S 73 1 16—For the words in the form prescribed by substitute the words as provided by

P 231 S 73 f n. (g)—Strike out the figures 201 and the Maheas case

P 247 S 70—Add the following in f n. (e) —

*Gorinda v Secretary of State* (1907) 50 Mad 449 104 I C 576 (27) A M 689

P 283 S 92—Add the following as a new paragraph immediately after the paragraph headed *Cy pres doctrine* —

**Appeal**—An order refusing to join as parties to a suit under Sec 92 is a judgment within the meaning of cl 15 of the Letters Patent and appealable as such  
*C E Doopley v M E Moola* (1927) 5 Rang 263 103 I C 261 (27) A R 180

P 291 S 96—Add the following in the beginning of f n (y) —

*Ram Bahadur v Luchu Kuer* (1885) 11 Cal 301 *Vando v Bidhu* (1886) 13 Cal 1  
*Midnapore Zamindari Co Ltd v Naresh* (1921) 48 Cal 460 *Tausukh Rai v Gopal* (1929) 8 Pat 617 (29) A P 586

P 333 S 110—Add the following in f n (s) —

*Maung Shwe v Ua Phe* (1929) 7 Rang 271 (29) A R 260

P 443 O 9 r 9—Add the following in f n (m) —

*Bajul Lal v Maharaja* (1978) 7 Pat 333 109 I C 264 (28) A P 335

P 463 O 3 r 4—Add the following as a separate paragraph —

**Signed**—See s 2 (a)

P 543 O 9 r 9—Add the following in the fourth line of f n (l) after the figures 126 —  
*Narayana v Muthu* (1927) 50 Mad 67 92 I C 653 (26) A M 114

P 553 O 9 r 13—Add the following as a new paragraph at the bottom of p 553 —

**Insolvency of defendant and deposit in Court.**—Where an ex parte decree is set aside on condition that the defendant should deposit in Court a sum equivalent to the amount of the plaintiff's claim or any other sum and the amount is so deposited and a decree is eventually passed for the plaintiff the plaintiff and not the Official Assignee or receiver is entitled on the insolvency of the defendant to the money paid into Court *Parsdam Das v David* (1915) 13 All L J 893 30 I C 779

P 553 O 9 r 13—Add the following at the end of the paragraph headed **Appeal** —

An appeal lies from an order rejecting the application for an order to set aside a decree passed ex parte when the order is made because the conditions which were lawfully imposed on the defendants were not complied with *Narayan v Tailani* (1927) 51 Bom 67 99 I C 384 (27) A B 1

P 553 O 9 r 13—Add the following in f n (g) —

*Bajul Lal v Maharaja* (1978) 7 Pat 333 109 I C 264 (28) A P 335

P 560 O 11 r 13—Add the following as a new paragraph after the paragraph headed **A party is not bound etc** —

The rules regarding inspection and discovery of documents are not different for suits relating to boundary disputes and other disputes. Assertions of a party on oath that documents required to be produced relate only to his own title cannot be disregarded if the Court is satisfied that they are true and that the party asserting has not misconceived the nature and effect of those documents  
*Chowood Ltd v Lyall* (1929) 2 Ch 406

P 794 O 2 r 4—Add the following in f n (f) —

See also *Perumal v Perumal* (1928) 51 Mad 701 112 I C 116 (28) A M 914

P 821 O 23 r 3—Add the following in f n (d) after the figures 503 —

*Ram Deti v Shamsah Lal* (1926) 48 All 475 95 I C 416 (26) A A 501

P 884 O 33 r 1—Add the following as a new para immediately after the paragraph headed *Jauper* —

An order granting leave to file a suit *in forma pauperis* is not a judgment within the meaning of cl 15 of the Letters Patent and not appealable as such *Mahajan v Mahajan* (1926) 4 Rang 26 33 I C 823 (26) A R 110

P 126 Cl 1a of Letters Patent—Add at the end of the second paragraph after fn (g) —

An order refusing leave to amend a plaint followed by a dismissal of the suit is a judgment and appealable as such *P. M. Chettyar Firm v Ma Sire* (1927) 5 Rang 113 101 I C 623 (—) A R 124

P 100 Cl 1 of Letters Patent 16—Add the following after fn (4) —

An order passed in a winding up proceeding refusing leave to a mortgagee decree holder to execute his decree and in effect directing him to prove the mortgage debt to the satisfaction of the official liquidator is a judgment and is appealable as such *Hansraj v Official Liquidators* (1939) 41 All 693

P 108 Cl 2b of Letters Patent—Add the following as a note to cl 28 —

Contempt of Court—It has been held by a Full Bench of the High Court of Patna that a Division Bench has power under this clause to issue a rule to show cause against committal for contempt *Ie Murl Manohar* (1929) 8 Pat 33 (29) A R —

# THE CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE

## ACT V OF 1908

RECEIVED THE ASSENT OF THE GOVERNOR GENERAL  
ON THE 21ST MARCH 1908

*An Act to consolidate and amend the laws relating to the  
Procedure of the Courts of Civil Judicature*

WHEREAS it is expedient to consolidate and amend the laws relating to the procedure of the Courts of Civil Judicature, It is hereby enacted as follows —

### Preliminary

Short title commencement  
and extent

**1** [S 1] (1) This Act may be cited as the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908

(2) It shall come into force on the first day of January, 1909

(3) This section and sections 155 to 158 extend to the whole of British India the rest of the Code extends to the whole of British India, except the Scheduled Districts

*Previous Procedure* —The first Code of Civil Procedure was Act 8 of 1859. Before that the procedure of the Mofussil Courts was regulated by special Acts and Regulations which were repealed by Act 10 of 1861 and the procedure of the Supreme Courts was under their own rules and orders and certain Acts e.g. Act 17 of 1855 and Act 6 of 1854. The Code of 1859 applied to Mofussil Courts only. In 1862 the Supreme Courts and the Courts of Sadder Diwani Adalat in the Presidency Towns were abolished by the High Courts Act 1861 (24 and 25 Vic c 104) and the powers of those Courts were vested in the Chartered High Courts. The Letters Patent of 1862 establishing the High Courts extended to them the procedure of the Code of 1859. The Charters of 1865 which empowered the High Courts to make rules and orders regulating proceedings in civil cases required them to be guided as far as possible by the provisions of the Code of 1859 and subsequent amending Acts. Such amending Acts are Act 4 of 1860 43 of 1860 23 of 1861 9 of 1863 26 of 1867, 7 of 1870 14 of 1870 9 of 1871 32 of 1871 and 7 of 1872.





*Administrator General v Premal (m)* the cases were not consistent (n) and even later the Madras High Court referred to the report of a Select Committee in *Assan v Pathumma (o)*

7 Marginal notes to the sections of an Act are not to be referred to for the purpose of construing an Act (p)

8 Illustrations in Acts of the Legislature although not part of the sections are helpful in the working and application of the Acts and it is the duty of a Court of law to accept them if that can be done as being both of relevance and value in the construction of the text The illustration should in no case be rejected because they do not square with ideas possibly derived from another system of jurisprudence as to the law with which the sections deal And it would require a very special case to warrant their rejection on the ground of their assumed repugnancy to the sections themselves It would be the very last resort of construction to make any such assumption (q) But an illustration cannot be allowed to control the plain meaning of a section (r)

9 The essence of a Code is to be exhaustive on the matters in respect of which it declares the law and it is not the province of a judge to disregard or go outside the letter of the enactment according to its true construction (s) In cases however where there is no specific provision in the Code the Court has the power and it would seem it is its duty to act according to justice equity and good conscience (t) See s 151

10 Every statute which takes away or impairs vested rights acquired under existing law must be presumed to be intended not to have a retrospective operation But this presumption does not apply to enactments affecting procedure or practice such as the Code of Civil Procedure The reason is that no person has a vested right in any course of procedure The general principle indeed seems to be that alterations in the procedure are always retrospective unless there be some good reason against it (u) But an appellate Court cannot reverse an order made under an old Code on the ground that the new Code has enacted a different rule (v) The right of appeal however is in the nature of a vested right and hence the provision in s 154 of the Code declaring that nothing in this Code shall affect any present right of appeal which shall have accrued to any party at its commencement

11 The Code consists (i) of that which is termed the body of the Code and (ii) of the rules The body of the Code is fundamental and is unalterable except by the Legislature the rules are concerned with details and machinery and can be more readily altered Thus it will be found that the body of the Code creates jurisdiction

- m) (1896) Cal 88 *Empire v Sri Churn (189) - (al 101 Qu en Empre s v Tulak (1898) - Bom 11 Malabar Teta v Har Claron (1903) 25 All 144*
- (n) Referred to in *R v Kartic Chander (188) 14 Cal 21 Romesh Chunder v Huru Mondal (1890) 17 Cal 85 Vankh Mal o a v Sakh Es a (1884) 8 Bom 411 (Report of Law Commissioners) Malfoora Ka v India General S v Co (1886) 10 Cal 166 Ye u Ramji v B I Khat a (1891) 15 Bom 593 Padhi Khat a Gour Moh a (189) 59 Cal 544 Chu dal l nala v Boma ju (1893) Bom 310 Malomed J kera v Ahmed Mahomed (1888) 15 Cal 139 Ramcha idra Jai h v Ha aha m (189) 16 Mad 0 Fictiled in *Id do od n Dy v B m ch n (1864) 1 Hyd 100 Tara k Nath v Iroson a Coomar (18 3) 19 W R 48 Shakh Moosa v Sh kh Es aupra (tatem nt of objects and r son) A di B l h v Bla (1891) 14 All 145**
- (o) (1899) Mad 494 504
- (p) *Bal aj Aw war v Jagatpal Singh (1904) 6 All 397 31 I A 13 Bulh*

- mall l v Hala (1896) 93 Cal 55 Pu ard v Ra i Sarup (1899) Cal 858*
- (q) *Malomed v Jeoh (1916) 43 I A 8 63 391 C 401 Mul aj l hatau v G shvanath Panturam (1913) 40 I A 24 30 37 Bom. 198*
- (r) *Toulat Chu der v So al n (1890) Cal 13*
- (s) *Golul Mandar v Pr dma d (1907) 91 I 194 200 C I 0 15 Shiba v Baban (1908) 35 Cal 33*
- (t) *Hukum Chand v Han aland (1906) 33 Cal 9 941 93 944 Abd l R hm v Shai na (19 0) 1 Lah 339 341 54 I C 44 Ha l L R v B dhu Mu h (1906) 33 Cal 1094 Pancha n v Du ir Kanath (1905) 3 C I J 9*
- (u) Maxwell on the Int rpretation of Statutes Chap vli a c li (rai son Statute Law pp 3 73 9 H ze t Akramm l al ul iana (1894) 18 Bom 4 9 Balk sh a Hapu (189) 19 Bom 904 r rish Chund a v Apu ba (1894) 1 Cal 910 95 Bureswar Jaoada Lal (1913) 40 Cal 01 191 C 391
- (v) *G rumoorth v du v Taradappa Chetty (1912) 2 M W v 256 1-1 C 5 3*



2 [S 2] In this Act, unless there is anything repugnant in the subject or context,—

Definition

(1) “Code” includes rules

See notes on p 3 para No (11)

(2) “decree” means the formal expression of an adjudication which so far as regards the Court expressing it, conclusively determines the rights of the parties with regard to all or any of the matters in controversy in the suit and may be either preliminary or final. It shall be deemed to include the rejection of a plaint and the determination of any question within section 47 or section 144, but shall not include—

(a) any adjudication from which an appeal lies as an appeal from an order, or

(b) any order of dismissal for default

*Explanation* —A decree is preliminary when further proceedings have to be taken before the suit can be completely disposed of. It is final when such adjudication completely disposes of the suit. It may be partly preliminary and partly final.

(3) “decree-holder” means any person in whose favour a decree has been passed or an order capable of execution has been made.

*Definition of decree in the Code of Civil Procedure 1882*—The term decree was defined in the Code of 1882 as follows —

Decree means the formal expression of an adjudication upon any right claimed or defence set up in a Civil Court when such adjudication so far as regards the Court expressing it decides the suit or appeal. An order rejecting a plaint or directing accounts to be taken or determining any question mentioned or referred to in section 244 [now s 47] but not specified in section 588 [now s 104 and O 43 r 1] is within this definition. An order specified in section 588 is not within this definition.

*Importance of the definition of decree*—The adjudications of a Court of law may be divided into two classes namely (1) decrees and (2) orders. Orders again may be subdivided into appealable orders and non appealable orders. The expression order is defined in cl (14) of the present section as meaning the formal expression of any decision of a Civil Court which is not a decree.

Where a decision amounts to a decree it is invariably appealable unless expressly provided that no appeal shall lie from it (s 96). Further where an appeal is preferred from a decision which amounts to a decree and a decree is passed in appeal an appeal will lie to the High Court from the decree passed in appeal if the same is within the provisions of s 100 below. This is called a second appeal. In the case therefore of an adjudication which amounts to a decree the law permits a first appeal and in some cases also a second appeal.

Where an adjudication amounts to an order no appeal lies from it unless it is enumerated in the list of appealable orders given in s 104 or in the list given in O 43 r 1

We have thus seen that an appeal lies from a decree. We have also seen that an appeal lies from an order specified in s 104 or in O 43 r 1. What then is the distinction between a decree and an appealable order? The distinction is this—that while in the case of an adjudication which amounts to a decree the law permits a second appeal in some cases no second appeal is allowed at all in the case of an adjudication which amounts to an appealable order. That is to say if an appeal is preferred from a decree and a decree is passed in appeal an appeal will in certain cases lie from the decree passed in appeal. But if an appeal is preferred from an appealable order and an order is passed in appeal no appeal lies at all from the order passed in appeal (s 104 sub-section (2)). To take an instance if an appeal lies from a decision of a subordinate Judge to a District Judge. The appellate Court decides against A. A refers a second appeal to the High Court from the decision of the District Court. If the decision of the subordinate Judge amounts to a decree a second appeal will lie provided the case comes within s 100. But if the decision amounts to an appealable order no second appeal will lie.

The distinction of decree is important not only for determining the right of second appeal but for determining whether an appeal lies at all in the first instance. If an adjudication is an appealable order there is no difficulty whatever in determining whether an appeal lies from it. All that has to be done in such a case is to refer to s 104 and to O 43 r 1 and to ascertain whether the order is enumerated in the list there given. The real difficulty in determining the right of appeal arises when the adjudication from which an appeal is preferred is not an appealable order. In such a case the adjudication may be either a decree or a non-appealable order and an appeal can lie only if the adjudication amounts to a decree. The appellant would in this class of cases endeavour to show that the adjudication appealed from is a *decree* while the respondent would endeavour to show that the adjudication is *merely an order*. Instances of this class of cases are given in the next following paragraph.

**Essential elements of a decree.**—The term *decree* is defined in the Code as meaning the formal expression of an adjudication which so far as regards the Court expressing it *conclusively determines the rights of the parties with regard to all or any of the matters in controversy in the suit*. The words italicized above indicate the distinguishing marks of a decree. To constitute a decision a decree the following conditions must be present—

- I.—The decision must have been expressed in a suit.
- II.—The decision must have been expressed in the *right* of the parties with regard to all or any of the *matters in controversy* in the suit.
- III.—The decision must be one which *conclusively determines* those rights.
- IV.—The decision must have been given formal expression as an adjudication.

If all these conditions are fulfilled the decision is a decree. If not it is an order or a finding on an issue.

**I. In a suit.**—Every suit is commenced by a plaintiff (p) and when there is no civil suit there is no decree (o). Some proceedings commenced by an application are statutory suits so that the decision is a decree e.g. a contentious probate proceeding (p) or an

(a) *1. Mafat v. 1. Istama* (199) M 1  
*2. Padhya* (195) M 1  
 (3) *21 f. m. A. pat v. J. P. Anant* (191)  
 8 AIL 102 4 111 A 37 1910 6

(1) *M. Al. M. v. S. bromany* (1908) 11 Mad  
 263 141 A 160  
 (p) *Lawrence v. Ho d. v. H. d. al. n. C. A. d.* (189  
 1 AIL 4 4

application to file an agreement to refer to arbitration (g) The following are instances of orders which are not decrees not having been made in a suit —An order rejecting an application for leave to sue *in forma pauperis* for no suit has till then been filed (r) an order refusing leave to institute a suit for accounts of a Religious Endowment (s) an order on a petition to appoint a new member on the committee of a Religious Endowment (t) an order under the Indian Trusts Act dismissing an application for the removal of a trustee (u) an order on a settlement case under sec 104 (v) of the Bengal Tenancy Act 3 of 1895 as the proceeding is instituted not by a plaintiff but by an application (r)

II Rights of parties as to matters in controversy—There must have been an adjudication on the rights of the parties (u) An order of dismissal for default of appearance is no determination of the rights of the parties and therefore is not a decree (x) So also an order under O 9 r 2 dismissing a suit when summons is not served in consequence of plaintiff's failure to pay Court fee (y) Special provision is made in the definition of decree for orders of dismissal for default apparently because the previous cases were not consistent An order rejecting an appeal under O 41 r 10 for failure to furnish security is not a decree as it does not determine the rights of the parties in controversy in the appeal ( ) An order granting leave to withdraw a suit with leave to file a fresh suit is not a decree for the rights of the parties are left open for determination in the subsequent suit (a) The right in controversy must be a substantive right and not merely a processual right for a finding on a processual right is only to enable the Court to inquire into the rights in controversy in the suit (b) Thus an order that a plaint should be stamped with a higher Court fee is not a decree (c)

III Conclusively determines—This expression implies that the decision must be one which is complete and final as regards the Court which passed it The decree may conclusively determine the rights of the parties although it does not completely dispose of the suit See note on p 8 Preliminary Decree

IV Formal expression—All requirements of form must be complied with Thus if no decree has been drawn up no appeal will lie from the judgment (d) Again a finding in an issue cannot be the subject of an appeal until it has been embodied in the judgment and decree This point was overlooked in some Bombay cases (e) which have been overruled (f)

- (g) *Guru Chanan v Umi Chanan* (191) 6 O.W.N. 40 O I C 985 *Cost a Poyan v Maruti* (19 0) — Bom L R 13 59 I C 55 *nd Salsel and v Palram* (19-1) 6 Pat L J 287 61 I C 390—submitted to be incorrect See *Ch II cl 0*
- (r) *Secreta y of State v Julio* (1899) 21 All 133
- (s) *Mo offer Al v H dajel* (190 ) 34 Cal 581 *Ka-em Ali v Azim Ali* (1891) 18 Cal 332 *Protal v Hrojanath* (189 ) 19 C I — 288 *Re Venkateswara* (1896) 10 Mad 98
- (t) *Minakshi v Subramanya* (1898) 11 Mal 26 5 14 I A 160 *Somasundray Vaidh. l nga* (1896) 19 Mad 8
- (u) *Nathu Bids n v Mc Afe* (1897) 19 All 131
- (v) *Upadhyay Th k r v Pers ad S gh* (1896) 3 Cal 7 3 7 9 *Lola Krut v Palakdhara* (1890) 17 Cal 3 6
- (w) *Ma Cho v Maung Mynt* (1927) 5 Rang 838 10 I C 618 (—) A R 148
- (x) *Eukhm m ya v Pa n Chandra* (1912) 9 C I 341 14 I C 8-3 *Shyam Mandal v Satinath* (1917) 44 Cal 9 4 38 I C 493 *Gay j Mats v Shamu Nath* (1916) 39 All 13 36 I C 307 *Su af De v Port d Rai* (19 3) 2 Pat 739 75 I C 284 (—) A J 514 *cf Abd l Waj l v Jav h* (1914) 36 All 350 23 I C 649 F C
- (y) *Lacimi Nara n v Darbari Lal* (1916) 29 All 357 33 I C 37 *Lucky Churn v Budu un Issa* (1883) 9 Cal 6
- (z) *Lalla v Bhanna* (1896) 18 All 101 *Romes*

- v M nind a* (19 1) 49 Cal 3 6 I C 51 ( ) 4 C 246 *Na im v Abdul* (10 —) 3 Lah 30 67 I C 56 ( ) A L 8
- (a) *Cenda Jf v Purbis Tal* (1895) 17 All 97 *Jagodind o v Saru Sunda* (1921) 18 Cal 3 *Abd l Hossain v Fas Sahu* (1900) 27 Cal 36 See also *Patloj v Ganu* (1891) 15 Bom 3 0
- (b) *D tati n v Padhadar* (19-1) 4 Bom 6-7 631 60 I C 883
- (c) *Mir Umar Ali v Asubunnissa* (1911) P R 8 13 I C 800
- (d) *Be Duals v Shah Fishnu* (1910) 34 Bom 18 4 I C 8 9 *Saharam v Sadasho* (1913) 3 Bom 490 19 I C 891
- (e) *S dhanath v Ganesh* (1913) 37 Bom 60 17 I C 63 *Narayan v Gopat* (1914) 33 Bom 39 3 I C 889 (limitation and jurisdiction) *Frashnaji v Ma ut* (1910) 1- Bom L R 76 — I C 986 (status as agriculturist)
- (f) *Chana al wami v Gangadh appa* (1915) 39 Bom 39 26 I C 85 (jurisdiction) *Rhama v Bh m gada* (1915) 39 Bom 4 1 — I C 461 (res judicata) *Dattal as v I adhab* (19 1) 45 Bom 6 7 60 I C 885 (status as agriculturist) See also *Kam i D b v P omolha* (1914) 19 C W B 755 2 I C 31 (maintainability of suit) *C labhand v Balu m* (1915) 39 Bom 4 3 23 I C 549 *I amana-ch rya v Corind* (19-3) 45 Bom L R 8 6 6 I C 1014 (—) A B 33

Points of distinction between the definition of decree in this Code and that in the Code of 1882 — The definition of decree as it stood in the Code of 1882 has been modified in the following two respects —

1 Under the Code of 1882 no adjudication came within the definition of a decree unless it decided *the suit*. Under this Code an adjudication which conclusively (g) determines *the rights of the parties* with regard to all or any of the matters in controversy in the suit is a decree though it does not completely dispose of the suit. But the decree in that case is called a preliminary decree as distinguished from a final decree. The present definition is wider than that in the Code of 1882 in that it includes preliminary decrees within its scope the object being to permit an appeal from preliminary decrees. See notes below Preliminary decree

2 Under the Code of 1882 there was a conflict of decisions as to whether an order of dismissal for default was a decree. The present section expressly declares that an order of dismissal for default is not within the definition of decree the object being to exclude the right of appeal from such order. See note below Order of dismissal for default

Two other alterations both of a minor character may also be noted here. They are as follows —

(i) An adjudication directing accounts to be taken is no longer to be deemed to be a decree as under the Code of 1882 it is a decree by the very terms of the present definition though a preliminary one. Under the Code of 1882 such an adjudication was appealable for it was to be deemed to be a decree. Under this Code it is appealable for it is a decree. This distinction however is of no practical importance. See notes to s 97 below

(ii) The word *within* has been substituted for *mentioned or referred to in* with a view to bring within the definition of decree orders against sureties (s 145) and orders as to Court fees in pauper suits (O 33 r 13) and thus providing for appeals therefrom. See notes to s 14 and O 33 r 13

The definition of decree is important because it determines the right of appeal. Hence every material change made in the definition of that term must be taken to have been made for the purpose either of permitting an appeal from adjudications which were not appealable before or excluding a right of appeal from adjudications from which an appeal was permitted under the old law. It is from this standpoint therefore that the new definition has been examined.

**Preliminary decree** — A decree may be preliminary or final or it may be partly preliminary and partly final. A decree is preliminary when the adjudication though it conclusively determines the *rights* of the parties with regard to some or one of the matters in controversy in the suit *does not completely dispose of the suit* and further proceedings have to be taken before the suit can be completely disposed of. It is final when such adjudication completely disposes of the suit (h). As to appeals from decrees see ss 96 and 97.

The question whether a decision amounts to a preliminary decree is one of considerable importance in view of the provisions of s 97 by which it is provided that if a party aggrieved by a preliminary decree does not appeal therefrom within the period of limitation allowed for appeals he shall be precluded from disputing its correctness in an appeal from the final decree. The High Court of Bombay as already noted at one time treated findings on issues as preliminary decrees but this was set right by the Full Bench in *Channalram v Gangadharappa* (i). The following are instances of decrees that are final or preliminary or partly final and partly preliminary

(g) The addition of the word *conclusively* is in accordance with the definition in *Lekha v Bhusa* (1896) 18 All 101 104. (h) *Ekharman v Talar* (191) P. R. no. 6 at pp 6, 39 I. C. 100. (i) (191) 39 Bom 339 C. I. C. 83.

*Illustrations*

1 A sues B for cancellation of a document and a decree is passed in the suit. This is a final decree for the suit is completely disposed of.

2 A suit is brought by one partner against another for a dissolution of partnership and for the taking of partnership accounts. Here the Court may pass a *preliminary* decree declaring the proportionate shares of the parties and directing such accounts to be taken as it thinks fit and after the accounts are taken it may pass a *final* decree directing payments of debts due by the partnership and the costs of the suit and directing payment to the parties of the amount found due to them on the taking of accounts. See O 20 r 1.

3 A sues B for the recovery of possession of certain immovable property and for mesne profit. The Court may pass a decree for possession of the property and direct inquiry as to mesne profits. Here the decree is partly final and partly preliminary. It is final so far as it directs delivery of possession to A. It is preliminary so far as it directs an inquiry as to mesne profits. After the inquiry is completed the Court has to pass a final decree in respect of mesne profits in accordance with the result of the inquiry. See O 20 r 12.

The following is a list of suits in which a preliminary decree may be passed under this Code —

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1 Suits for recovery of possession of immovable property and for rent or mesne profits (O 20 r 12) | 6 Suits for partition of property or separate possession of a share therein (O 20 r 18) |
| 2 Administration suits (O 20 r 13)   | 7 Suits for foreclosure of a mortgage (O 34 rr 2-3)                                     |
| 3 Suits for pre-emption (O 20 r 14)  | 8 Suits for sale of mortgaged property (O 34 rr 4-5)                                    |
| 4 Suits for dissolution of partnership (O 20 r 15)   | 9 Suits for redemption of a mortgage (O 34 rr 7-8)                                      |
| 5 Suits for account between principal and agent (O 20 r 16)  |   |

The above list is not exhaustive and there is nothing to preclude the Courts from passing a preliminary decree in other cases (j).

**Rejection of plaint.**—As to an adjudication rejecting a plaint it has been expressly provided by the present clause that it shall be deemed to be a decree. Such adjudication therefore is appealable as a decree (k). An appeal however is not the only remedy open to a party whose plaint is rejected for he may cure the defect for which the plaint was rejected and present a fresh plaint (O 7 r 13). As to the cases in which a plaint shall be rejected see O 7 r 11.

**Order returning plaint.**—A plaint may be returned for amendment (O 7 r 1) or to be presented to the proper Court (O 7 r 10). In either case the decision returning the plaint is an order as distinguished from a decree. An order returning a plaint to be presented to the proper Court was appealable under the Code of 1882 [s 584 cl (6)] and it is also appealable under this Code [O 43 r 1 cl (a)]. An order returning a plaint for amendment was appealable under the Code of 1882 [s 588 cl (6)] it is no longer appealable under this Code (l).

(j) *Datt v. J. Dutt* (1911) 4 Bom 6  
633 GO I C 845 (1911) 4 Bom 6  
V. M. J. (1913) (11 W. N. 99)  
99 293 4 I C 33 (11 A. C. 160)  
160 I C 157 (1911) 4 Bom 133  
40 M. D. 147 I C 808 (1911) 4 M. J. 34

(k) *U. L. P. v. L. I. S. v. (1910) 6 Ban 9*  
110 I C 41 (1911) 4 A. C. 168  
(l) *S. v. J. v. L. I. S. v. (1914) P. P. 80*  
I C 56  
(m) *C. v. J. v. L. I. S. v. (1911) P. P. no. 96 p 34*  
11 I C 1



Points of distinction between the definition of decree in this Code and that in the Code of 1882.—The definition of decree as it stood in the Code of 1882 has been modified in the following two respects —

1 Under the Code of 1882 no adjudication came within the definition of a decree unless it decided *the suit*. Under this Code an adjudication which conclusively (g) determines the rights of the parties with regard to all or any of the matters in controversy in the suit is a decree though it does not completely dispose of the suit. But the decree in that case is called a preliminary decree as distinguished from a final decree. The present definition is wider than that in the Code of 1882 in that it includes preliminary decrees within its scope the object being to permit an appeal from preliminary decrees. See notes below Preliminary decree

2 Under the Code of 1882 there was a conflict of decisions as to whether an order of dismissal for default was a decree. The present section expressly declares that an order of dismissal for default is not within the definition of decree the object being to exclude the right of appeal from such order. See note below Order of dismissal for default

Two other alterations both of a minor character may also be noted here. They are as follows —

(i) An adjudication directing accounts to be taken is no longer to be deemed to be a decree as under the Code of 1882. It is a decree by the very terms of the present definition though a preliminary one. Under the Code of 1882 such an adjudication was appealable for it was to be deemed to be a decree. Under this Code it is appealable for it is a decree. This distinction however is of no practical importance. See notes to s 97 below

(ii) The word within has been substituted for mentioned or referred to in with a view to bring within the definition of decree orders against sureties (s 145) and orders as to Court fees in pauper suits (O 33 r 13) and thus providing for appeals therefrom. See notes to s 14 and O 33 r 13

The definition of decree is important because it determines the right of appeal. Hence every material change made in the definition of that term must be taken to have been made for the purpose either of permitting an appeal from adjudications which were not appealable before or excluding a right of appeal from adjudications from which an appeal was permitted under the old law. It is from this standpoint therefore that the new definition has been examined.

**Preliminary decree**—A decree may be preliminary or final or it may be partly preliminary and partly final. A decree is preliminary when the adjudication though it conclusively determines the rights of the parties with regard to some or one of the matters in controversy in the suit *does not completely dispose of the suit* and further proceedings have to be taken before the suit can be completely disposed of. It is final when such adjudication completely disposes of the suit (h). As to appeals from decrees see ss 96 and 97.

The question whether a decision amounts to a preliminary decree is one of considerable importance in view of the provisions of s 97 by which it is provided that if a party aggrieved by a preliminary decree does not appeal therefrom within the period of limitation allowed for appeals he shall be precluded from disputing its correctness in an appeal from the final decree. The High Court of Bombay as already noted at one time treated findings on issues as preliminary decrees but this was set right by the Full Bench in *Chanmalsuami v Gangadharappa* (i). The following are instances of decrees that are final or preliminary or partly final and partly preliminary

(g) The addition of the word conclusively is in accordance with the decision in *Lekha v Bhana* (1899) 14 All 101 104. (i) *Lekha v Bhana* v *Tilak Ram* (1917) P R no 39 at pp 8 39 f C 100 ( ) (191 ) 39 Bom 339 6 f C 88

### *Treatments*

1 A sues B for cancellation of a document and a decree is passed in the suit. This is a final decree for the suit is completely disposed of.

2 A suit is brought by one partner against another for a dissolution of partnership and for the taking of partnership accounts. Here the Court may pass a *preliminary* decree declaring the proportionate shares of the parties and directing such accounts to be taken as it thinks fit and after the accounts are taken it may pass a *final* decree directing payments of debts due by the partnership and the costs of the suit and directing payment to the parties of the amount found due to them on the taking of accounts. See O 20 r 15.

3 A sues B for the recovery of possession of certain immovable property and for mesne profits. The Court may pass a decree for possession of the property and direct inquiry as to mesne profit. Here the decree is partly final and partly preliminary. It is final so far as it directs delivery of possession to A. It is preliminary so far as it directs an inquiry as to mesne profits. After the inquiry is completed the Court has to pass a final decree in respect of mesne profits in accordance with the result of the inquiry. See O. 20 r. 12.

The following is a list of suits in which a preliminary decree may be passed under this Code —

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1 Suits for recovery of possession of immovable property and for rent or mesne profits (O 20 r 12) | 6 Suits for partition of property or separate possession of a share therein (O 20 r 18) |
| 2 Administration suits (O 20 r 13)   | 7 Suits for foreclosure of a mortgage (O 34 rr 2 3)                                     |
| 3 Suits for pre-emption (O 20 r 14)  | 8 Suits for sale of mortgaged property (O 34 rr 4 5)                                    |
| 4 Suits for dissolution of partnership (O 20 r 15)   | 9 Suits for redemption of a mortgage (O 34 rr 7 8)                                      |
| 5 Suits for account between principal and agent (O 20 r 16)  |   |

The above list is not exhaustive and there is nothing to preclude the Courts from passing a preliminary decree in other cases (3)

Rejection of plaint—As to an adjudication rejecting a plaint it has been expressly provided by the present clause that it shall be deemed to be a decree. Such adjudication therefore is appealable as a decree (1). An appeal however is not the only remedy open to a party whose plaint is rejected for he may cure the defect for which the plaint was rejected and present a fresh plaint (O 7 r 13). As to the cases in which a plaint shall be rejected see O 7 r 11.

**Order returning plaint**—A plaint may be returned for amendment (O 6 r 1.) or to be presented to the proper Court (O 7 r 10). In either case the decision returning the plaint is an order as distinguished from a decree. An order returning a plaint to be presented to the proper Court was appealable under the Code of 1852 [s 588 cl (6)] and it is also appealable under this Code [O 43 r 1 cl (a)]. An order returning a plaint for amendment was appealable under the Code of 1852 [s 588 cl (c)] it is no longer appealable under this Code (1).

(f) *D t t a r a v l d a b n a* (19 1) 4 Rom 6  
633 60 1 C 84 R 31 I e r v Mol 4  
v M tota (19 3) (1) v 249  
94 73 1 I C 3 3 (1) A C 160  
161 I 5 p i e r v 160 I I f n a (19 3)  
40 Mad 144 I L 809 (1) 3 4 v 54

(1)  $U I : J \vee L I \wedge \delta \epsilon (10_{-}) 6 R a \wedge 9$   
 $110 I \wedge 41 (-4) A \wedge 168$   
 (2)  $add : K a r v E u t a \delta \eta A (1914) P P \approx 0$   
 $- I C 6$   
 (3)  $G r d i s e B l g (1911) P P n o 96 p 34$   
 $11 I C -31$

**Rejection of memorandum of appeal**—The rejection of a plaint is deemed to be a decree. There is no express provision for the rejection of a memorandum of appeal but the Court has the power to do so under sec 107 (2). An order rejecting an appeal as not duly presented (m) or as scandalous (n) or as insufficiently stamped (o) is appealable as a decree. A memorandum of appeal which is time barred is dismissed under the Limitation Act and such dismissal disposes of the appeal and is appealable as a decree (p). When an appeal is rejected under O 41 r 10 (2) for failure to furnish security for costs there is no appeal for the order does not determine the rights of the parties (q).

**Order returning memorandum of appeal**—No appeal lies from an order returning a memorandum of appeal to be presented to the proper Court (r). Nor does an appeal lie from an order returning a memorandum of appeal for amendment.

**Section 47—Execution proceedings**—An execution proceeding though a proceeding in a suit is not a suit (s). An order made in an execution proceeding is not a decree unless it determines a question within sec 47 (t). If it decides a question relating to the rights and liabilities of the parties with reference to the relief granted by the decree it falls within the scope of sec 47 and is a decree—but orders that are merely incidental and refer to the conduct of the proceedings are not within the section (u). Thus a decision refusing to recognize the transferee of a decree (v) or to record an adjustment of a decree (w) falls within sec 47 and is appealable as a decree. But an order refusing to bid at an execution sale (x) or staying or refusing to stay execution on security being furnished (y) is an interlocutory matter and not appealable.

**Section 144—Restitution**—The determination of a question under sec 144 is a decree and is appealable as such. See note Bar of Suit under sec 144 (2).

**Appealable orders**—Appealable orders are those specified in sec 104 and O 43 r 1. They are excluded from the definition of decree even though they may fall under sec 47 and would be decrees if the Code had not expressly excluded them e.g. an order setting aside or refusing to set aside a sale under O 21 r 92. The effect of this exclusion is to do away with the right of second appeal.

(m) *Ajva n v Nag bhoo Sh man* (1893) 16 Mad 8

(n) *Zami dar of Tuni v Ban ajja* (1899) Mad 155

(o) *P p n gh v Muft az Singh* (188) All 88  
*Mela Mal v Ha bhag* (1894) P I 115

(p) *Gul b Fai v Ma gl Lot* (1885) 7 All 4  
*Raghun th v Vio* (1885) 9 Bom 5  
*Ganga D s v Ramjo* (189) 1 C I 70  
*Samin th v Yeskaram* (1903) 7 Mad 1  
*Rakh IV As'utoh* (1913) 17 C W N 807 19 I C 931

(q) *Rakh I v As'utoh* (1913) 1 C W N 807 19 I C 931  
*Lekhav Bra n* (1896) 18 All 101  
*Jo re h v W d a* (13 1) 49 Cal 3 5 6 I C 7 1 (2) A C 48

(r) *Pankunath v Shamo Kori* (1904) 31 Cal 344  
*Sec Mat br v Beh* (1891) 13 All 3 0

(s) *Te lata v Te lata ma* (1898) M d 6 8

(t) *Sar o ti v Moli* (1913) 41 Cal 180 - I C

(u) *Jogul I v J d sh* (189) 24 Cal 39  
*S w g m v S Ir Aman a* (1904) 7 Mad 9 F B D I v Bana (191) 16 C W N 14 10 I C 3 1  
*Mukht v W aurah* (191) 34 All 530 16 I C 50  
*Drumrah v A sho* (1911)

38 Cal 54 9 I C 86  
*Saran a v Mot* (1913) 41 Cal 180 - I C 2  
*Hus in Bli v Batul Sh h* (19 4) 46 All 35 3 83 I C 1035 ( 4) A 808  
*Sarla m R M Rtan* (19 0) 2 Lah L J 398 58 I C 603  
*S e dra Vath v M utiaf* (19 0) 5 1st L J 0 56 I C 4

(v) *Bad V a n v J Kushen* (1894) 16 All 493  
*Tume h v Thol r* (1903) 5 All 3  
*Gang D v Jalub* (1900) 5 Cal 60  
*S bbutaram al v Chidamb r m* (190) 5 Mad 383  
*Ha ditia v W h o* (19-) 4 L h L J 9 ( ) A L 396  
*R Bat dr v B j a j* (19 4) 3 Pat 344 81 C 49 ( 5) A 1 16

(w) *Jamna v Mollu* (1894) 16 All 1 9  
*J Bh j* (189) 11 Bom 57  
*Guru m v Lud jagg a* (189) 18 M d 48  
*J l a d n v Sh o anita* (19 ) 11 t 641 69 I C 615 ( ) A I - 6

(x) *Jodoo ath B j W hun* (1896) 13 Cal 174  
*K Tha Han v Ma Han I* (1911) 33 Cal 71 33 I A 1 6 11 I C 545

(y) *Sar sent v Mot supra Ja ard n v Vairand* (19 1) 4 Bom 241 50 I C 3  
*H a n B l v Belie* (19 4) 46 All 733 83 I C 103 ( 4) A 804  
*I ay dra A s/or v Mollu a V han* (1919) C W N 55 55 I C 3

**Order of dismissal for default**—A suit may be dismissed for default of appearance under O 9 r 8. Such a dismissal is not a decree and is not appealable. Under the Code of 1882 there was a conflict of decisions: the Madras High Court holding that the order was not appealable ( ) while the other High Courts held that it was appealable (a). An appeal may be dismissed for default of appearance under O 41 r 11 (2) or r 17. Such an order of dismissal is not a decree and is not appealable (b). But an order dismissing an appeal under O 41 r 11 (1) had been held to be a decree (c).

There may also be a dismissal for default under O 9 r 3 if neither party appears when the suit is called on for hearing. This is also excluded from the definition of decree.

**Non appealable orders**—Orders that are not appealable are generally speaking orders that are processual i.e. interlocutory or incidental orders regulating procedure but not deciding any of the matters in controversy in the suit. Such orders occur both in suits and in execution proceedings. Their number is legion and the following are cited merely by way of illustration. In suits—under ec 148 for enlargement of time (d) under ec 149 for amendment of a clerical error in a judgment (e) under O 9 r 9 granting an application for restoration of a suit ( ) under O 9 r 13 granting an application to set aside an ex parte decree (g) under O 14 r 9 refusing to frame an issue (h). In execution proceedings—under O 21 r 40 refusing an application to arrest a judgment debtor (i) under O 21 r 66 settling the terms of a sale proclamation (j). See also cases cited under note Section 47—*Execution proceedings* p 10.

**Decree holder**—The definition in the Code of 1882 included a transferee of a decree but this was inconsistent with the provisions relating to execution whereby an oral transferee has no *locus standi*; the section therefore enacts that a transferee is not a decree holder unless he has been recognised by the Court. A decree for specific performance of an agreement for the sale of immovable property may be executed either by the plaintiff or the defendant either party being a decree holder in such a case (k).

(4) "district" means the local limits of the jurisdiction of a principal Civil Court of Original jurisdiction (hereinafter called a "District Court"), and includes the local limits of the ordinary original civil jurisdiction of a High Court.

Following this definition the expression District Court as used in the Inventions and Designs Act 5 of 1888 has been held to include a High Court in the exercise of ordinary original civil jurisdiction (l).

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| ( ) <i>Gulki o v Subrami va</i> (1899) Mad 1     | I C 914 and under O 9 r 4 <i>Alwar v</i>          |
| (a) <i>C v F v H v Mohan</i> (1903) 8 C W        | <i>de Ramwa</i> (188 ) 10 Mad O <i>Harid v</i>    |
| 313 <i>i mela da</i> <i>Madhav</i> (189 ) 16     | <i>va v J endan Lal</i> (1913) 3 All 4            |
| <i>Bor 3 All v Bhagat</i> (188 ) 9               | O I C 14  |
| All 4  | (j) <i>St ma Dass v Hur uns</i> (1880) 10 Cal 4 6 |
| (b) <i>Fukri mavi v I a n C a dra</i> (191 )     | (l) <i>T lyam v Alagappa</i> (191 ) 3 Mad 1       |
| 39 Cal 341 14 I C 8 3 <i>v ujico v</i>           | <i>S I C 310 Eb al ni</i> <i>Fuckru usa</i>       |
| <i>I r r p</i> (19 3) Pat 39 I C 284             | (18 9) 4 Cal 531                                  |
| (-3) A P 314                                     | ( ) <i>Lala Das M a Mal</i> (19 ) 4 Lah L J       |
| (c) <i>Al v Al v Ja r Al</i> (19 6) 30 C W v     | 66 ( ) 4 L 59 <i>Abd i Hal man</i>                |
| 334 93 I C 909 (-6) v C 368                      | <i>v Mah med</i> (1908) 1 Mad 9                   |
| (d) <i>S a ja v F a b j i</i> (1913) 25 All 58   | (f) <i>Suzgam v Sib amani</i> (1904) Mad          |
| 1 I C 85   | 9 <i>Ramaratha v i katu h lam</i>                 |
| (e) <i>Nal naki ja v M fals ar</i> (1900) 93 Cal | (19 3) 44 Mad L J 92 <i>v i C 8 6</i>             |
| 17 <i>Nara m v Natera</i> (189 )                 | (3) A. 31 619 <i>P v v Man</i> (191 )             |
| 16 M 1 4 <i>Ha Sh i i kudu v Agar</i>            | 16 C W v 90 1 I C 88                              |
| <i>4 at</i> (190 ) 31 Bom 44 <i>B va nqh</i>     | (k) <i>Bo Fa u b bi v Abderel man</i> (19 ) 46    |
| <i>Lo i man Si gh</i> (1911) I R 4 10            | Bom 990 6 I C 66 ( ) A 11 5                       |
| I C 80   | (l) <i>Kedar ath v Co eth</i> (190 ) 1 C W v 446. |
| (f) <i>H d m n v J i ghoo</i> (1900) C I 11      |   |
| <i>F ol v Hasi at</i> (1916) P R 40 31           |   |

(5) "foreign Court" means a Court situate beyond the limits of British India which has no authority in British India and is not established or continued by the Governor General in Council

**Foreign Court**—The Privy Council is not within this definition for though it is situate beyond the limits of British India it is invested with judicial authority within it (m) But the High Court of Justice in England whether it be the Chancery Division (n) or the King's Bench Division (o) is a foreign Court The Ceylon Court also is a foreign Court (p) and so is the Supreme Court of Mauritius (q) and Courts in Native States (r) As to suits on judgments of the High Court of Justice in England see notes to s 13 A British Indian Court will not give effect to a foreign judgment etc

(6) "foreign judgment" means the judgment of a foreign Court

(7) "Government Pleader" includes any officer appointed by the local Government to perform all or any of the functions expressly imposed by this Code on the Government Pleader and also any pleader acting under the directions of the Government Pleader

(8) "Judge" means the presiding officer of a Civil Court

No judge can act in any matter in which he has any pecuniary interest nor where he has any interest though not a pecuniary one sufficient to create a real bias (s)

(9) "judgment" means the statement given by the Judge of the grounds of a decree or order

**Judgment**—In England the word judgment is generally used in the same sense as decree in this Code For the meaning of the word in the Letters Patent see Appendix II

(10) "judgment debtor" means any person against whom a decree has been passed or an order capable of execution has been made

(11) "legal representative" means a person who in law represents the estate of a deceased person, and includes any person who intermeddles with the estate of the deceased and where a party sues or is sued in a representative character the person on whom the estate devolves on the death of the party so suing or sued

**Legal representative**—The expression legal representative was not defined in the Code of 188 In its strictest sense the term legal representative was limited to

(m) *Bowl v Bowles* (1881) 8 Bom 5 1  
(n) *I d n B A v Hornsby* (18 1) 8 B II C  
-00  
(o) See *De p vora n v D t r* (1904) 31 Cal 4  
(p) *Sh 1 4th v Darud* (1909) 3 M d 469  
4 1 31 C 190

(q) *A n Isuf* (1901) 29 Cal 509  
(r) *Gu d, l v R*, of *Faridol* (189) 2 Cal  
11 4 11  
(s) *Al v Gay bia* (189) 19 Bom 608 S o  
also *F o e U i d B series Co v Bath*  
*Just ces* [19 6] 4 C 586

executors and administrators only (t) and in cases under the Indian Succession Act that is still the case (u) But its meaning was extended after many conflicting decisions to include heirs and also persons who without title either as executors administrators or heirs, were in possession of the estate of the deceased All these earlier cases are reviewed in *Dinamani v Elahadut Khan* (1) and the definition settles the meaning of the term as there explained (u) See also notes to sec 50 sec 52 and O 22 r 3 *Party in a representative character* Where a person is a party in a representative character the legal representative is the person who after his death represents the estate that is the subject matter of the suit Thus on the death of a trustee or of a shebait of a mutt his successor in office and not his executor or heir is the legal representative and the suit would be continued by or against the successor under O 22 r 3 or r 4 A reversioner sues in a representative character as representing the reversionary right to the estate of the last male owner The legal representative of such reversioner is the next reversioner and a suit by a reversioner to set aside an adoption by a widow may be continued on his death by the next reversioner (x) A suit by a Hindu daughter (y) or by a Hindu widow (z) to recover the father's or husband's estate is continued after her death by the next heirs entitled to come in after her except in Bombay where the daughter takes an absolute estate It has been held that a coparcener leaves no estate in the coparcenary property at his death and so the surviving coparcener is not his legal representative with reference to that property (a) See note Legal Representative under O 22 r 3 The Official Assignee has been held to be the legal representative of the insolvent judgment debtor within the meaning of O 21 r 22 of the Code (b)

**Intermeddles with the estate**—One who intermeddles with the estate of a deceased person even though it may be with part thereof is a legal representative within the meaning of this clause and is liable to the extent of the property taken possession of by him (c) But it has been held that a mere trespasser is not a legal representative as he has not intermeddled with the intention of representing the estate (d)

(12) 'mesne profits' of property means those profits which the person in wrongful possession of such property actually received or might with ordinary diligence have received therefrom, together with interest on such profits, but shall not include profits due to improvements made by the person in wrongful possession

**Mesne profits**—The Code of 1882 for the first time included interest in the definition of mesne profits The reservation as to profits due to improvements made by the person in wrongful possession is new

See s 144 and notes to O 20 r 12

- (t) *Price v Strange* (18) 6 Mal 159  
 (1) *Eriny v Adarys* (1894) 13 Bom 33  
*Ba ett B or v Fowle* (19) 3 F 100  
 46 85 I C 3 (2) A F 186  
 (c) (1904) 8 C W N 843  
 (v) (1904) 8 C W N 843 at p 858  
 (x) *Benk tana jana v S blammal* (1915)  
 38 Mad 406 4 I A 1 9 I C 94  
 (y) *Maladeo v Sheo J n* (1913) 35 All 481  
 1 I C 464 *Jadub n v Malpal Sing*  
 (1916) 38 All 111 3 I C 104 *Pam:*  
*Sv m v Padam i jya* (1916) 39 Mad  
 34 1 I C 1001  
 (z) *Pr mmyas v Ire th* (1896) 3 Cal 6 6  
*Trishb sen v Sri Varas* (1908) 0 All

- 341 *Ritani Pail v Sheo Iujan* (1910)  
 33 All 10 I C 9  
 (a) *Cum lat v B Jiani* (1918) 4 Bom 504 46  
 I C 74 *D arka Da v K i h n* (19 1)  
 2 Lah 114 61 I C 6 8  
 (b) *Laghunith Das v d r Das* (1914) 41 I A  
 1 5 4 Cal 83  
 (c) *D pd v Sada Awar* (1913) P R no 115  
 p 436 1 I C 141 See also *Jam Singh*  
*v Hs wen v gh* (19 3) 5 Lah L J  
 459 I C 545 (4) A L 2 1 [no  
 intermeddla]  
 (d) *Satya Janyan v Sarat Cha d a* (19 6)  
 30 C W N 60 96 I C 690 (-6) A C  
 8 5

(13) "movable property" includes growing crops

**Growing crops**—These are now movable property and cases in which crops were held to be immovable property until reaped are obsolete. The definition must be limited to the Code for under sec 3 (2) of the General Clauses Act 1897 standing crops are immovable property.

(14) "order" means the formal expression of any decision of a Civil Court which is not a decree

See notes under cl (3) of this section

(15) "pleader" means any person entitled to appear and plead for another in Court and includes an advocate, a vakil and an attorney of a High Court

**Pleader**—The term pleader is here used in a much larger sense than its ordinary signification as a convenient term to designate all persons who are entitled to *plead* for others in Court. Pleader in its ordinary sense is synonymous with vakil (c)

**Authority to compromise**—An attorney or solicitor is entitled in the exercise of his discretion to enter into a compromise on behalf of his client if he does so in a *bona fide* manner (f) And so is counsel (g) But a pleader cannot enter into a compromise on behalf of his client without his client's express authority (h) The reason is that both counsel and solicitor have an *implied* authority to compromise the former by reason of his *retainer* and the latter by virtue of his position of *agent* in relation to his client (i)

The result is that the consent of the client is not needed for a matter which is within the authority of counsel and if a compromise is entered into by counsel it binds the client though his consent was not taken (j). But what if the authority of counsel has been expressly limited by the client and counsel consents to an order or decree in spite of the dissent of the client or on terms differing from those which the client authorized? In such a case if the limitation of authority is communicated to the other side consent by counsel outside the limits of his authority is of no effect (k). If the limitation is not communicated to the other side the question arises whether having regard to the fact that the other side entered into the compromise believing that the opponent's counsel had the ordinary unlimited authority the Court has power to interfere. It has been recently held by the House of Lords that it has and that it is not prevented by the agreement of counsel from setting aside or refusing to enforce the compromise that it is a matter for the discretion of the Court and that when in the particular circumstances of the case grave injustice would be done by allowing the compromise to stand the compromise may be set aside even although the limitation of counsel's authority was unknown to the other side (l). The authority of counsel and solicitor to compromise a suit is limited to the issues in the suit. A compromise will not therefore be binding on

- ( ) *Pl. d. rs of the H gh Co rt in re* (1894) 8 Bom 145

- (f) *Erasmus v. Gules* (1859) 1 E. & F. 839. *Jagathas v. Jand* s. (18 0) 7 B. H. C. O. C. 9. *Wen v. re* (1903) 1 Ch. 81. *Little v. Spradbury*, (1910) K. B. 69. Apparent authority but misander trading o part of client as to terms of com

- |     | Year | Age | Sex | Location | Year | Age | Sex | Location | Year | Age | Sex | Location |
|-----|------|-----|-----|----------|------|-----|-----|----------|------|-----|-----|----------|
| (g) | 1901 | 1   | ♂   | Card     | 1901 | 1   | ♂   | Card     | 1901 | 1   | ♂   | Card     |
| (h) | 1901 | 1   | ♂   | Card     | 1901 | 1   | ♂   | Card     | 1901 | 1   | ♂   | Card     |

- (\*) Coun 1 is not his client's agent but solicitor is Matthews v. Munster (1883) 0

- Q B D 141 14 *Ja g Bahadur v*  
Sd/- (1891) 14 An

- (g) *U the s y M t e r* (184 ) 0 0 B D  
141 *Ja n Bahad ir* *St inlar* (1891) 13  
All *Larr on s* *Rodrigues* (1888)  
14 Cyl 11 *U th a* *Ch tta i* *A up*  
*p n Ch u* (19 ) 50 Mad 86 10 I t

- (K) 94 1st Francis (1886) L R Q B 379 38  
(L) 1e 1e Go don 1e or [19U] A C 46  
4 0 pherd 1e Robt [1919] 1 A B  
4 4 T e B la 1e Su d a 1e  
(19 5) 41 C L J 13 18 88 J  
360 ( ) C 666 Ch L 1 v H r  
L i (1j) 3 C W N 44 106 IC 309  
1 1 1 2 8

a client if it extends to matters *outside* the scope of the particular case in which the counsel or solicitor is retained (m) The appointment of a receiver of debutter property in a partition suit is a collateral matter and not within the scope of counsel's authority and an arrangement for the appointment of a party's attorney as receiver interrupts the relationship of attorney and client and will be set aside (n) A compromise effected out of Court is also not binding upon the client (o) but a compromise entered into by counsel and sanctioned by the Court is not vitiated merely because counsel considered the matter in the corridor of the Court or the Bar library (p) And since a compromise is no more than an agreement it can be set aside at the instance of the client if it has been made by the counsel or solicitor under a misrepresentation or mistake (q) The application to have the suit restored to the list should be made before the decree is sealed (r)

**Power to refer to arbitration**—The law is the same as regards reference to arbitration Counsel has an implied power to consent to a reference and so has a solicitor on the record (s) But the authority does not extend to referring the case to arbitration on terms *different* from those which the client has authorised (t) A pleader or vakil has no power to refer a case without the express authority of his client (u) nor to settle a case by the oath of the opposite party (v)

**Authority to withdraw suit**—Counsel has an implied power to withdraw an action (w) As regards vakils or pleaders it has been held that a vakalatnama couched in general terms suffices *prima facie* to authorize him to apply on behalf of his client for leave to withdraw a suit and in the absence of anything to show that the vakil had acted contrary to the client's instructions or otherwise was guilty of misconduct in making the application the client is bound by the act of his vakil (x)

**Power to bind client by admission**—Counsel (y) solicitors (z) and pleaders or vakils (a) have an implied authority to bind their clients by admissions of *fact* provided such admissions are made during the actual progress of litigation and not in mere conversation (b) A verbal admission by a pleader must be taken as a whole and must not be unduly pressed (c) but an admission of liability by a vakil is sufficient to warrant a decree against his client in the suit (d) The result is that the client will be bound by the admission even though it may be erroneous But counsel solicitor or vakil cannot bind his client by an admission on a point of law Hence if the admission be erroneous the client is free to repudiate it (e) It may here be observed that the omission

- (m) *Vund L v V Marini* (1900) 2 Cal 44 *Sun v V Lord C/elmford* (1852) 29 L J (Ex) 84  
(n) *Johu mult v Kedarnath* (19 7) 55 Cal 113 104 IC 34 ( ) 4 C 14  
(o) *Asi ran v E I I J Co* (19 5) 5 Cal 336 89 IC 413 ( ) A C 696  
(p) *Joturn ill v K darn H sugra*  
(q) *Huckn v Be ens* (189 ) Ch 633 *Will v V Sa de son* (189 ) Ch 634 *Hud de feld b king Co v Lite* (189 ) 2 Ch - 3 *B bez Solomon v Ablool Azeez* (1891) 5 Cal 647 *De Fyone Hoe Taz v Kjon So n Dun* (19 ) 3 Rang 61 ( ) 3 R 214  
(r) *E rry v Mullen* (19 1) 5 Ir Rep 368 *Ja g L had v S a lar* (1891) 13 All ( ) *C rison v Ioder es* (1896) 13 Cal 11  
(s) *Smith v Tomp* (1849) 1 B 5 *F r B v Ea te n Court es ly Co* (1843) - 1 v 344  
(t) *Nesle v Gordon Le nox* [1907] 1 C 46  
(u) *Thaku P r a t v Ialla* (18 4) 6 v W P 210  
(v) *S dash v M ruts* (1890) 14 Bom 4

- (w) *Chambe s v Mason* (18 3) 5 C D N 6 9 *St t ss v Franci* (1866) L P 1 Q B 319  
(x) *Pam C omay v Coll ctor of Beerbhoo* (1906) 5 W R 80  
(y) *Hiller v Worran* (1900) - F d F 16 *Stracy v Blake* (1836) 1 M d W 164  
(z) *Wag laff v Wat on* (1833) 4 B & Ad 339 *I t h v Lion* (1846) 9 Q B 147  
(a) *Ko r V arain v Stee th* (1863) 9 W R 48 *Pnyunder v B j* (1839) - M I A 181 334 *Mingann Lot v Man a Pim* (1906) 14 All 384 *Te lata v Bhasly* *I a l* (1899) M 1 534  
(b) *I v Wright* (190 ) 1 Cam 139 *Pa l v Hawish m* (181 ) - St - 39 *Patch v Lyon* (1846) 9 Q B 14  
(c) *V Ha v Jodha* (1834) 6 All 408  
(d) *S emutt Dos ee v Plambe* (18 4) 21 W 1 33  
( ) *Dwar Buz v Fatil* (1893) 3 C W v 202 (pl ad r) *Ben Jer hal v Dud'nath* (1900) - Cal 158 26 I 4 216 (rounds 1) *A sh ji v Faymal* (1 99) 24 Bom 360 363 *v an v Venkat charya* (1904) 25 Bom 404



of a pleader or counsel to argue a question of law or his abandoning a question of law does not preclude the Court from dealing with the question (f)

**Power to abandon issue**—A pleader's general powers in the conduct of a suit include the power to abandon an issue which in his discretion he thinks it inadvisable to press (g)

(16) "prescribed" means prescribed by rules

(17) "public officer" means a person falling under any of the following descriptions, namely —

- (a) every Judge,
- (b) every member of the Indian Civil Service,
- (c) every commissioned or gazetted officer in the military or naval forces of His Majesty, including His Majesty's Indian Marine Service, while serving under the Government,
- (d) every officer of a Court of Justice whose duty it is, as such officer, to investigate or report on any matter of law or fact, or to make, authenticate or keep any document, or to take charge or dispose of any property, or to execute any judicial process, or to administer any oath, or to interpret, or to preserve order, in the Court, and every person especially authorised by a Court of Justice to perform any of such duties,
- (e) every person who holds any office by virtue of which he is empowered to place or keep any person in confinement,
- (f) every officer of the Government whose duty it is, as such officer, to prevent offences to give information of offences, to bring offenders to justice, or to protect the public health, safety or convenience,
- (g) every officer whose duty it is, as such officer, to take, receive, keep or expend any property on behalf of the Government, or to make any survey, assessment or contract on behalf of the Government, or to execute any revenue process, or to investigate, or to report on, any matter affecting

the pecuniary interests of the Government, or to make, authenticate or keep any document relating to the pecuniary interests of the Government, or to prevent the infraction of any law for the protection of the pecuniary interests of the Government, and

- (h) every officer in the service or pay of the Government, or remunerated by fees or commission for the performance of any public duty

**Public Officer**—The definition very nearly corresponds to that of a public servant in the Indian Penal Code but a person may be a public servant and not a public officer e.g. a Municipal Commissioner and Engineer (h) The following have been held to be public officers (a) a Collector and Agent for the Court of Wards (i) the Official Trustee of Bengal (j) an officer of the Indian Staff Corps (k) an officer in the Indian Army (l) an Official Assignee (m) the Administrator General of Bengal (n) a Cantonment Committee (o) a Receiver in insolvency (p)

(18) "rules" means rules and forms contained in the First Schedule or made under section 122 or section 125

As to the relation of the body of the Code to Rules see notes to s 1 p 3 para No (11)

(19) "share in a corporation" shall be deemed to include stock, debenture stock, debentures, or bonds and

(20) "signed," save in the case of a judgment or decree, includes stamped

**Signed**—The definition is wider than in the General Clauses Act Indians of rank sometimes use a stamp instead of signing and inability to write is not a condition precedent to the use of a stamp (q)

**3 [S 2]** For the purposes of this Code, the District

Subordination of Courts

Court is subordinate to the High Court, and every Civil Court of a grade inferior to that of a District Court and every Court of Small Causes is subordinate to the High Court and District Court

- (h) *I g v Vairam* (1869) 6 Bom H C 1  
64 Cr 13  
(i) *Collector of Bhojpur v Vairam* (1869) 3  
All O N 101  
(18 6) 1 Bom 318 *Bhai v Vairam* (1868)  
13 Bom 443  
(j) *N. H. v. F. R. v. F. R.* (1891) 1 Cr 499  
*Abdul Dozi* (1891) 1 Mad 0  
(k) *H. v. L. v. L.* (1901) 3 M 1 40  
(l) *I. v. J. Murra* (1919) 3 Bom 16 50

- 1 C 683  
(m) *J. v. Kemp* (1907) 26 Bom 809  
(n) *Blot am* *Adm. v. Gen. l.* (1904)  
8 C W 913  
(o) *Cecil v. C. v. C.* *Comm. v.* (1910)  
34 Bom 591 1 C 69  
(p) *D. v. L. v. L.* (19 6) 44 Bom 29 53  
1 C 411  
(q) *M. v. J.* *f. E. v. D. v. D.* (1831)  
3 All 5 5

**Subordination of Courts**—The High Court with reference to civil proceedings is the highest Court of Appeal in the part of British India in which the Act or Regulation containing the expression operates see sec 3 (24) General Clauses Act 1897 The enumeration of subordinate Courts is not exhaustive and a Collector exercising judicial functions under the Mamltdars Courts Act is subject to the superintendence and control of the High Court (7)

**Different rulings of different High Courts**—Where there are different rulings of different High Courts on a particular point a Subordinate Judge should follow the decision in law of a Bench of the High Court to which he is subordinate unless the decision of the Bench has been overruled by a decision of a Full Bench of that Court or unless it has been overruled expressly or impliedly on an appeal to His Majesty in Council or unless the law has been altered by a subsequent Act of the Legislature (8)

**4 [S 4] (1)** In the absence of any specific provision to the contrary, nothing in this Code shall be deemed to limit or otherwise affect any special or local law now in force or any special jurisdiction or power conferred, or any special form of procedure prescribed, by or under any other law for the time being in force

Savings

**(2)** In particular and without prejudice to the generality of the proposition contained in sub section (1), nothing in this Code shall be deemed to limit or otherwise affect any remedy which a landholder or landlord may have under any law for the time being in force for the recovery of rent of agricultural land from the produce of such land

**Special or local law**—The section does not mean that the Code does not apply to proceedings under special or local laws but only enacts that where there is an inconsistency the rules of the Code do not prevail (t) For instances of such inconsistencies the undermentioned cases (u) may be referred to The Mamltdars Courts Act enacts its own special procedure which excludes that of the Code (v)

The section gives a local Act local validity and special procedure validity its own sphere No local Legislature can prescribe procedure for any Court beyond its own jurisdiction (w)

**Any special form of procedure**—It has been held having regard to the words that where two Judges differ in an appeal from the Original Side of the High Court the special procedure laid down in cl 36 of the Letters Patent should be followed and not the rule laid down in s 98 of the Code (x) S 98 (3) which was added by Act 18 of 1928 gives effect to these divisions

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| ( ) <i>P r h o l l m v M a h d u</i> (191 ) 3 B o m 114 1 I C 6 6                           | <i>I e K a t a n a r v m h a v S</i> (1891) 17 Mad 35   |
| (x) <i>P i t u J I v I a r b t</i> (191 ) 4 I A 15- M E O 37 All 3 9 306 29 I C 617 A b o n | (v) <i>K a n a m v M a t</i> (1889) 13 B o m. 5 2   |
| <i>A l l v S h a r o d a I r o h t</i> (1844) 19 Cal 8                                      | (w) <i>C h a t o o L a l v N a a n d s</i> (19 9) 56 Cal 64                                       |
| <i>S a m r a o v K a s h n t h</i> (1891) 15 B o m 419                                      | ( ) <i>B h d a s v B o G t</i> (19 1) 43 I A 181 4  |
| <i>B a l a f v S i h a a n</i> (1893) 17 I o n 5  | <i>L o m 18 60 I C 8</i>  |
| <i>K a m i s I r a a l v P a t j I m</i> (1919) 4 Pat L J 56 51 I C 400                     | <i>H o r m n</i> (1919) 9 B o m L R 18 1  |
| (t) <i>4 p a M / m l C l e n</i> (188 ) 3 Cal. 1 3  | <i>4 I C 419 E m p r e s v I r o t a b C h a n f r a</i> (19 4) 51 Cal 504 84 I C 31 (-4) A C 603 |
| (w) <i>I l l a v M o d</i> (1846) 9 M d 33  |   |
| <i>A p p a d a v S h a r i</i> (1890) 16 Mad 4 1  |   |

**5 [S 4 A]** (1) Where any Revenue Courts are governed by the provisions of this Code in those matters of procedure upon which any special enactment applicable to them is silent, the Local Government may, by notification in the local official Gazette, declare that any portions of those provisions which are not expressly made applicable by this Code shall not apply to those Courts, or shall only apply to them with such modifications as the Local Government may prescribe

(2) Revenue Court ' in sub section (1) means a Court having jurisdiction under any local law to entertain suits or other proceedings relating to the rent, revenue or profits of land used for agricultural purposes, but does not include a Civil Court having original jurisdiction under this Code to try such suits or proceedings as being suits or proceedings of a civil nature

**Object of the section**—The object of this section is to preserve the summary character of rent litigation under local laws

**6 [S 6]** Save in so far as is otherwise expressly provided, nothing herein contained shall operate to give any Court jurisdiction over suits the amount or value of the subject matter of which exceeds the pecuniary limits (if any) of its ordinary jurisdiction

**Pecuniary jurisdiction**—See notes to s 15 under the head Court of lowest grade competent to try a suit

**Pecuniary jurisdiction in passing decrees**—The jurisdiction of a Munsif in Bengal & W P and Assam extends to suits (not otherwise exempted from his cognizance) of which the value does not exceed Rs 1 000 and in the Madras Presidency to suits of which the value does not exceed Rs 2 000 It has been held by the High Courts of Calcutta (y) Allahabad (z) Madras (a) and Patna (b) that where a suit is properly brought in the Court of a Munsif for recovery of possession of land and mesne profits prior to the date of the suit and there is a prayer also for mesne profits from the institution of the suit which are claimed or assessed at a sum beyond the pecuniary jurisdiction of the Munsif the Munsif has jurisdiction to fix the mesne profits from and after the date of the institution of the suit and pass a decree therefor though the amount may be beyond his pecuniary jurisdiction The value of such a suit for the purposes of jurisdiction is the value of the immovable property plus mesne profits up to the date

(1) *It deadth v Maitra* (1890) 10 B 53 (14 80 I C 6 ( ) 4 C 10 6

(2) *Saikh D v Pannu* (1911) 33 All 971 (74 Mad 101 (1894) 16 All 50

(a) *It deadth v Maitra* (1890) 10 B 53 (14 80 I C 6 ( ) 4 C 10 6

(b) *It deadth v Maitra* (1890) 10 B 53 (14 80 I C 6 ( ) 4 C 10 6

of the suit Mesne profits after the date of the suit do not form part of the cause of action on which the suit is brought The forum of appeal also is determined by the value of the suit and not by the amount decreed See notes to s 38 Jurisdiction of Court executing decree and notes to s 96 Forum of appeal

A sues B for possession of land valued at Rs 686 and for the mesne profits up to the date of the suit valued approximately at Rs 200 and for mesne profits subsequent to the date of the suit not valued at all The suit is brought in the Court of a Munsif whose pecuniary jurisdiction is limited to Rs 1 000 A decree is passed in the suit for the plaintiff for possession and for mesne profits up to the date of the suit Subsequently the plaintiff applies to the Munsif for assessment of mesne profits after the date of the suit claiming Rs 60 000 for such profits The Munsif can pass a decree for Rs 60 000 though the amount exceeds his pecuniary jurisdiction

7 [S 5] The following provisions shall not extend to  
Provincial Small Cause Courts Courts constituted under the Provincial Small Causes Courts Act, 1887 or to Courts exercising the jurisdiction of a Court of Small Causes under that Act, that is to say,—

(a) so much of the body of the Code as relates to—

- (i) suits excepted from the cognizance of a Court of Small Causes,
- (ii) the execution of decrees in such suits,
- (iii) the execution of decrees against immovable property, and

(b) the following sections, that is to say,—

section 9,

sections 91 and 92,

sections 94 and 95 so far as they authorize or relate to—

- (i) orders for the attachment of immovable property,
- (ii) injunctions,
- (iii) the appointment of a receiver of immovable property, or
- (iv) the interlocutory orders referred to in clause (e) of section 94, and

sections 96 to 112 and 115

**Changes in the section**—The words in *italics* were substituted by Act I of 1926 for the words *so far as they relate to injunctions and interlocutory orders* which occurred in cl (b) of the original rule after the words and figures sections 94 and 95

**Attachment before judgment by Provincial Small Cause Court**—A Provincial Small Cause Court has jurisdiction *to attach* movable property before judgment. An attachment before judgment is not one of the interlocutory orders referred to in cl (b) of the section (c)

As regards *immovable* property there were conflicting decisions of the Calcutta High Court on the question whether a Provincial Small Cause Court had jurisdiction to order an attachment of such property before judgment. The whole question was considered by a Full Bench of that High Court in the undermentioned case (d) and it was held by a majority that a Court of Small Cause has such jurisdiction but expressed a doubt as to the intention of the Legislature in the matter when the Code was passed in 1908. To resolve that doubt the word in *italics* were substituted by Act I of 1926 for the words *so far as they relate to injunction and interlocutory order* which occurred in cl (b) of the original section after the words sections 94 and 95. To make the matter clearer a new rule being rule 13 was added to O 38 by the same Act.

8 [S 8] Save as provided in sections 24, 38 to 41, 75, clauses (a), (b) and (c), 76, 77 and 155 to 158, and by the Presidency Small Cause Courts Act, 1882, the provisions in the body of this Code shall not extend to any suit or proceeding in any Court of Small Causes established in the towns of Calcutta, Madras and Bombay,

Provided that—

- (1) the High Courts of Judicature at Fort William, Madras and Bombay as the case may be may from time to time, by notification in the local official Gazette, direct that any such provisions not inconsistent with the express provisions of the Presidency Small Cause Courts Act, 1882, and with such modifications and adaptations as may be specified in the notification shall extend to suits or proceedings or any class of suits or proceedings in such Court
- (2) All rules heretofore made by any of the said High Courts under section 9 of the Presidency Small Cause Courts Act 1882, shall be deemed to have been validly made

The provisoes were inserted in the section by the Code of Civil Procedure Amendment Act I of 1914 s 2

(c) *T. Mud v. Hars* (1919) 46 Cal 1 5311

(d) *Bar Ja Ka ta Sa'sa Poy v. Sheikh Mojuhd*

(19) 5 C 1 5 8 1 C 103 (5)

A C 111 B] approving *Sad A. Ah v*

*Samed 41* (19 3) —3 Cal W. N. 16 801

C 309 (4) 4 C 193 and overruling

*Kadarnath v. Hem v. th* (19) 49 Cal

994 O J C 841 (-) 4 C 1 d

## PART I

## Suits in General

## JURISDICTION OF THE COURTS AND RES JUDICATA

9 [S 11] The Courts shall (subject to the provisions herein contained) have jurisdiction to try <sup>Courts to try all civil suits unless barred</sup> all suits of a civil nature excepting suits of which their cognizance is either expressly or impliedly barred

*Explanation*—A suit in which the right to property or to an office is contested is a suit of a civil nature, notwithstanding that such right may depend entirely on the decision of questions as to religious rites or ceremonies

*Alterations in the section*—The word either expressly or impliedly barred have been substituted for the words barred by any enactment for the time being in force which occurred in s 11 of the Code of 1882. The latter words were held to mean *expressly* barred (e)

*Onus*—A party seeking to oust the jurisdiction of ordinary Civil Courts must establish his right to do so (f)

*Suits of a civil nature*—Suits may be divided into two classes—(1) those which are of a civil nature and (2) those which are not of a civil nature. It is suits only of a civil nature which a civil Court has jurisdiction to entertain. A civil Court has no jurisdiction to try suits which are not of a civil nature. The explanation shews that if the principal or only question in the suit is a caste question or a question relating to religious rites or ceremonies the suit is not of a civil nature for it deals not with the rights of the citizen but with matters that are purely social. But when (1) a caste question or a question relating to religious rites or ceremonies is not the principal question in the suit but is merely a subsidiary question and (2) the principal question is of a civil nature e.g. a question as to any right to property or to an office or to any other civil right and (3) the principal question which is of a civil nature cannot be determined without deciding the caste question or question relating to religious rites or ceremonies the Court has the power to decide the caste question or question relating to religious rites or ceremonies *to enable it to decide the principal question* (g). It is upon this principle that the Explanation to the section is based. We may therefore say that a suit is of a civil nature if the principal question in the suit relates to a civil right. The mere fact that the determination of such a question depends entirely on the decision of caste questions or questions as to religious rites or ceremonies does not take the suit out of the category of suits of a civil nature (see the Explanation to the section). We now proceed to consider the leading cases in which the Courts have refused to try suits on the ground either (1) that the principal question in the suit was a caste question or (2) that it related to religious rites or ceremonies.

(e) *F. J. Mah v Chandra Nath* (193) 14 I 644 645

(f) *Srinath J v Sathya Narayana*

(1916) 2 Mil. 1 I C 801  
(g) *L. J. v. B. J.* (191) 10 Bom. 80 1922  
Gor. d (184) 11 B. m. 34

Suits in which the principal question is a caste question are not suits of a civil nature—A caste is any well defined native community (be it Hindu or Mahomedan) governed for certain internal purposes by its own rules and regulations (*h*) A caste question is one which relates to matters affecting the internal autonomy of the caste and its social relations (*i*)

To determine whether or not a question is a caste question the test is—Would the cognizance of the matter in dispute by the Court be an interference with the autonomy of the caste? Would the Court be deciding the question which the caste as a self governing body is entitled to decide for itself If yes the question is a caste question and no civil Court has jurisdiction to entertain it (*j*) Thus a caste may pass a resolution depriving a member of *man pan* invitation or invitation to dinner or to *mung* or other ceremony for an alleged breach of a caste rule The excluded member has no remedy in law for all that he has lost is a *social* privilege and not a *legal* right and the caste is the only tribunal to which a casteman deprived of that privilege can resort A civil Court has no power by its decree to compel the members of a caste to invite a casteman to dinner or to any ceremony (*k*) Similarly a Court has no power to compel barbers belonging to a certain caste to shave a casteman or to pare his nails though the party aggrieved may allege that he would lose caste by the loss of service at the hand of the barbers (*l*) On the same principle a member of a caste is not entitled to any remedy in law if the other members refuse to go to his house on the occasion of a death in his family and assist him in the removal of the dead body though they may in doing so break a rule of the caste It is not for a Court of law to enforce a caste rule or resolution it is for the caste itself that makes the rule or passes the resolution to do so (*m*) Hence a Court will not compel a defaulting member to pay to the caste a sum of money which by a resolution of the caste every casteman is liable to pay on the occasion of a marriage in his family (*n*)

Expulsion from caste—To exclude a member of a caste from invitation to caste dinners or ceremonies is as stated above to deprive him of a *social* privilege But to expel him from the caste is to deprive him of a *legal* right which forms part of his status Hence a suit will lie for a declaration that the plaintiff is entitled to be re-admitted into the caste and also for damages for expulsion from the caste (*o*) But to entitle the plaintiff to a decree it must be shown that his excommunication was wrongful and the Court will in such cases enquire into the validity of the sentence of excommunication Excommunication is wrongful if a member is expelled from the caste without opportunity of explanation being offered to him (*p*) It is also wrongful if a member is expelled for an alleged breach of a caste rule which as a matter of fact he has not broken (*q*) In the *mufassal* of Bombay however a suit does not lie for *restoration* to caste the cognizance of such a suit being expressly barred by Bombay Regulation II of 1827 s 21 (*r*) But a suit is maintainable for *damages* on account of an alleged injury to the caste and character of the plaintiff arising from some illegal act or unjustifiable conduct of the other party

As to defamation for expulsion from caste see the undermentioned cases (*s*)

- (A) *Abdulkadir v Dharm* (1896) 20 Bom 190  
 (1) *Appaya v Padappa* (1899) 23 Bom 10  
 130 *Jethabai v Chappu* (1910) 34 Bom 46 441 41 C 103  
 (2) *M. Aravind v Suda* (1928) 5 Bom 27  
 (3) *R. G. Unani v Jangdhan* (1891) 15 Bom 599 5 *dharm v Sudhakar* (1869) 3 B L R 4 J 91 *M. yash kar v Har shankar* (1896) 10 Bom 661  
 (4) *G. J. v. V. b. e.* (1884) 1 W P 31  
 (5) *E. J. v. A. J.* (1894) 18 Bom 115  
 (6) *Abdulkadir v Dharm* (1896) 20 Bom 190  
 (7) *Jayram v Akali* (1894) 1 Cal 463

- (p) *Appaya v Padappa* (1899) 23 Bom 10  
*Kesavaiah v B. G. Raja* (1900) 4 Bom 15 3 *Yallabai v Madhusudan* (1899) 1 Mal 49 *C. napat v Bh. ali* (1894) 1 Mad 134  
 (2) *Fr. Anas m. v. F. s. n.* (188) 10 Mad 133  
 (3) *V. F. v. F. e. haw* (190) 26 Bom 14  
 (4) (1891) 15 Bom 599 5 *p. u.* (190) 6 Bom 14 5 *p. a. G. b. d. Da v. b. shambhar* D s (191) 441 A 19 9 All 561 ult for definition for publication of caste resolution—action of publication held to be justifiable



Suits in which the principal question relates to religious rites or ceremonies are not suits of a civil nature—Thus a suit will not lie to establish a right to parade bullocks on certain days (t) or to compel *punjaris* to adorn an idol at certain seasons (u) or to instal it in a particular temple instead of in another (v) There is no right of a civil nature involved in these cases and the Court will not pronounce on any religious doctrine unless it is necessary to do so in order to determine rights of property (w)

Suits for vindication of a mere dignity attached to an office are not suits of a civil nature—A claim by a *Suami* (arch priest) that he is entitled to be carried on the high road of a town or village in a palanquin on ceremonial occasions will not be entertained by a civil Court (x) What is claimed by the plaintiff in such a case is a mere mark of honour appended to the office of a *Suami*. Civil Courts should discourage as much as possible claims of so unsubstantial and objectionable a nature and they ought not to be involved in the determination of trivial questions of dignity and privilege although connected with an office. For the same reason a suit will not lie for a declaration that the plaintiff as *gurukul* or spiritual leader is entitled to be received at a pagoda by the wardens of the pagoda with the honours and emoluments due to his rank on the occasion of the annual festival of the pagoda. The duty of individuals to submit to and perform certain religious observances in accordance with the ritual or conventional practices of their race or sect is in the absence of express legal recognition and provision an imperfect obligation of a moral and not a civil nature. Of such obligations the present civil Court cannot take cognizance (y) Following this rule the Courts have declined to entertain claims made by holders of religious office to precedence in worship such as a claim to be the first to worship the deity and to receive gifts of rice and cocoanuts on certain public religious ceremonies (z). They have likewise declined to decide disputes as to precedence or privilege between purely religious functionaries (a). It is important to note that the suit in each of the above cases was not to establish a right to an office but for a declaration that the plaintiff was by virtue of his office entitled to certain tokens of dignity or to receive offerings. In other words the suit was not for a claim to an office but to vindicate an alleged dignity attached to an office. A suit for an office is of a civil nature but a suit for vindication of a mere dignity though connected with an office is not. But if honours be attached to an office by way of remuneration in other words as part of its emoluments a civil Court can entertain a suit for such honours (b).

Office.—Suits in which the principal question is as to a civil or legal right are suits of a civil nature. The right to an office is a right of a civil nature. Therefore suits in which the principal question relates to the right to an office are suits of a civil nature and they are not the less so because the right claimed may depend on the decision of caste questions or questions as to religious rites or ceremonies or even religious tenets (c). See the Explanation to the section.

Suits for secular office.—When no remuneration attaches to the office of the secretary of an Association (registered under Act 21 of 1860) a suit for a declaration that the plaintiff is the secretary of the Association and that his dismissal from the office

- (t) *Pt v Sharm* (184) 8 Bom 116  
 (u) *Id v Sharm* (185) 10 Bom 20  
 (v) *Lok Nath v Dastar* (100) 3 Cal 10  
 (w) *Id v Ge* (100) 3 Cal 10  
 (x) *Id v Ge* (100) 3 Cal 10  
 (y) *Id v Ge* (100) 3 Cal 10  
 (z) *Id v Ge* (100) 3 Cal 10  
 (a) *Id v Ge* (100) 3 Cal 10  
 (b) *Id v Ge* (100) 3 Cal 10  
 (c) *Id v Ge* (100) 3 Cal 10

- (t) *Id v Sharm* (184) 8 Bom 116  
 (u) *Id v Sharm* (185) 10 Bom 20  
 (v) *Lok Nath v Dastar* (100) 3 Cal 10  
 (w) *Id v Ge* (100) 3 Cal 10  
 (x) *Id v Ge* (100) 3 Cal 10  
 (y) *Id v Ge* (100) 3 Cal 10  
 (z) *Id v Ge* (100) 3 Cal 10  
 (a) *Id v Ge* (100) 3 Cal 10  
 (b) *Id v Ge* (100) 3 Cal 10  
 (c) *Id v Ge* (100) 3 Cal 10

was not justified by the rules of the Association is not maintainable in a civil Court especially if the Association has the power to alter its rules from time to time. The reason is that in such a case no decree which a civil Court may pass in plaintiff's favour could prevent the Association from altering its rules and then dispensing with the plaintiff's services and employing some one else (d).

**Suits for religious office**—*Quære whether every suit for a religious office is a suit of a civil nature?* The Explanation to the section assumes that a suit in which the right to an office is contested is a suit of a civil nature. Now an office may be either secular or religious in its character. We are here principally concerned with an office of a religious character for the question as to religious rites and ceremonies contemplated by the Explanation can only arise when the right to a religious office is contested. Religious offices may be divided into two classes namely—

- I—Those to which fees are appurtenant as of right such as the office of the *Ka* of Bombay or of the *Joshi* of a village or the *Upadhyaya* of a caste.
- II—Those to which no fees are attached but which entitle the holder thereof to receive such *gratuities* as may be paid to him such as the office of *pujari* or of an officiating priest in a temple or of the *Aya* of a *math*.

**Fees** are to be distinguished from *gratuities*. When fees are attached to an office the holder of the office is entitled on performance of the services to the stipulated or customary fees. Thus a *Ka* or *Joshi* is entitled on performing a marriage ceremony to the marriage fee and if the fee is not paid to him he may enforce payment by a suit. In fact a fee is a sum which the holder of an office is entitled to demand as payment for the execution of functions attached to the office. Besides the fee paid to a *Ka* or to a *Joshi* on the occasion of a marriage there may be gratuities paid to him which are entirely voluntary in their character. If a person invites a *Joshi* for performing a marriage ceremony at his place and pays him the fee but no gratuity a suit will not lie at the instance of the *Joshi* for payment to him of any sum by way of gratuity though it may be usual to pay gratuities on such occasions the reason is that there is no obligation in law on the part of the person inviting a *Joshi* to make any payment by way of gratuity (e). The same remark applies to holders of religious offices referred to in class II above.

The question which concerns us at present is whether a suit will lie at the instance of the holder of a religious office for disturbing him in the exercise of his office. If the office is wrongfully usurped can the person claiming to be the rightful holder of the office sue the intruder in a civil Court for a declaration that he is entitled to the office? Will a civil Court entertain such a suit? To answer these questions we must deal with the two classes of religious offices separately.

As regards religious offices of the first class that is offices to which fees are attached there is no doubt that a suit will lie against an intruder for a declaration that the office is vested in the plaintiff. Such a suit is a suit of a civil nature (f).

Turning now to religious offices of the second class the question that faces us is whether a suit will lie for an office to which no fees are attached. Different views have been held on this point by different Courts. It has been held by the High Court of Calcutta that a suit by a person claiming to be entitled to a religious office against a usurper for a declaration of the plaintiff's right to the office is a suit of a civil nature

(d) *Maharaj v. Raju v. Shastri* (1915) 3 A.R. 331, 91 C. 23.

(e) *M. H. Ahmad v. S. J. d. Ahmed* (1861) 1 Bom. H.C. App. p. 1111.

(f) *Muhammad v. Sayad Ahmed* (1861) 1 B.H. C. App. p. 1111. [*Kazi Joshi*] *Lakshabhai*.

*v. Hargovan* (191) 36 Bom. 94, 1 J.C. 94, 1 J.C. 147, 1 M. Indhar (191) 4 Bom. 34, 91 C. 23. [*Pathy*] *Shan* Injunction granted as it is a branch of the suit on the ground that the hereditary office of a *priest* in the nature of a right or immovable property.]

and will therefore be entertained by a civil Court though no emoluments are attached to the office. This conclusion is based upon the reasoning that a religious office though no fees are attached to it is an office within the meaning of the Explanation to this section and that the section assumes that a suit for an office is a suit of a civil nature. The office in that case was that of musicians who chanted holy songs in a *satra* at a certain village (g). In another case the office was that of a *shebait* and the suit was by one member of a family against another for a declaration of a hereditary right to officiate as *shebait* at the worship performed by votaries at the foot of a certain tree. It was held that the suit was maintainable. In this case also there were no fees attached to the office but voluntary offerings were made by the votaries (h). In a third case the right claimed by the plaintiff was the right of worship of *Saradiya Haragouri Thakurani* and to make certain offerings to the image installed in the place of worship and it was held that the plaintiff was entitled to maintain a suit against a usurper (i). It is worthy of note that in all these cases the office was one attached to a place as distinguished from an *absolutely personal office*.

On the other hand it has been held by the High Court of Madras that a suit does not lie for a religious office to which no fees are attached. According to that Court a religious office to which no fees are attached is not an office within the meaning of this section (j). The office in one of these cases was that of the priest of *Samayacharm* whose duty was to exercise spiritual and moral supervision over a certain class of persons.

As regards Bombay decisions if we are to reconcile them all we must divide them into two classes namely (1) those in which the religious office is attached to a temple shrine or sacred spot and (2) those in which the office is entirely personal in its character. And it may be safely said that a suit will lie for a religious office which is attached to a place though no fees are appurtenant to it such as the office of an officiating priest in a temple or of the *Aya* of a *math* (k). But a suit will not lie for an office to which no fees are attached if the office be personal in its character such as the office of *Chalua* (l) [bearer on public occasions of the insignia of a caste] or the office of *Guru* (m). The distinction between offices that are attached to a place such as a temple or a *math* and offices that are in their nature personal is our own and it must be said that none of the Bombay decisions turns expressly on any such distinction. This distinction has been devised to harmonize what would otherwise be a mass of conflicting decisions though it must be observed that even then there remains one Bombay decision in which the office was a personal one and there were no fees attached to the office and yet it was held that a suit would lie for the office. The distinction suggested above was approved by the High Court of Bombay in a recent case where it was held that a right to perform *Urus* ceremonies and to collect offerings at the shrine of a saint appertains to a religious office and can be enforced by a suit (n). The principal question in that case was whether a suit lies for the office of *I katib* (preacher) regard being had to the fact that no fees were attached to the office and it was held that it does. The Court said: Had it been the intention of the Legislature that such a suit should not lie the same would have been clearly provided for (o). But if it is a question of the intention of the Legislature it may be said that the Explanation to the section which did not occur in the Code of 1877 appears to have been suggested directly by a passage in a judgment in

(g) *M. at F. m. v. H. pu. P. m.* (1888) 15 C. I. 159

(h) *Dino v. th. v. Irat p. C. and a.* (1900) 27 C. I. 30

(i) *Deband v. S. ty. Ch.* (19 ) 54 Cal 614 10 I. C. 184 ( ) A. C. 83

(j) *Thol. pp. is. v. Is. I. ta.* (1896) 19 M. d. 6  
*S. dda. ya. v. Vedantacharkar.* (190 ) 4 M. d. 21

(k) *L. ma. v. I. ma.* (1889) 13 Bom. 549 *Gu. m. v. ya. v. Tama.* (189 ) 16 Bom. 291

(l) *Sh. F. av. H. am.* (19 8) Bom. 470

(m) *M. r. v. S. uba.* (188 ) 6 B. m. 5 ( *ad. gey. Ba. aya.* (1910) 34 Bom. 455 6 I. C. 519

(n) *K. m. A. A. v. K. n. I. d. b.* (19 6) 50 Bom. 148 93 I. C. 1 ( ) A. B. 161 See also *D. b. n. l. v. Satya Ch. ra.* (19 7) 54 Cal 614 6 3 10 I. C. 188 ( -7 ) A. C. 83

(o) *S. vad. H. st. m. v. Hurst. ha.* (1889) 13 Bom. 42

a Madras case decided in 1871 (p) which was approved in a subsequent case by the Privy Council (q) and the religious office in both those cases was one to which fees were attached

The High Court of Allahabad has held that a mere right to perform *Ram Lila* (religious pageants) which does not carry with it any right to emoluments nor is attached to a shrine or temple or secret spot cannot be enforced in a Court of law (r)

The Patna High Court has held that a right to officiate at funeral ceremonies performed upon the banks of the Ganges between certain points which did not carry any fees with it but merely gratuities cannot be enforced in a Civil Court (s)

Suits for recovery of fees attached to an office are suits of a civil nature but not suits for recovery of gratuities—It is settled law that if a per on usurps an office to which another per on is entitled and receives the fees of the office he is bound to account to the rightful owner for them and the rightful owner may sue the *usurper* to recover the fees properly payable to him But the case is different where the payments are merely *voluntary* and a suit will not lie to recover *voluntary gratuities* that may have been received by the *usurper* (t) The reason is that where *voluntary* offerings are made they must be taken to have been intended for the very person who was then *actually* performing the ceremony whether rightfully or wrong fully and further that it is quite possible that no gratuities would have been given at all if the rightful owner officiated at the ceremony instead of the *usurper* (u) The same principles apply when a suit is brought by the lawful holder of an office against a *member* of the caste for employing the *usurper* for performing ceremonies which the rightful holder was entitled to perform Thus a village priest may be entitled by hereditary right to officiate and take fees in the families of a particular caste in the village and if a member of the caste employs an intruder in the office to perform the ceremonies the village priest is entitled to recover from the casteman the fees which would properly be payable to him if he had been employed to perform those ceremonies (v) But a suit will not lie against a casteman for a *gratuity* which the party might have refused to give if he had pleased (w) If for determining the plaintiff's right to the fees claimed it becomes necessary to determine incidentally the right to perform the ceremonies the Courts should try and decide that right (x) The above principles have been held to apply to *batandai* barbers who are entitled to render services as barbers on ceremonial occasions and to receive the customary fees (y)

The cases in which a suit by the rightful owner of a religious office against a *usurper* for recovery of voluntary gratuities has been held not to be maintainable must be distinguished from those where a suit is brought by a sharer in a religious office against his *co sharers* for recovery of his share of the voluntary gratuities In the latter class of cases it has been held that a suit will lie for the basis of the claim in such cases is an *agreement* expressed or implied that all the sharers should have a share in the gratuities (z)

Dues paid by *taggals* and shopkeepers to *choudhrys* of *baras* are in the nature of *voluntary* payments hence a suit will not lie to recover such dues or for a declaration

(p) *Varma v. J. Ram* (1871) 6 M. H. C. 419

(q) *Arulnama v. J. Ram* (1890) 2 Mad. 666

(r) *Chunnu Dat v. B. B. Vandan* (1910) 3 All. 561

(s) *H. A. v. Bachu* (1906) 11 Lat. L. J. 381

(t) *S. I. am Bhat v. Sitar m. C. e. h.* (1869) 6 B. H. C. 20

(u) *J. Lom v. J. Lom* (1903) 30 Ind. L. J. 381

(v) *Pat. L. J. 381* (1903) 30 Ind. L. J. 381

(w) *Kash. C. P. n. d. v. J. Lal Chand* (1899) 6 Cal. 356

(x) *Dina v. V. Sadash* (1909) 3 Bom. 9

(y) *1. L. J. 98* (1900) 30 Ind. L. J. 381

(z) *U. v. Suda* (1888) 6 Bom. 1

(a) *K. v. K.* (1890) 11 Lat. L. J. 381

(b) *Bhagya v. B. B.* (1900) 44 Bom. 33

(c) *D. v. V.* (1900) 11 Lat. L. J. 381

(d) *1. L. J. 98* (1900) 30 Ind. L. J. 381

(e) *1. L. J. 98* (1900) 30 Ind. L. J. 381

of the right to recover them (a) A woman is not disqualified from enforcing such an agreement (b)

Where the question at issue is not a matter relating to the internal administration and affairs of a caste but to the property of the caste the civil Court has jurisdiction to interfere although there has been a division of opinion in the caste (c)

**Suits relating to caste property**—Suppose that a caste is divided into two factions F1 and F2 and that F1 owns certain property which stands in the names of some of its members. If these members secede from faction F1 and go over to faction F2 a suit will lie to recover the property from them at the instance of faction F1 (d). Here the subject matter of the suit is property belonging to one section of the caste and the claim is against persons outside that section. Suppose next that a caste owns a property purchased out of the caste funds and that it is subsequently divided into two factions F1 and F2. If faction F2 happens at the time of the division to be in possession of the caste property, faction F1 cannot maintain a suit against faction F2 for recovery of one half of the caste property or its value (e). Here the subject matter of the suit is caste property and the claim is not against an outsider but against another section of the caste.

As regards user of caste property it has been laid down that a majority of a caste has the right to regulate the use of the property and the minority is bound by the resolution of the majority provided the resolution is not so subversive of the interests of the minority as to amount to a complete denial of their rights. Thus if the majority of a caste passes a resolution that the caste hall should not be used for feasting any Brahmans and the minority invites Brahmans to a feast in the hall a suit will lie to restrain the minority from using the hall in contravention of the resolution (f).

**Suits for inspection of accounts of caste property**—Such a suit relates purely to a caste question and it cannot therefore be entertained by a civil Court (g).

**Interference with temple property**—Removal or alteration of namams or religious marks in a temple which are recognized as the badges of a particular religious denomination amounts to an interference with property and is a ground of action in civil Courts (h).

**Interference with right of worship**—Suits for a declaration of the right to worship or to offer prayers at a certain place are suits of a civil nature. It often happens that the members of a particular class are alone entitled to worship in the sanctuary of a temple and to perform certain portions of the religious worship. Such a right is one of a civil nature and it may be enforced by a suit in a civil Court (i).

**Right of burial**—The right of burial is a civil right and it has accordingly been held that an interference with the rights of the relatives of a deceased Mahomedan to recite prayers over his body before burial in front of a particular mosque being an invasion of a civil right may be enforced by suit (j).

**Religious processions**—Members of a religious body possess the right to conduct a religious procession with its appropriate observances along a highway and a

- (a) *Baratt v. Ch. mru* (190 ) 2 All 683  
 (b) *K. J. Behari v. Mast. Varna* (19 3) 45 All 43 11 C 10-6 ( 3) A A 4 5  
 (c) *Fulchand v. H. ril* (19 6) 50 Bom 1 4 9 1 C 549 (-6) A B 69  
 (d) *Mishra J. th. l. v. Jamnal am* [1888] 1 Bom 5 5 *Pragati v. Gori d* (1847) 11 Bom 534  
 (e) *G. dh. r. v. A. lva* (1881) 5 Bom 83 *Vem. h. d. v. d. racha d* (1866) 3 Bom 84 (foot note)  
 (f) *Lalji v. H. alji* (189 ) 19 Bom 507  
 (g) *etabha v. Ch. p. cy* (1909) 34 Bom 36 4

- 1 C 168  
 (h) *J. r. h. a. am v. Samaram* (1907) 30 Mad 154  
 (i) *A. l. an v. Ch. la* (1883) Bom 3 3 *Ar. h. astmi v. Kruah. ma* (188-) 5 Mad 315 *le. gamuluv. la d. ew. a* (1883) 6 Mad 1 1 *le. latel. lupal v. Sub. ba. i. d* (1890) 13 Mad 95 *Kalidas v. Cor. l. rja am* (1891) 15 Bom 309  
 (j) *Kooni W. ra v. Mahomed* (1907) 30 Mad 15 *Pam. j. o. v. Husum Khan* (190 ) 6 Bom 199

suit will lie against those who prevent the procession with its observances. The worshippers in a mosque or temple which abut on a high road could not compel the processionists to interrupt their worship while passing the mosque or temple on the ground that there was continuous worship there. But no one sect can claim the exclusive use of the highway for their worship (a).

**Suit to set aside election of directors**—Such a suit is of a civil nature and the Court is entitled to take cognizance of it. The matters involved in such a suit are not matters of internal management of the company (l).

**Suit for administration of estate of a living Hindu debtor**—Such a suit is not cognizable by a civil Court (m).

**Suits expressly barred**—The general rule of law is that when a legal right and an infringement thereof are alleged a cause of action is disclosed and unless there is a bar to the entertainment of a suit the ordinary civil Courts are bound to entertain the claim (n). This is in substance the rule laid down in the present section which provides that suits though of a civil nature are not triable by civil Courts if the cognizance of such suits is expressly or impliedly barred. By expressly barred is meant barred by any enactment for the time being in force. Thus section 11 provides that no Court shall try a suit in which the matter in issue is *res judicata* and section 47 bars a decree holder from filing a suit when he can take execution proceedings. Section 39 of the Income Tax Act provides that no suit shall lie in any civil Court to set aside or modify any assessment made under that Act (o). Similarly the Pensions Act 23 of 1871 s. 4 enacts that except as provided by that Act no civil Court shall entertain any suit relating to any pension or grant of money or land revenue conferred or made by the British or any former Government (p). The cognizance of a suit by a civil Court may also be impliedly barred. Thus a suit by a proclaimed person whose property has been attached and sold under ss. 87 and 89 of the Criminal Procedure Code 1908 against the auction purchaser for its restoration is impliedly barred by the provisions of that Code the remedies of the proclaimed person being limited to those provided for in the Code (q). The mere fact however that an enactment provides a summary remedy in certain cases does not constitute a bar to a regular suit. Thus the provisions of Act 1 of 1871 do not bar a suit for compensation for wrongful seizure of cattle (r). Again a guardian may apply to the Court for possession of his ward under sec. 20 of the Act but this does not exclude a suit for that purpose (s). Another instance is O 21 r. 9 (Code of 1892 s. 318). That rule provides a summary remedy to which a purchaser at a sale in execution of a decree may resort to recover possession from a judgment debtor. But it does not say that no suit shall lie to recover possession. The purchaser may therefore resort to the remedy provided by that section or he may at his option bring a regular suit (t). Further the jurisdiction of a civil Court is not excluded unless the cognizance of the entire suit as brought is barred (u). The general rule is that statutes affecting the jurisdiction of Courts are to be construed so far as

- (k) *Mahajan v. Hammad Zam* (19 5) 1 A 61 4 All 151 86 I C 36 ( 5 ) A PC 36 in app from (19 1) 43 All 69 *Sundam The Queen* (1887) 6 Mad 93 [F B] *Parthasarthy v. Chinnari* (1894) 5 Mad 304 *Sadapachari v. Pama Rao* (1903) 6 Mai 3 6 Mohd 4 Addl Haffiz v. Latif Hussein (189 ) 4 Cal 4 *Bahigappa v. Dharmappa* (1910) 34 Bom 5 1 7 I C 663 *Hamas Bala* (19 0) 44 Bom 410 56 I C 419
- (l) *So at Chandra v. Toak Chandra* (19 4) 1 Cal 916 8 I C 40 ( 4 ) A C 98
- (m) *Ga qaran v. Nagind* (1908) 3<sup>rd</sup> Bom 381
- (n) *Fall v. Corp. nat on of Madras* (1915) 38 Mad 41 16 I C 971
- (o) *Ford v. Secret of State* (1915) 4 Cal 151 6 I C 893

- (p) *Bhulal v. Dattatraya* (1915) 4 Bom 557 4 I C 590
- (q) *D. R. S. Gh v. Fazl Dad* (19 0) 10 Lab 338 111 I C 98 ( 8 ) A L 6<sup>th</sup>
- (r) *Shullugh v. Hokus* (1890) 16 Cal
- (s) *Sf v. Muneish* (1901) 5 Bom 57
- (t) *Kshor v. Chandra v. th* (188 ) 14 644 See also *Nag Lal v. Official* (1911) 25 Bom 4 3 1 I C 391 *Chand v. Muhammad* (191 ) P 83 40 I C 2 0 [sub Official Assignee] Contrast *Laon v. (1899) 13 Bom 43 B* (1901) 5 Bom 186 ( 19 ) 47 Bom 95 63 I C B 410 (cases under sec 18 Officers Act 3 of 18 41)
- (u) *Antu v. Gulam* (1884) 6 All



**Political questions**—The Courts of British India may determine the title of property situated within their jurisdiction belonging to a Native Prince though a political question is involved (1). But where the real object of the suit is to settle the right of succession to the throne and the property right involved is only contingent the Court should decline jurisdiction (2).

**10 [S 12]** No Court shall proceed with the trial of any suit in which the matter in issue is also directly and substantially in issue in a previously instituted suit between the same parties, or between parties under whom they or any of them claim litigating under the same title where such suit is pending in the same or any other Court in British India having jurisdiction to grant the relief claimed, or in any Court beyond the limits of British India established or continued by the Governor-General in Council and having like jurisdiction, or before His Majesty in Council.

**Explanation**—The pendency of a suit in a foreign Court does not preclude the Courts in British India from trying a suit founded on the same cause of action.

**Alterations in the section**—The words proceed with the trial have been substituted for the word try. The words except where a suit has been stayed under section 20 which occurred at the commencement of the corresponding section of the Code of 1892 the words for the same relief which occurred after the words previously instituted suit and the words whether superior or inferior which occurred after the words any other Court have been omitted. The words litigating under the same title are new.

**Scope and object of the section**—The present section provides that where a suit is instituted in a Court to which the Code applies the Court shall not proceed with the trial of the suit if—

first the matter in issue in the suit is also directly and substantially in issue in a previously instituted suit between the same parties,

secondly the previously instituted suit is pending—

- (a) in the same Court in which the subsequent suit is brought or
- (b) in any other Court in British India (whether superior inferior or co-ordinate) or
- (c) in any Court beyond the limits of British India established or continued by the Governor-General in Council or
- (d) before His Majesty in Council and

thirdly where the previously instituted suit is pending in any of the Courts mentioned in cl (b) or cl (c) such Court is a Court of jurisdiction competent to grant the relief claimed in the subsequent suit (m).

The object of the section is to prevent Courts of concurrent jurisdiction from simultaneously trying two parallel suits in respect of the same matter in a suit B reiding in

|  |   |
|--|---|
| (k) <i>N. I. Krishna D b v. Beer Chandra</i> (1869) 1 M. I. A. 3 | (m) <i>I. a. a. Val v. Raj ara</i> (1919) P. R. no. 114 p. 93 53 I. C. 46 |
| (l) <i>Sa. re dra v. B. eni a</i> (1909) 1 C. W. N.              | <i>W. leod</i> (1909) S. C. 1 28 24                                       |



Calcutta has an agent at Calicut employed to sell his goods there A sues B in Calicut claiming a balance due upon an account in respect of dealings between him and B During the pendency of the suit in the Calicut Court B institutes a suit against A in Calcutta for an account and for damages caused by A's alleged negligence Here the matter in issue in B's suit is directly and substantially in issue in A's suit further both the suits are between the same parties therefore if the Court at Calicut is a Court of jurisdiction competent to grant the relief claimed in B's suit the Calcutta Court must not proceed with the trial of B's suit and the suit in the Calicut Court being the one instituted prior in point of time should alone be proceeded with (n) But if it was B's agent at Pondicherry instead of at Calicut and the suit was brought by him in the Pondicherry Court the Calcutta Court would not be precluded from proceeding with the trial of B's suit the Pondicherry Court being a foreign Court See the Explanation to the section

The section does not of course empower one Court to stay the proceedings of another Court A district Court exercising insolvency jurisdiction under the Provincial Insolvency Act 5 of 1920 cannot under this section stay a suit pending against the solvent in a subordinate Court (o)

Whether the subject matter of both suits must be the same—S 12 of the Code of 1832 contained the words for the same relief after the words previously instituted suit Hence it was necessary for the application of the section not only that the matter in issue in the second suit should also be directly and substantially in issue in the first suit but that the second suit must be for the same relief as that claimed in the first suit (p) The words for the same relief have been omitted in the present section The omission of the word however does not alter the law as it stood under the old section It does not follow because the words the same relief are no longer in the section that sec 10 is applicable to suits for recovery of successive rents It is necessary for the application of the decision that the subject matter of both suits must be the same (q) A suit could not be stayed even if the main issue in both the suits was the same if the subject matter of the second suit was different from that of the first suit (r) A previous suit for rent or for pension or for any other recurring liability for a particular year is no bar to the trial of a subsequent suit for rent or for pension or other recurring liability for a subsequent year It is however different if the first suit is for dissolution of partnership and for accounts and the subsequent suit is by one of the partners for the return of a deposit In such a case the second suit is barred (s)

Previously instituted suit—Note that it is the pendency of the previously instituted suit that constitutes a bar to the trial of the subsequent suit The word suit includes appeal It also includes an appeal to His Majesty in Council (t) But it does not include an application for leave to appeal to His Majesty in Council for the application may not be granted at all and if granted the applicant may not prefer any appeal (u) It seems that it does not also include applications under s 47 (v)

- ( ) *Pit v. Latha* (1916) 43 C 1 141  
53 L C 53 Mehta v. Kaur (1913) 4 C 1 R 28
- ( ) *T. Off. v. Latha* (1916) 43 C 1 141  
53 L C 53 Mehta v. Kaur (1913) 4 C 1 R 28
- (p) *Balkish* A. H. Lal (1920) 11 All. 14  
11 All. 14 Lal (1920) 11 All. 14
- (q) *Choudh. v. Jam* (1916) 43 C 1 141  
53 L C 53 Mehta v. Kaur (1913) 4 C 1 R 28
- (r) *Choudh. v. Jam* (1916) 43 C 1 141  
53 L C 53 Mehta v. Kaur (1913) 4 C 1 R 28
- (s) *Choudh. v. Jam* (1916) 43 C 1 141  
53 L C 53 Mehta v. Kaur (1913) 4 C 1 R 28

- ( ) *Pit v. Latha* (1916) 43 C 1 141  
53 L C 53 Mehta v. Kaur (1913) 4 C 1 R 28
- ( ) *T. Off. v. Latha* (1916) 43 C 1 141  
53 L C 53 Mehta v. Kaur (1913) 4 C 1 R 28
- ( ) *Balkish* A. H. Lal (1920) 11 All. 14  
11 All. 14 Lal (1920) 11 All. 14
- (q) *Choudh. v. Jam* (1916) 43 C 1 141  
53 L C 53 Mehta v. Kaur (1913) 4 C 1 R 28
- (r) *Choudh. v. Jam* (1916) 43 C 1 141  
53 L C 53 Mehta v. Kaur (1913) 4 C 1 R 28
- (s) *Choudh. v. Jam* (1916) 43 C 1 141  
53 L C 53 Mehta v. Kaur (1913) 4 C 1 R 28

**Shall not proceed with the trial**—These words indicate the action to be taken by the Court under this section. The second suit is not to be *dismissed* as barred. It is only the *trial* of the suit that is not to be proceeded with. That may render the institution of a subsequent suit unnecessary in many cases, but the section is *no bar to the institution of such suit*. Nay, there are cases in which it is necessary for a party to institute a regular suit to establish a right claimed by him, and failure to institute the suit within the period of limitation may preclude the party from asserting the right in any other suit or proceeding. Suits referred to in O 21 r 63 (Code of 1882 s 283) are suits of this character. This section does not dispense with the necessity of instituting such suits (w). A suit may be stayed under this section even after the hearing has commenced (x).

**Between the same parties**—The mere fact that the first suit is between Z and J as plaintiffs and W, X and Y as defendants and the second suit is between W as plaintiff and Z, J and S (not a party to the first suit) as defendants will not take the case out of the operation of this section if the other conditions of the section are satisfied (y).

**Interlocutory orders pending stay**—A stay order under this section does not take away the power of the Court in the stayed suit to make interlocutory orders such as orders for a receiver or an injunction or an attachment before judgment (z).

**Contract providing for place of suing**—There is nothing in this section to prevent the Court from giving effect to an agreement that suits in respect of transactions between the parties to the agreement should be brought in the High Court or Small Cause Court of Bombay (a).

**Revision**—The Madras and Lahore High Courts hold that an order under this section is open to revision (b) but not so the Allahabad High Court (c). The High Court can interfere under sec 15 of the Charter (d).

**Inherent power to grant stay**—See notes to O 39 r 1.

## 11 [S 13] No Court shall try any suit (p 35) or issue in which the matter directly and substantially in issue (pp 38-42) has been directly and

Res Judicata

substantially in issue in a former suit (p 36) between the same parties (p 55), or between parties under whom they or any of them claim (p 56), litigating under the same title (p 62), in a Court competent to try such subsequent suit or the suit in which such issue has been subsequently raised (p 63), and has been heard and finally decided (p 69) by such Court.

**Explanation I**—The expression “former suit” shall denote a suit which has been decided prior to the suit in question whether or not it was instituted prior thereto (p 36).

- (w) *Aemag da v Paresha* (1898) Bom 640  
 (x) *Wahid un Nissa v Zamin* (19 0) 42 All 290 55 I C 89 ( ) A B 76  
 (y) *Wahid un Nissa v Zamin* (12 0) 4 All 90 55 I C 89 See also *M Ichand v Gul & Co* (1910) 41 Bom L R 963  
 (z) *Sennay v Pannaji* (19 ) 46 Bom. 431 64 I C 520 ( ) A B 76  
 (a) *Tulskram v Kod mal* (19 8) 30 Bom L R.

- 546 110 I C 77 ( ) A B 175  
 (b) *Ramachandram v Veelambai* (19 3) O I C 5 ( ) A M 83 *Bushen v Bushen* (19 1) 61 I C 830  
 (c) *Sultanat J han v Sunder Lal* (19 0) 4 All 409 31 I C 90  
 (d) *Sa Prasad v Tricomdas* (1915) 4 Cal. 96 71 C 91

*Explanation II* —For the purposes of this section, the competence of a Court shall be determined irrespective of any provisions as to a right of appeal from the decision of such Court (p 68)

*Explanation III* —The matter above referred to must in the former suit have been alleged by one party and either denied or admitted, expressly or impliedly, by the other (p 38)

*Explanation IV* —Any matter which might and ought to have been made ground of defence or attack in such former suit shall be deemed to have been a matter directly and substantially in issue in such suit (p 44)

*Explanation V* —Any relief claimed in the plaint, which is not expressly granted by the decree, shall, for the purposes of this section be deemed to have been refused (p 74)

*Explanation VI* —Where persons litigate *bona fide* in respect of a public right or of a private right claimed in common for themselves and others, all persons interested in such right shall, for the purposes of this section, be deemed to claim under the persons so litigating (p 58)

#### Alterations in the section —

- 1 Explanation I is new See notes under the head Former suit p 36 below
- 2 Explanation II is also new See note p 68 below
- 3 Explanation IV to s 13 of the Code of 1832 has been omitted The reason of the omission is stated to be that it was liable to misconstruction and that the law was well established apart from the Explanation The words of the Explanation if literally interpreted would relieve parties from the bar of res judicata whenever there existed a latent power of alteration see s 149 (1) O r 3 and O r 11
- 4 The words public right have been added into Explanation VI in view of the provisions of section 91 relating to public nuisance

**Res judicata** —The present section deals with the doctrine of res judicata The leading case on the subject is the *Duchess of Kingston's case* (c) and the following classic passage from the judgment of Sir William de Grey is a statement of the leading principles of res judicata —

From the variety of cases relative to judgment being given in evidence in civil suits these two deductions seem to follow as generally true first that a judgment of a Court of concurrent jurisdiction directly speaking on the point is as a plea a bar or as evidence conclusive between the same parties upon the same matter directly in question in another Court secondly that the judgment of a Court of exclusive jurisdiction directly on the point is in like manner conclusive upon the same matter between the same parties coming incidentally in question in another Court for a different purpose

But neither the judgment of a Court of concurrent or exclusive jurisdiction is evidence of any matter which came collaterally in question though within their jurisdiction nor of any matter incidentally cognizable nor of any matter to be inferred by argument from the judgment

This passage summarizes the law enacted in this section. The rule of res judicata is readily distinguished from the rule in section 10 for the latter relates to a res sub judice that is a matter which is pending judicial inquiry while the rule in the present section relates to res judicata that is a matter adjudicated upon or a matter on which judgment has been pronounced. Section 10 bars the trial of a suit in which the matter directly and substantially in issue is pending adjudication in a previous suit. The present section bars the trial of a suit or an issue in which the matter directly and substantially in issue has already been adjudicated upon in a previous suit. Thus if A sues B for damages for breach of contract and the suit is dismissed a subsequent suit by A against B for damages for breach of the same contract is barred. This is the rule of res judicata stated in its simplest form. The question of A's right to claim damages from B having been decided in the previous suit it becomes res judicata and it cannot therefore be tried in another suit. It would be useless and vexatious to subject B to another suit for the same cause. Moreover public policy requires that there should be an end of litigation. The question whether the decision is correct or erroneous has no bearing on the question whether it operates or does not operate as res judicata (f) otherwise every decision would be impugned as erroneous and there would be no finality (g). The rule of res judicata may thus be put upon two grounds—the one the hardship to the individual that he should be vexed twice for the same cause and the other public policy that it is in the interest of the State that there should be an end of litigation (h). Putting it in another form it may be said that every suit must be sustained by a cause of action and there is no cause of action to sustain the second suit of A it being merged in the judgment in the first (i).

**Res judicata and estoppel**—Res judicata is sometimes treated as part of the doctrine of estoppel but the two are essentially different. Estoppel is part of the law of evidence and prevents a man from saying one thing one time and the opposite thing at another time while res judicata precludes a man from avowing the same thing in successive litigations (j). Mahmud J in *Sita Ram v. Amir Begum* (k) said—Perhaps the shortest way to describe the difference between the two is to say that while the plea of res judicata prohibits the Court from entering into an inquiry at all as to a matter already adjudicated upon an estoppel prohibits a party after an inquiry has been entered upon from proving anything which would contradict his own previous declaration or acts to the prejudice of another party who relying upon these declarations and acts has altered his position. In other words res judicata prohibits an inquiry in limine while estoppel is only a piece of evidence.

**Suit**—Section 11 applies in terms to cases where the matter in issue in a subsequent suit was in issue in a former suit. A suit is a proceeding which is commenced by a plaintiff (s. 26). The section is not exhaustive and the doctrine of res judicata has been extended to adjudications in proceedings other than suits see note section not exhaustive on p. 76 below. Some cases extending the doctrine beyond the limits of the Code have given a more extensive meaning to the word suit. Thus when probate

- (f) *T. r. Chandra Kedar Nath* (1908) 33 C. W. N. 16 (S. A. C. 7 (F. B.))  
 (g) *Behl v. M. I.* (1901) 24 All. 134. *P. J. do v. Ja. g. Nath* (1893) 1 All. 1. *Go. Ho. v. 4 d. Hoer* (1894) 10 Cal. 1047. *Moh. I. en v. S. J. do* at (1918) M. W. N. 40. 49 I. C. 369. *I. v. T. a. a. ch. d.* (1918) 1 I. 8. 4 I. C. 33.

- (i) *Lockyer v. Ferguson* (1891) L. R. 4 C. 19.  
 (j) *K. ag. How. e.* (1844) 13 C. W. 496. *J. 04. 56. Ha. it.* (1891) L. R. 4 A. C. 1.  
 (k) *C. a. all. v. Carri. n. h. o. y.* (1911) 36 B. 1. 14. 1 I. C. 1. *Bh. g. r. th. v. Bal. Aw.* (1913) 41 Cal. 69. 19 I. C. 256.  
 (k) (1908) 8 All. 34.

was refused after a contentious proceeding the judgment was held to operate as *res judicata* for sec 29 of the Indian Succession Act 1925 requires the proceeding to take the form as far as possible of a suit (l) On the other hand although an application to file a private award is required by Sch II para. 20 to be numbered and registered as a suit a refusal to file a private award has been held not to operate as *res judicata* (m) In a case decided under s 10 of the Code it was said suit is a very comprehensive term It includes any proceeding in a Court of Justice by which the party pursues the remedy which the law gives him If a right is litigated between parties in a Court of Justice the proceeding by which the decision of the Court is sought is a suit (n)

**Former suit**—The expression former suit means a previously decided suit and the same interpretation applies to appeals Explanation I confirms previous decisions to the same effect (o) It matters not that the previously decided suit was instituted subsequently (p)

**Suits tried together—one judgment**—There is a conflict of decisions as to whether if two suits involving common issues are disposed of in one judgment and an appeal is filed against the decree in one and not in the other the matter decided in the latter suit becomes *res judicata* so that it cannot be reopened in the appeal It has been held in Allahabad (q) Calcutta (r) Patna (s) and Rangoon (t) that the rule of *res judicata* applies while in Madras (u) and Lahore (v) that it does not In *Zaharia v Debia* (w) two rival suits for pre-emption in respect of the same sale were brought by two claimants A and B each of whom asserted as against the other that he had a paramount title to pre-empt A was made a party defendant in B's suit and B was made a party defendant in A's suit A's suit was decreed and B's suit was dismissed B appealed from the decree in his own suit but he did not prefer any appeal from the decree in A's suit The Allahabad High Court held that B having failed to appeal from the decision in A's suit the decision had become final and operated as *res judicata* and could not be retried in B's appeal with the possible result that there might be two inconsistent decrees on the files of the Court The contrary view was at one time taken by the Calcutta High Court (x) and in one case (y) it was said that the two suits being tried together neither could be said to be the former suit in relation to the other In one of these cases (z) A sued B for possession alleging B to be a monthly tenant while B sued A for a declaration that he held under a lease for a term of which two years were still to run Both suits were tried together and one judgment was given finding B to be a monthly tenant there were two decrees one in A's suit for possession and the other in B's suit dismissing it B appealed in A's suit but not in his own suit A contended that B's appeal was barred by the decree in his own suit from which he had not appealed but the Court held that the decree did not operate as *res judicata* These decisions

- (l) *A la h n v Sudhai* (1914) 38 Bom 309  
33 I C 3 See *Kata v Lal* (1889) 11 All 143  
ma *Jari* (1941) 46 M L J 383 91 C  
44 (24) A M 5 9  
(m) *Pajm v Marit* (1911) 4 Bom 32 69  
1 C 7 *Ibid* *Ar v Cha* (19 )  
7 Bom L R 65 89 I C 68 (—) A  
11 418 But see *G W Charn v Uma*  
*Charn* (1911) 6 C W 940 91 C  
99  
(n) *Ve kata v Venkatarama* (1909) Mad. 38  
(o) *Balkrish v Kish n Lal* (1889) 11 All 143  
*J m Lal v Kish n Lal* (1890) 1 All  
5 8 *Be v Madho v Indar S h* (1909)  
3 All 6 31 C 70 *G rjammah v*  
*Venkata* (1901) 4 All 30  
(p) *Is p Ali v Gour Chandra* (1923) 3 C. L. J  
194 41 L 591 (23) A C 496  
(q) *Zaharia v Debia* (1911) 33 All 51 71 C 158  
*Dakh D n v Syed Ali* (1910) 33 All  
151 71 C 909 *Anant Das v Dal*  
*Jha* (1913) 35 All 15 191 C 6 15 m

- Faqir v Hind Ari* (1919) 41 All 54 47 I C  
837 *Mam Chinnam v Jagobali* (19 7)  
101 I C 518 (7) A A 40  
(r) *Inf Ali v Gnr* (19 3) 37 Cal L J 181  
71 I C 591 (3) A C 498  
(s) *Dha v Sa ha v ri Chandra* (19 3) 75 I C  
570  
(t) *A ra Ali v Ameer Ali* (19 5) 2 Rang  
633 81 I C 891  
(u) *P ncha v v thi tha* (1906) 9 Mad  
333 1 *Mutams v Arupp n* (1915) 3  
M L J 216 *Sinnana v*  
A M I C 3 (28)  
(v) *Larchm* Lah 381 101  
10  
(w) (1911) 3  
(x) *Ibid* 31  
33 3  
Cal 11  
(y) (1906) 3 C  
(z) (1899) 16 C

were dissented from in a later case and it was held that the rule of *res judicata* applies so as to bar the appeal (a) It is submitted that the Madras and Lahore decisions are correct

In *Damodhar Das v Sheo Ram Das* (b) there was one original suit for an account and cross appeals from the decree in that suit which resulted in two appellate decrees. The plaintiff filed a second appeal from the decree in his appeal but not from the decree in the defendant's appeal. A preliminary objection was raised that the decree in defendant's appeal having become final the plaintiff's appeal was barred by *res judicata*. The Allahabad High Court overruled the objection on the ground that the two decrees were substantially one decree. The same question came before a Full Bench of the same Court in *Ghansham Singh v Bhola Singh* (c). There was a preliminary decree for sale in a suit on a mortgage which disallowed plaintiff's costs and also disallowed defendant's claim that the interest was excessive. Both parties appealed and both appeals were allowed in one judgment and two decrees. The plaintiff filed a second appeal against the decree allowing interest in defendant's appeal but as the decree in his own appeal was in his favour he filed no appeal against it. The Court held that the decree that was not appealed against did not operate as *res judicata*. The ratio decidendi was that a party is not bound to appeal from a decision which is not prejudicial to him. The Full Bench said that *Zaharia Debia* (d) was correctly decided on its own facts. In a still later case on the same point a Division Bench of the same High Court reverted to the reason given in *Damodhar Das v Sheo Ram* that decrees in cross appeals in the same suit are substantially one decree (e).

**Suits tried together—separate judgments**—If two cross suits are tried together and the same issue is tried and disposed of in two separate judgments the omission to appeal from the decree in one suit will make the decree in the other *res judicata* so as to bar the appeal (f).

**Conditions of *res judicata***—It is not every matter decided in a former suit that can be pleaded as *res judicata* in a subsequent suit. To constitute a matter *res judicata* the following conditions must concur

- I—The matter directly and substantially in issue in the subsequent suit or issue must be the same matter which was directly and substantially in issue either actually (*Explanation III*) or constructively (*Explanation IV*) in the former suit (pp 38 55)
- II—The former suit must have been a suit between the same parties or between parties under whom they or any of them claim. *Explanation I* is to be read with this Condition (pp 50 61)
- III—The parties as aforesaid must have litigated under the same title in the former suit (pp 62 63)
- IV—The Court which decided the former suit must have been a Court competent to try the subsequent suit or the suit in which such issue is subsequently raised. *Explanation II* is to be read with this Condition (pp 63 69)
- V—The matter directly and substantially in issue in the subsequent suit must have been heard and finally decided by the Court in the first suit. *Explanation I* is to be read with this Condition (pp 69 76)

The above Conditions are considered in order

- (a) *Isup Al v Gour* (19 3) 37 C L J 184 74  
1 C 501 (3) A C 496
- (b) (1907) 9 All 30
- (c) (19 3) 4 All 406 4 I C 411 (3) A A  
490
- (d) (1911) 33 All 51 7 I C 13

- (e) *Ya nu Ya* (19 9) 9 All 51 (8)  
A A 4
- (f) *Gangadhar v Sel* (19 1) 34 Cal L J  
31 61 I C 574 See also *Abdul Easit v*  
*Ashfaq* (1908) 3 All W 11 13 and  
*Lachmi v Bhullar* (19-8) 8 Lah 394  
401-404 104 I C 819 (7) A L 39



or incidentally in issue To constitute a matter *res judicata* it is necessary that it must be in issue directly and substantially in the suit under trial and that it must have been in issue also directly and substantially as distinguished from collaterally or incidentally in a former suit

All matters involved in a suit may be directly and substantially in issue but they cannot all be collaterally or incidentally in issue A *collateral* or *incidental* issue is one that is ancillary to a *direct and substantive* issue the former is an *auxiliary* issue the latter the *principal* issue The expression collaterally or incidentally in issue implies that there is another matter which is directly and substantially in issue

**Distinction between matter directly and substantially in issue and matter collaterally or incidentally in issue**—The leading case on the subject is *Barrs v Jackson* (m) Every suit must involve a matter or matters in respect of which relief is claimed by the plaintiff It may also involve matters which though there is no relief claimed in respect of them are brought in issue for the purpose of deciding matters in respect of which relief is claimed

**Matter directly and substantially in issue**—Every matter in respect of which relief is claimed in a suit is necessarily a matter directly and substantially in issue

#### Illustrations

1 *A* sues *B* for the rent due for the year 1907 The defence is that no rent is due Here the claim for rent is the matter in respect of which relief is claimed This therefore is a matter directly and substantially in issue

2 *A* sues *B* (1) for a declaration of title to certain land and (2) for the rent of those lands *B* denies *A* a title to the lands and contends that no rent is due Here there are two matters in respect of which relief is claimed namely (1) the matter of title and (2) the claim for rent Both the one are matters directly and substantially in issue

**Matter collaterally or incidentally in issue**—A matter in respect of which no relief is claimed but which is put in issue for the purpose of enabling the Court to adjudicate on a matter in respect of which relief is claimed may be directly and substantially in issue or it may be in issue collaterally or incidentally It would be a matter directly and substantially in issue if it was necessary to decide it to adjudicate on the principal issue and if it was decided in fact the judgment was based upon that decision otherwise it would be a matter collaterally or incidentally in issue A matter cannot be directly and substantially in issue if the judgment would be correct whether that matter exists or not

#### Illustration

*A* sues *B* for rent *B* pleads abatement of rent on the ground that the area is less than that entered in the lease The Court finds that the area is greater than that shewn in the lease The finding as to the excess area is not *res judicata* for it is only ancillary to the direct and substantial issue whether the area is equal to that shewn in the lease or less (n)

**Examination of pleadings and judgment**—Whether a matter was directly and substantially in issue in a former suit is to be determined by a reference to the plaint the written statement the issues and judgment The decree may also be referred to but it is not enough to refer to the decree without the judgment for a decree states merely how a suit is disposed of and it is in the judgment that the findings on the issues are





became entitled to it by survivorship *C* is thereupon joined as a defendant to the suit. The issues are—

- 1 Whether the deceased alone received the whole rent of the property in his lifetime or whether the rent was received by him jointly with *C*?
- 2 Whether any and what rent is due by *B*?

The finding on the first issue is that the deceased alone received the whole rent in his lifetime (The finding on the second issue is unnecessary for our present purposes)

Subsequently *C* sues the widow for a declaration that he and his brother were joint and claims the said property by right of survivorship. The question whether the deceased and *C* were joint or separate is not *res judicata* for it was not directly and substantially in issue in the former suit. It was in issue in that suit only collaterally or incidentally for it will be seen on referring to the first issue in that suit that it did not cover the entire question of *C*'s title but related merely to the joint or separate receipt of rent. *Ran Bahadur v. Lucho Koer* (1885) 11 Cal 301 12 I A 23. *Srihari v. Khitish Chandara* (1897) 94 Cal 569.

*B. Both suits for rent or other recurring liability*—The rules which apply to the preceding class of cases apply also to this class. Thus where *A* sues *B* for rent due for a particular period and the defence is that *A* has no title to the land of which the rent is claimed then if a direct issue is raised and decided on the question of title the decision will operate as *res judicata* in a subsequent suit by *A* against *B* for the rent for a subsequent period either of the same (g) or other (r) property held under the same title. But if there is no direct issue raised on the question of title and the finding falls short of going to the very root of the title upon which the claim for rent is based it will not have the effect of *res judicata*. If the question of title is gone into in the previous suit as if the right of rent were sought to be established not for one particular year but once for all it will be said to have been directly and substantially in issue. But if the question of title is gone into in the previous suit as if the right of rent were sought to be established not once for all but for one particular year it will be said to have been in issue collaterally or incidentally. The same principles apply to other cases of recurring liability such as *malikana* (s) maintenance (t) interest (u) annuity (v) &c.

#### Illustration

*A* sues *B* for rent due for the year 1903. The defence is that the land is rent free. An issue is raised whether the land is rent free. The Court finds that the land is rent free and *A*'s suit is dismissed. Subsequently *A* sues *B* claiming rent for the year 1904. *B* again sets up the same defence namely that the land is rent free. Here the question of *A*'s right to recover the rent having been directly and substantially in issue in the previous suit the suit for the rent for 1904 is barred as *res judicata*. *Rakhal Doss v. Heera* (1874) 22 W. R. 282. *Venkatchalapati v. Krishna* (1890) 13 Mad 287. *Ushnu v. Ramling* (1902) 26 Bom 25. *Natesa v. Venkatarama* (1907) 30 Mad 510. *Duarka Das v. Akhay Singh* (1908) 30 All 470.

It may here be observed that each year's rent is in itself a separate and entire cause of action and where a suit is brought for the rent due for a particular year a judgment obtained in that suit whatever the defence may have been would seem only to extend to the subject matter of the suit and hence the landlord is at liberty to bring another suit for the next year's rent and the tenant is at liberty to set up to that suit any defence he thinks proper. The above proposition however is subject to this and here comes in the doctrine of *res judicata* that neither party is at liberty to reopen in the suit for rent

(g) *Nobu v. Foydur* (1876) 1 Cal 20. *Gnanada v. Valmiki* (1906) 43 C. L. J. 116.  
(r) *Chanda Prasad v. Mahadad* (1901) 24 All 112.  
(s) *Balkrishna v. Kshan Lal* (1909) 11 All 148.

*C. p. Nath v. Bhugwant* (1884) 10 Cal 69.  
(t) *Bhakadhas v. Ba. Bh. ri* (1903) Bom 418.  
(u) *Pahlwa v. Fual* (1851) 4 All 55.  
(v) *Duarka Das v. Akhay Singh* (1908) 30 All 470.



entitled to rent at the rate of Rs 2 per square yard the question of rate would not be res judicata for A had not asked for a declaration in that suit in respect of the rate of rent A's claim in the former suit was merely for arrears of rent amounting to Rs 500 and the decree in that suit has no greater effect than evidence that Rs 500 was due when the decree was passed Had A in the former suit also prayed for a declaration in respect of the rate of rent as part of the substantive relief and had the Court then declared that the rate of rent was Rs 2 the question of rate would have been res judicata though the decree was passed ex parte for it would then have been a matter directly and substantially in issue *Modhusudan v. Brae* (1889) 16 Cal 300

A suit to set aside an ex parte decree on the ground that it was obtained by fraud may be barred by res judicata if an application to set it aside on the same ground has been dismissed under O 9 r 13 See note under that rule Ex parte decree obtained by fraud.

**Decree for injunction and res judicata**—A sues B for an injunction restraining B from doing certain act The injunction is granted B repeats the acts complained of in the suit A again sues B for an injunction The suit is barred as res judicata for the relief claimed is covered by the injunction granted in the former suit and A's remedy to proceed against B in execution of the decree [O 9 r 32] Where the decree is passed by a chartered High Court A may proceed against B for contempt (d) See notes to 30 below

**Decree for restitution of conjugal rights and res judicata**—A sues B his wife for restitution of conjugal rights Restitution is granted and B goes and lives with A (that is to say the decree is satisfied) B again leaves A and A again sues B for the same relief The suit is not barred as res judicata (e) The distinction between this and the case of an injunction is that while in a suit for injunction the defendant is for ever restrained from doing the acts complained of the wife cannot be directed in a suit for restitution of conjugal rights to live with her husband for the rest of her life for many things may occur entitling her to leave him e.g. gross cruelty

**Decree for possession conditional on payment of dower**—Where in a suit by the heirs of a Mahomedan against his widow in possession of his estate in lieu of her dower a decree is passed against her that they should have possession of their shares of the estate upon payment of a proportionate part of the dower debt within six months and that upon failure to pay their suit should be dismissed and the plaintiffs fail to pay within six months the decree is no bar to a subsequent suit for immediate possession by the same plaintiffs against the widow on the ground that the dower debt had in the meantime been satisfied out of the income of the estate in the hands of the widow (f)

**Subject matter of suits may be different**—As the test of res judicata is the matter directly and substantially in issue it follows that the subject matter of the second suit may be entirely different Thus if A claims certain property as the adopted son of X and the defendant denies the adoption a finding in A's favour on this issue as to adoption will be binding on the defendant as res judicata in a subsequent suit by A against the same defendant to recover another property claimed under the same title (g) It is not open to the defendant to contend that the properties claimed in the two suits being

(d) *P. m. Sa. n. v. Ch. tar. St. gh* (1901) 3 All 46

(e) *K. shah. l. v. Parrot* (1894) 18 Bom 37

(f) *M. a. B. l. v. C. f. a. d.* (19 ) 1 A 14 4 All 0 86 I C 9 ( ) 4 I C 61 *Chirming* (1919) 41 All 38 51 I C 4 *v. n. v. B. jam. v. D. Ifaro. Bej. n.* (19 4) 44 All 803 98 I C 93 ( ) 4 A 39 *comp. re. H. l. l. as. i.* (19 ) 99 I C 48 ( ) 4 O 60

(j) *P. t. p. r. f. a. j. B. J. (1 2 ) 8 V. 1 12*  
1 1 A 16 A 11 B. n. L. I  
(18 6) 1 (al) 114 I A 43 I dh  
*I. r. l. s. i. L. I. 5. h. i. (18 11) 13 All*  
53 6 1 1 A 10 B. l. l. ha  
*A. J. v. L. I. (18 4) 11 All 148 1*  
*4n. ta. D. out. (18 J) 13 B n*  
*cha. d. P. d. M. J. M. a. f. a*  
(130 ) 4 All 11 *Sa. n. h. v. B. n. d. p*  
(1900) - C. L. J. 40 *D. r. a. l. D. e. v*  
*All. J. S. gh. (1908) 30 All. 40*



belonged to the subject of the litigation and which the parties exercising reasonable diligence might have brought forward at the time (n)

Where a matter has been *actually* in issue it is necessary to constitute the matter *res judicata* that it should have been *heard and finally decided*. But where a matter has been *constructively* in issue it could not from the very nature of the case be heard and decided and it will be *deemed* to have been heard and decided against the party omitting to allege it. This is in accordance with the view of the section taken by the High Courts of Allahabad and Bombay (o). In *Kailash Mondal v Baroda Sundari Das* (p) Banerjee J observed that though a matter which might and ought to have been made ground of attack or defence should be *deemed* as provided by Explanation IV to have been *directly and substantially* in issue yet it could not be deemed to have been heard and finally decided as there was nothing in Explanation IV to suggest that such matter should *also* be deemed to have been *heard and finally decided*. This view was followed in a subsequent case (q) but it is obviously incorrect and it was rejected by the same Court in later cases (r) and it has been dissented from by the High Court of Lahore (s). Moreover in a recent case the Judicial Committee took exception to the language in which the observations of Banerjee J were couched saying that the language was not so careful as it might have been (t). The Privy Council case illustrates the rigidity with which the principle laid down in Explanation IV is to be applied. In that case it was held that where a matter which might and ought to have been made a ground of attack is not raised in the plaint and an application is afterwards made to amend the plaint but it is refused the matter will be deemed to have been directly and substantially in issue in that suit. See ill 4 below.

#### Illustrations

1 *X a Hindu dies leaving a widow*. The widow makes a gift to her brother *B* of certain property belonging to her husband. After the death of the widow *A* alleging that he and *X* were members of a joint family sues *B* for a declaration that he is entitled to the property by right of *survivorship*. The Court finds that *A* and *X* were separate and *A*'s suit is dismissed. Subsequently *A* sues *B* for the recovery of the same property alleging that as the nearest reversionary heir of *X* he became entitled to the property on the death of the widow and that the alienation made by her in favour of *B* was not binding upon him. The suit is barred as *res judicata*. *A* might and ought to have set up the title by *heirship* as a ground of attack in the former suit. It will therefore be deemed to have been directly and substantially in issue in that suit and it will also be deemed to have been heard and finally decided against *A*. *Guddapa v Tirukappa* (1901) 20 Bom 189. [The Bombay ruling was dissented from in *Pamasuami v Vythinaitha* (1903) 26 Mad 760 a case on different facts altogether. The grounds of dissent it is submitted are not satisfactory. See also *Masilamani v Thiruvengadam* (1908) 31 Mad 385 being ill (3) below.]

2 *A a Hindu dies leaving a widow and a brother B*. The widow sues *B* for recovery of certain property alleging that it was the self acquired property of her husband and that a will alleged to have been executed by her husband and relied on by

(n) *F n a l v D Ratry* (1901) 6 Bom 601 667 See also *Sahib ali v M Jammal* (1907) 8 Lah 1 17 99 I C 100 (45) A L 603

(o) *Sri Gopal v P d S gh* (1899) 0 All 110 113 confirmed on appeal (1901) 4 All 49 [1 C 1 Gid ppa T i ppa (1901) Bom 189 at pp 19 and 197]

(p) (1901) 4 Cal 11

(q) *Woomes v H Rata* (1901) 9 Cal 1

(r) *Jat S gh v S r d i n* (1904) 3 Cal 90 *M h n C d r* in l (1903) 13 C W N 13 15 I C 60 *Shah d a*

*v L L a P r* (1904) 40 Cal L J 07 511 8 I C 13 ( ) A C 47 See also *P nyan Na l v S v nyan a* (1914) 3 Mad 074 I C 445 *M g v v* *M a* *P o* (1903) 1 Pan 363 350-66 6 I C 61 (3) A P 939

(s) *G b d l v E l l r o S gh* (1915) P P No 1 p 69 I C 931 *M u l a m m a d v G h u l a B* (1909) 11 Lah L J 9

(t) *P a t h S gh v J y* *th E a k h S gh* (1905) 1 A 100 4 All 153 ( ) A P C 55

*B* is a forger. *B* alleges that the property was joint family property and that on the death of *A* he became entitled thereto by right of survivorship but he does not claim any title to the property under the will. The Court finds that the property was the self acquired property of *A* and decrees the widow's claim. Subsequently *B* sues the widow to recover the same property from her now claiming the same as a devise under *A*'s will. The suit is barred as res judicata. *B* might and ought to have set up the claim under the will as a ground of defence in the former suit. When a plaintiff claims an estate and defendant being in possession resists that claim he is bound to resist it upon all the grounds that are possible for him according to his knowledge then to bring forward. *Srimut Pajal v Kalama Natchiar* (1866) 11 MIA 20. *Doorga Iersaid v Doorga Konuars* (1879) 4 Cal 190. A 14.

3. *A* sues *B* to recover certain property belonging to the estate of *C* alleging that his father had been adopted by *C*'s brother *D* to whom the property descended on *C*'s death. The suit is dismissed on the ground that the adoption is not proved. *A* then sues *B* to recover the same property claiming it as *C*'s bandhu. The suit is barred as res judicata. *A* ought to have claimed the property in the first suit in the alternative as *C*'s bandhu. *Manlamania v Thiruvengadars* (1908) 31 Mad 380.

4. *A* claiming as the next reversioner of a deceased Hindu sued his widow for a declaration that a gift by her to *D* of property inherited by her from her husband was void. *D* was joined as a party defendant and so also *G* who claimed to be a reversioner nearer than *A*. As to *C* *A* alleged that he was colluding with the widow and the donee *D*. The defence was that *G* was the nearest reversioner and the only person entitled to dispute the gift. In this state of pleadings the widow died. On the death of the widow the question of collusion became comparatively unimportant for if *C* was the nearest heir *A* could get no title to the property. *A* then applied for leave to amend the plaint by setting forth the death of the widow and claiming that he had become entitled to institute a suit for possession and by setting up a family custom that he was equal in degree with *C*. The application was rejected on the ground that it was an attempt to introduce a new case. The question then arose whether it was worth while continuing the suit. *A*'s counsel admitted that apart from custom *A* was one degree more remote than *G* and that if *A* could not make out the case of a family custom the suit must fail. The trial judge thereupon dismissed the suit with costs but gave liberty to *A* to bring a fresh suit for possession. Subsequently *A* sued *D* and *G* for possession of one half of the property founding his title on family custom. The Privy Council held that the second suit was barred for *A* might and ought to have alleged the family custom in the first suit it being clearly a ground of attack in that suit. As the first suit was dismissed and not withdrawn under O 23 the trial judge had no power to grant leave to bring a fresh suit. *Fateh Singh v Jagannath Biksh Singh* (1925) 50 ILJ 100 47 All 108 (2) AIC 50.

5. *A* sues *B*, *C*, *D* and *F* as joint tenants for rent on the basis of a pottah. The property in respect of which the rent is claimed consists of 20 kottas of land. None of the defendants appears in the suit and a decree is passed against them ex parte. Subsequently *A* sues *B*, *C*, *D* and *E* for rent for a subsequent period. *B* appears and contends that he does not hold the land jointly with *C*, *D* and *F* and that he is liable only for one fourth rent for one fourth of the whole area. *B* is precluded from setting up the case of separate tenancy because he might and ought to have set up that case in the previous suit. It is immaterial that the decree in the previous suit was passed ex parte. *Sarojini v Lakshminji* (1944) 29 CWN 385 IC 123 (2) AIC 42.

TEST.—The question whether a matter might have been made a ground of attack or defence in the former suit rarely presents any difficulty. Whether it ought to have been made a ground of attack or defence depends on the facts of each case. As a general rule every ground of attack with reference to the title sued on must be

pleaded if necessary in the alternative (u) for the plaintiff will not be allowed to make out a fresh case afterwards. Thus if a plaintiff sues for possession on the ground of ownership and his suit is dismissed he cannot afterwards claim possession as mortgagee for it was an alternative ground of attack which he did not raise in the first suit (v). If the matter raised as a defence would have defeated, varied or in any way affected the decree in the previous suit it ought to have been raised (u). Conversely if the decree in the previous suit is inconsistent with a defence which ought to have been raised that defence must be deemed to have been raised and finally decided and is barred by res judicata (x). If a matter could have been set up as a ground of attack or defence in the former suit and if its introduction into that suit was necessary for a complete and final decision of the right claimed by the plaintiff therein it will be deemed to be a matter which ought to have been made a ground of attack or defence in that suit unless the matters in that and the subsequent suit are so dissimilar that their union might lead to confusion (y). Thus in (1) on page 45 the title by heirship could have been made a ground of attack in the alternative in the first suit it was necessary to do so for the complete and final disposal of all questions as to A's right to the property and it was not forbidden by any rule of pleading and further the question in both suits being the same namely whether A was entitled to the property or B the title by survivorship and the title by heirship could not be said to be so dissimilar that their union might lead to confusion. It may appear at first sight that the two matters are dissimilar for the title by survivorship and the title by heirship have to be supported by different evidence. But the test of evidence which was relied on in some old cases ( ) is not a satisfactory test and though it was advanced in argument in two cases before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council no notice was taken of it in the judgments (a). The reason is when a plaintiff sets up alternative ground of attack or when a defendant sets up alternative grounds of defence the evidence in support of such alternative grounds would in most cases be different. But it has been said where the evidence in support of one ground is such as might be destructive of the other ground the two grounds need not be set up in the same suit. The reason given is that the test of determining whether both the grounds ought to have been set up in the same suit is afforded by the provision of O 2 r 1 and the provisions of that rule as to the framing of suits are only to be applied as far as practicable (b).

It is clear that it cannot be said of any matter that it ought to have been set up as a ground of attack in a former suit if its introduction would have been incongruous to the matter of that suit (c). Thus a person claiming property on the allegation that it is wakf property and that he is the manager thereof is not bound to claim the same property in the same suit alternatively in his own right in the event of its being held that the property was not wakf property. Having asserted that the property was wakf property [he] could not have consistently claimed the same property as [his] personal property except possibly in an alternative form. [He was] however not under

(u) All v F, 128 (1884) 7 Mad 964  
(v) I am v n, 155 (189) 19 All 57  
(w) Sub Ch v A, Loh's (19) 9 C W N 3  
8 1 C 123 ( ) A C 4 Gop Loh  
B n v I r i ad (1906) 31 C 148  
(x) M v m, 411 (1901) 13 C W N 13  
11 C 66 Ma v M, J P (19) 3  
1 Ran 361 61 C 61 ( ) A R 33  
(y) F v I, 7 I 3k ar (1893) 0 Cal 9  
8 191 A 36 Mo v r b A (1913)  
40 Cal 1 391 A 37 161 C 0 Guild pl  
2 Ark pp (1901) B m 189 19  
S in t f j h v I t a v tel ar (1866)  
1 M 14 0 3 Moa tara v La o  
poorna (18 3) 11 Benx I R 14 16  
(d) d a Lal v L n la n (19 1) 3 Lab  
L J 15 1 63 I C 1

( ) M H (J H) M H n (J H) (188) 4 M 1  
96 JJ v t v I r i dra (1883) 13  
B m 36 J J  
(a) H M I A 0 11 11 Pang L R 19 p  
(b) Ma. I A 7 g t (1908) 31  
31 134 395 I J pl natha  
(1903) 6 M d 60 f J J ppas  
a (1916) M W N 86 32 I C 16  
I r B ch t (19 1) 3 Lab L J 15  
63 I C 17  
(c) D p t y Co v s o u e f K l r v I l a r j a  
v p (190) 3 A H 33 34 I A Lala  
So i I v I a 7 v (1913) 40 I A 4  
I C W N 60 121 C J I I C I D w a n  
Ch f Hare (ha) I (1914) P 1 No 10  
p 343 41 C 636 t u d a n v M l a m  
I d (1916) I R No 94 p 3 I C  
119



an obligation to adopt the latter course. The mere fact that he could have claimed the property in the alternative as his own property is no ground for saying that he ought to have done so (d). Where a person who is joined as a defendant in a mortgage suit as being interested in the equity of redemption is entitled to the property by a paramount title but his title is not disputed in the plaint he is not bound to set it up as a ground of defence in that suit (e). See note to O 34 r 1. Persons having an interest either in the mortgage security or in the right of redemption.

The decisions bearing on this branch of the subject are numerous. An examination of these decisions leads to the following four Rules.

**Rule I**—Where the right claimed in both suits is the same the subsequent suit will be barred as *res judicata* though the right in the subsequent suit is sought to be established by a title different from that in the first suit.

The dismissal however of a plaintiff's suit for the recovery of land based on an alleged lease is no bar to a subsequent suit for the recovery of the same land on the strength of his general title the reason given being that the legal relation put forward in the subsequent suit is different from that in the former suit [see ill. (c)].

In the following illustrations it is assumed that the other conditions of *res judicata* are fulfilled.

#### Illustrations of Rule I

1 *Guddappa v Tirappa* (1901) 25 Bom 189 ill (1) on p 40 above *Masilamani v Thirurengadam* (1908) 31 Mad 380 ill (3) on p 40 above and *Fateh Singh v Jagannath Balsh Singh* (1900) 52 I A 100 47 All 158 (00) 1 P C 00 ill (4) on p 40 above are cases under this Rule.

2 A Hindu H dies leaving a widow B and a son in law S the husband of a predeceased daughter D. B sues S as the heir of her husband H to recover certain property alleging that it forms part of the estate of H. The defence is that H had made a gift of the property to his daughter D and that on D's death S as D's husband became entitled to the property as D's heir. B alleges that the deed of gift relied upon by S is a forgery. The Court finds that the deed of gift is genuine and the suit is dismissed. B then sues S to recover the same property alleging that as it has been found that the property belonged to D she is entitled to the property as the heir of her daughter D. The suit is barred as *res judicata*. Here the right claimed in both the suits is the same namely the right to the property in question. In the first suit it was claimed by B as her husband's heir. In the second suit it is sought to be established by her by a different title namely as her daughter's heir. B might and ought to have claimed in the alternative as her daughter's heir in the former suit. Having failed to do so her title as her daughter's heir will be deemed to have been directly and substantially in issue in the former suit and it will also be deemed to have been heard and finally decided against her in that suit. *Denoondhoo v Kristomonee Dossee* (1877) 2 Cal 16. The Calcutta decision has been dissented from in *Ummatta v Cherva* (1800) 4 Mad 308 but the Madras case falls within the Exception rather than the Rule. See ill. (4) below.

3 A lends Rs 50 000 to a Hindu widow on a mortgage of her husband's property. The widow then surrenders the property to B the reversionary heir of her husband on B agreeing to pay all her debts. A sues B and the widow to recover Rs 50 000 by sale of the mortgaged property. A also asks for a personal decree against the widow but he

(d) *Kanba vs Lal v Ashraf Khan* (1904) 48 All 10 4 E C 40 (04) A A 3 *Dola v Paliya* (1900) 40 Bom. 803 64 I C. 613 (00) A B 3

(e) *Ummatta v Cherva* (1900) 33 C W N 659 (00) A C 67 *Jama na v Ferkala Narayana* (1907) 5 Mad L J 5 22 I C 469 (07) A M 301

does not ask for a personal decree against *B*. *B* is joined as a defendant on the ground that the mortgaged property formed part of the property transferred by the widow to him. The Court finds that the mortgage is not binding upon the husband's estate and the suit against *B* is accordingly dismissed. As against the widow a personal decree is passed for the amount of the loan. *A* realises Rs 5 000 only from the widow and after her death he sues *B* for the balance of the money due under the decree (that is to say *A* asks for a personal decree against *B* for the balance) alleging that *B* was personally liable under the agreement with the widow to pay her debts. The suit is barred as res judicata for *A* might and ought to have alleged in the former suit that if the mortgage was not binding on the estate *B* was at all events personally liable to pay the debt in consequence of the agreement which he (*B*) had entered into with the widow. *Kameswar Pershad v Rajkumar* (1893) 20 Cal 79 19 I A 234.

**Note**—Suppose that in the above illustration *A* had applied in the first suit for amendment of the plaint by adding a claim for relief against *B* personally but the application was refused. In such a case it has been held that the subsequent suit would not be barred. *Alagirisami v Sundareswara* (1898) 21 Mad 278. *Thakore v Thakore* (1890) 14 Bom. 31. But these decisions it is submitted are not correct. *Fateh Singh v Jagannath Balhah* (1925) 52 I A. 100 47 All 158 (25) A P C 50.

4. *A* alleging that he is the *lilima* adopted son of *B* claims the whole estate of *B* and sues for the administration of *B*'s estate. *A* fails to prove the adoption and the suit is dismissed. *A* afterwards sues for administration of the same estate claiming one half of the estate as the *apathia* adopted son of *B*. The suit is barred as res judicata. *Maung Ba Thein v Ma Jhan Myint* (1927) 5 Rang 565 105 IC 580 (28) A R 9.

5. *A* sues *B* to recover certain lands from him alleging that *B* held the lands under a lease and that the lease had expired. The lease is not proved and the suit is dismissed. Subsequently *A* sues *B* to recover the same land on the strength of his general title. The suit is not barred as res judicata. *Zamora of Calicut v Narayanan* (1899) 22 Mad. 323. *Kutti Ali v Chindan* (1900) 23 Mad 629. *Kandunni v Katiamma* (1886) 9 Mad. 201. *Ummatha v Cheria* (1882) 4 Mad 308. *Girdhar v Dayabhai* (1884) 8 Bom. 174.

For other cases under this Rule see foot note (f).

**Rule II**—If a matter which forms a ground of attack in the subsequent suit could have been alleged as a ground of defence in the former suit but was omitted to be so alleged in that suit it will be deemed to have been directly and substantially in issue in that suit within the meaning of Explanation IV.

This rule contemplates cases in which the plaintiff in the subsequent suit was defendant in the former suit. Thus a claim which might have been pleaded by way of set off (g) or counter claim (h) to a previous suit will not be barred.

#### Illustrations

1. *Srimut Rajah v Katama Vatchiar* (1866) 11 M A I 50 which is ill (2) on p 45 above. *Doorga Persad v Konuani* (1879) 4 Cal 190 5 I A 149 cited in that illustration and *Sarajini v Lakhs Praya* (1925) 29 C W N 203 80 IC 123 (25) A C 427 which is ill (5) on p 46 above belong to this class.

(f) *Varman v Phulman* (1881) 4 All 6. *H v gotan v Aluhji* (1903) 11 Bom L R 91 4 IC 241. *Akayi v Ayasa* (1903) 6 Mad 645. *Imani Phan v Ayub Khan* (1897) 19 All 517. *Haf Has m v Man claram* (18 9) 3 Bom 137. *Woomalara v Unnopoorna* (1873) 11 B L R 158 (P C). *Kesa Singh v Ata Si gh* (1913) P R no 86 p 305 20 IC 890. *Muhammad v Abd l* (19 3) 46 Mad 135 IC 0

(3) A M 57 C i. *Ve td* (1919) M W N 47 IC 735. *K ppur m v S bda* (19 1) 6 IC 501. *M l Ja v P mummam* (19 4) 47 Mad 46 IC 65 (24) A M 808.

(g) *Amritsar National Bank v Co v Patel* (1919) P R 74 5 IC 850.

(h) *Puch v S bda vya* (1915) 28 Mad L J 513 29 IC 54.

1 and B two Hindu brothers divide the whole of the joint family property except a garden. A dies leaving a widow who sells A's half share in the garden to C. After the death of the widow C sues B for partition of the garden and an ex parte decree is passed under which he (C) enters into possession of a moiety of the garden. B then sues C to recover possession of the moiety sold by A's widow to C alleging that the sale was made by the widow without legal necessity and that on the death of the widow he became entitled to the moiety as the reversionary heir of A. The suit is barred as res judicata. B might and ought to have raised the question of the validity of the sale as a ground of defence in the former suit *Shyama Charan v Minmaya Deb* (1904) 31 Cal 19.

3 A mortgagor who holds the mortgaged property also leases it from the mortgagor sues the mortgagor to recover Rs 3000 being the amount of the mortgage debt. At the date of the suit the mortgagee owes Rs 4000 to the mortgagor for rent under the lease and this sum the mortgagor claims to set off against the mortgage debt under an express agreement in that behalf. The agreement is not proved and a decree is passed against the mortgagor for Rs 3000. The property is sold in execution of the decree and it is purchased by the mortgagee with the leave of the Court. The mortgagor then sues the mortgagee to have the sale set aside and for a declaration that the mortgage debt is extinguished now claiming that a general account may be taken as between him and the mortgagee and that in taking such account the rent due to him may be set off against the mortgage debt. The suit is barred for the mortgagor might and ought to have set up that claim in the alternative in the former suit *Mahabir Ierhad v Macnaghten* (1859) 10 Cal 432 16 I 107.

4 A who owns a share in a village mortgages it to B and sells it subsequently to C. C sues B for redemption of the mortgage and obtains a decree. Subsequently B sues C for pre-emption of the share sold by A to C alleging that he is a co-sharer in the village and entitled as such to pre-emption. The suit is not barred. The right of pre-emption not being a vested and ascertained right when B filed his written statement in the former suit it could not have been properly pleaded by B as an answer to the claim for redemption in that suit *Pamchand v Durga Prasad* (1904) 26 All 61.

For other cases under this rule see foot note (i).

**Rule III**—Where the right claimed in the subsequent suit is different from that in the former suit and it is claimed under a different title the subsequent suit is not barred as res judicata.

#### Illustrations

1 A sues B for possession of certain lands alleged to have come to his share on a partition of joint family property with B. The defence is that the family property has not yet been divided and the suit is dismissed on a finding to that effect. A subsequent suit by A against B for partition of the family property is not barred *Shyam v Narayan* (1881) 6 B M 7 *Konerkar v Curraj* (1881) B M 56 *Vidya v Ch* (1886) 10 Bom 21 *under Bhakta v Bhujjo* (1878) 3 Cal 23 which was disented from in *Umatha v Chitra* (1889) 4 Mad 309.

2 A alleging that B held certain lands from him under a lease and that the lease had expired sues B to recover Rs 400 for use and occupation of the land by B after expiration of the lease. The defence is that the lease is a sub-tenancy and the suit is dismissed on a finding to that effect. A subsequent suit by A to recover Rs 400 as rent payable under the lease is not barred *Watson v Dhonenra* (1878) 3 Cal 6.

(i) *M H v N I m m* (1 2) 10 B H C 101  
*D d M A m m* v *and B y m* (1 10)  
 70 All 81 *H* *et al* (1883) 7  
*I m* *J p a* v *th v* *Fullam* (1890)

All W N M 2 v v M 2  
 1 (173) 1 B n2 363 61 61 (4)  
 6 1 2



A prior mortgagee who is made a party to a suit brought by a subsequent mortgagee on his mortgage is not bound to set up his claim under his prior mortgage unless his mortgage is impugned or unless it is sought to be postponed to the subsequent mortgage. If the prior mortgage is not attacked or sought to be postponed to the subsequent mortgage the prior mortgagee is outside the controversy of the suit and he is entitled to bring a suit for sale on his own mortgage even though he may not have appeared in the suit that was brought by the subsequent mortgagee. As regards a subsequent mortgagee the rule is that if he is made a party to a suit on a mortgage prior to his own he ought to claim his right to redeem the prior mortgage and if he omits to do so he cannot afterwards sue for redemption of the mortgage he omitted to plead in that suit (c).

If a mortgagee has successive mortgages of the same property from the same person there is a conflict of decisions whether he can obtain an order for sale on one alone. The Bombay High Court has held that if a mortgagee sues on a subsequent mortgage without reference to a prior mortgage he is barred by Explanation IV as he might and ought to have included the prior mortgage in his suit (p). Similarly the Madras High Court has held that a suit on a prior mortgage bars a suit on a subsequent mortgage of the same property (q). But it was held that a mortgagee might sue on a later mortgage reserving his rights on a prior mortgage (r). In Madras there was a conflict of decisions at one time which was set at rest by a decision of the Full Bench in *Subramania v. Disa-subramania* (s) which adopted the above view. In doing so the Full Bench followed the decision of the Allahabad High Court in *Sundar Singh v. Bholu* (t) which held that the two mortgages constituted different causes of action. This view is correct and has been generally followed (u). But as it is a hardship on the mortgagor that his property should be sold twice it is now provided by the Transfer of Property Amendment Act that a mortgagee having several mortgages of the same property from the same person must sell all or none.

In suits for redemption, foreclosure or sale, there ought to be a complete and final settlement of all accounts between the mortgagor and the mortgagee right up to the time of actual redemption, foreclosure or sale, as the case may be. (r) A mortgagor, therefore, who has obtained a decree for redemption against a mortgagee in possession and paid what was due according to the decree and obtained possession, cannot afterwards sue for profits realized by the mortgagee for a period prior to the delivery of possession. Such profits might and ought to have been taken into account at the time of passing the decree. (w) Similarly, where a mortgagor deposits the mortgage money in Court under sec. 83 of the Transfer of Property Act and obtains a decree for possession from a usufructuary mortgagee under sec. 62, he cannot subsequently sue for

- (a) J d l Au) v A l h i H e u (19 0)  
47 I A 11 47 C 1 66 6 I C 9 9 (1st  
m r t e not attacked) G opal v  
I r h ph (100 ) 8 All 4 9 3 I A  
114 (opal v ) as (1901) 31 Cal 4 v  
spudus v Inayat (1913) 33 All  
111 14 I C 1 [pri m ortiga s admitted]  
Mahom d Ibra m v Ambika Per h i  
(191 ) 30 c l E 39 I A 68 14 I C  
400 C j dh v Bha nra la (191 ) 34  
AU 99 16 I C 6 Ari a v Amral  
(1914) 19 c W N 94 94 81 c 6 3  
[Pri m rtiga s admitted], Add i F A d  
v Sae 24 i (19 9) 4 Lu k 115 I C  
K 3 (192) A O 46
- (p) Dhond v P h l (191 ) 3 Lam 129  
I C 100 Dala ka iv KA mo (11 1)  
4 1 9 I C 317
- (q) V r u v K g ra (190 ) 0 Mad 3 3  
H oentl from S d v gh v Ikhola  
(1 1) 1 All 300
- (r) Sukram a v B Lashdrama wa (191 ) 34  
Mad 90 I C 117 Dhond v P h l j  
(191 ) 3 1 m 13 14 0 I C 100
- Jagann th v Moh a A (1916) 1 1 L  
J 118 39 I C 6 R j s a Valan v  
V loo v (100 ) 30 Ma 409 Talha  
A sh ar v M it a (1904) 31 Ma 1  
30 Sha ka v sup M jo M i (1901)  
3 All 313 29 I A 01
- ( ) (191 ) 38 Mad 9 50 I C 31
- (U) (19 9) 9 All 3 Ingk h Prasad v  
Jam a Prasad (190 ) 9 All 233  
Va ri usa v f i (19 ) 100 I C  
6 7 ( ) A A 311
- ( ) L k Ama ar v M th v (1911) 40 M d  
L J 1 6 c E (191 farm hu v  
I j Kaur (1904) 3 1 5 2 80 I C  
34 ( ) A I s d ( ) a t v y m  
c gh (1919) 31 I 40 t v v  
H v (1910) 34 c 1 60 I C 330  
Val v t bond (190 ) C W N 1 1  
60 I C 309
- ( ) M a t Per val v Mar glen (1949) 16  
Cal 6 18 I A 10 1 na; K v India-  
troya (190 ) 6 I m 661
- (w) K v l v f a g i mid (1906) 0 All 36

**Suits for partition**—If in a previous suit for partition some of the properties are left out by mistake or with the consent of the parties a subsequent suit for partition of those properties is not barred but it will be barred if they were excluded by the Court from partition after a contest between the parties on the ground that they are incapable of partition (v)

**Subject-matter may be different**—It is not necessary for Explanation IV to be applicable that both the issue and the subject matter of the two suits should be the same. It is enough if the matters in issue are the same otherwise in suits for arrears of rent there could be no res judicata at all for the subject matters of successive suits for arrears of rent are necessarily different ( ). See note under the same heading at page 43 supra.

**Issue of law**—This section provides that no Court shall try any suit or issue etc. Issues are of three kinds (1) issues of fact (2) issues of law and (3) mixed issues of law and fact. An issue of fact may be res judicata. A mixed issue of law and fact may also be res judicata. (a) An issue of law it has been held may or may not be res judicata. The law on the subject may be summarized as follows—

(1) A decision on an issue of law operates as res judicata if the cause of action in the subsequent suit is the same as that in the first suit (b) It is immaterial that the decision was erroneous in law (c) See ill (1) below

(2) There is a conflict of decisions whether if the causes of action in the two suits are different an erroneous decision on a question of law operates as res judicata. It has been held in some cases that it does not (d) [11 (2)] and in some that it does (e) [11 (3)]. The latter view was adopted by a Full Bench of the Calcutta High Court in *Tarini Charan v Kedar Nath* (f). The judgment proceeded on the broad ground that the correctness or otherwise of a judicial decision has no bearing upon the question whether it does or does not operate as res judicata. It was also pointed out that it was the identity of the matter directly and substantially in issue that was the test of res judicata and not the identity of the cause of action. It was contended in that case that the law had been altered by judicial decisions since the judgment in the first suit and reliance was placed upon the judgment of Maclean C J in *Alimunnissa v Shama Charan* (g) where it was said "Cases must be decided upon the law as it stands when judgment is pronounced, and not upon what it was at the date of the previous suit the

- (x) P lām iha v Fe katesh (130) 31 Pom  
Satiyabadi v Harabhi (1907) 31  
C 1 Ma Nyo v Mau v Ula B  
(104) Rang 34 84 I C 30 ( )  
A P 13  
(y) Sas n han v Hara Vath (19 9) 3 CW N  
10 3 110 I C 60 ( ) 9 A C 459 See also  
M U v Vina ml (19 9) 31 Bom L R  
610 ( ) A B 3 3  
(z) Jamida S gh v Ye an lā n (1309) 3  
Cal 9 9 Saro v Lakh P y (19 )  
C U W N 3 3 8 I C 1 3 ( )  
A C 477  
(a) Balam J s ja v Bhaba d andr (1901) 8  
C 1 318 Koy v Do s (1906) 3 Mad  
(b) G v F r v v 1 d h Foer (1894) 10 Cal  
1047 Phu to v J g v al (1903) 1  
All 3 7 Ia r i all v Sa C s Pam  
(1907) 6 Mad 104 Baman v Hara  
(1150) 31 Bom 104  
(c) Gorrē Ko v 1 d h Foer (1944) 10 Cal  
1087 apv d in Tamm Ch an v  
Kela v th (19 9) 6 Cal 3 31 ( )  
A C 777  
(d) Al m a v Stama Ch an (190 ) 3  
( ) to B v aha Padak and (111)  
9 Cal 84 14 I C 1 4 Chima lot v  
Bap dha (1899) Bom 669 Vishni v  
I a i q (130) 6 Bom 3 Parth v raf  
v Jinnna (194 ) Mad 301 Venka v  
Mahesh q (1898) 11 Mad 323 325 396  
G p v Sami (190 ) 8 M d 517 Mā  
q i thām ul v ay ac m (190 ) 30  
Mad 461 4 tinnna v Ya a a (190 )  
30 M d 0 t kupp na v Kuma q (1911)  
34 Mad 450 I C 413 Aphore  
Jam (1903) 11 C L J 451 6 I C  
5 4 P na v Karul (1911) 13 C L J  
119 9 I C 68  
(e) Venkata v A da ol (1917) 3 Mad L J  
63 37 I C 8 7 stara v Larma  
(19 1) 45 Bom 1 60 64 I C 16 Ia i  
v D o t a m Ia (19 3) 1st 771 74 I C  
781 Huh L I C 1 Lal (19 7) 49  
AB 5 3 100 I C 601 ( ) A A 3  
Iaya v Ce tral Es i f i dā (19  
4) Bom L I 8 9 94 I C 341 ( ) A L  
441 Ayro es i dā Ajayad Ali (19  
3) C W N 8 4 T m Ch an v Ae r  
v U (19 9) 56 Cal 3 ( ) A C  
[I B]  
(f) (19 9) 56 Cal 3 ( ) A C  
(19 1) 9 3 Cal 4

law having been altered in the meantime. It has been conceded that if the law had been altered in the meantime by statute the objection [of *res judicata*] could not prevail. It is difficult to see why it should prevail because the law has been since determined to be otherwise by judicial decisions. Referring to this passage Rankin C J observed in the Full Bench case that the reasoning in *Alumunnessa's case* was erroneous. The learned Judge said: "The legislature by statute may alter the rights of parties and when it does so it makes such provision as it thinks proper to prevent injustice. Courts of law are in no way authorized to alter the rights of parties. They propose at all events to ascertain the law and if the binding character of a decision upon a concrete question as to the terms of a particular holding is to fluctuate with every alteration in the current of authority the Court will become an instrument for the unsettlement of rights rather than for the ascertainment thereof. The principle relied upon is abhorrent to section 11 of the Civil Procedure Code and to the general intention of the doctrine of *res judicata*." At the same time the learned Judge observed that when a plea of *res judicata* is raised with reference to a point of law which concerns questions of jurisdiction (1) or procedure or limitation and in which besides the parties the Courts and the public have an interest it was at least a question whether special considerations should not apply.

(3) There is no doubt as observed by Rankin C J that if the law is altered by the passing of a new Act after a decision in a case the decision cannot operate as *res judicata*. Thus in *Lalshmi v. Atal* (2) after a preliminary decree for sale had been passed on a mortgage and before a final decree was made the Chota Nagpur Tenancy Act 1909 was extended to the district in which the property was situated. That Act provided that no decree shall be passed for the sale of the right of a raiyat in his holding and that such right shall not be sold in execution of a decree. It was held that the preliminary decree did not operate as *res judicata* and that the Court had no power to pass a final decree for sale [see also ill. (-) above]. This rule as stated above does not apply to a case where the law has been altered by subsequent judicial decisions (3).

#### Illustrations

(1) *Same cause of action decision though erroneous held to operate as res judicata* — A sells certain property to B. At the time of sale the property was in the possession of B who claimed it adversely to A. A sues B in the High Court of Calcutta to recover possession of the property as purchaser from A. An issue is raised in the suit and it is an issue of law namely whether a person who is not in possession of property at the time of sale is competent to convey it. The issue is found in the negative and the suit is dismissed. Afterwards it is decided by a Full Bench of the same High Court in another case between different parties altogether that although a person may not be in possession of a property he is competent to convey it. After the decision of the Full Bench A again sues B to recover possession of the same property under the same deed of sale and asks for a decision in his favour on the strength of the Full Bench ruling on the point of law which was decided against him in the former suit. Here the cause of action in the subsequent suit is the same as that in the former suit. The Court is therefore precluded from re-trying the same question of law in the subsequent suit in other words the issue of law is *res judicata*. It is immaterial that the decision on the question of law in the first suit was erroneous. *Covers Koor v. Bulb Koor* (1884) 10 Cal. 1087. *Fazlul v. Deolliers* (1913) 1 Pat. 174 I.C. 381 (1) A.I.R. (1913) 10 Cal. 1087. *Dhruvas v. Gopalaswami* (1914) 40 Mal. L.J. 63 C.M.C. 189.

(1) See s. 11 of L.R. 89 94 I.C. 31 (78) |

(2) (1913) 10 Cal. 531

(3) 24 Bom. L.R. 872 94 I.C. 341 (1) A.B.

(2) *Different causes of action decision held not to operate as res judicata*—*A* sues *B* in 1874 to recover 12 years arrears of his share of a certain Government allowance received by *B*. *B* contends that *A* is not entitled to recover more than 3 years allowance. *A* claims beyond that period being barred by the law of limitation. The Court allows *A*'s claim in its entirety. In 1894 *A* sues *B* for further arrears for 11 years from 1892 to 1893. *B* raises the same point of law that was raised by him in the former suit. Held that the decision in the former suit does not operate as res judicata in the subsequent suit. Here the cause of action in the subsequent suit is different from that in the former suit for the claim in the subsequent suit is for arrears which had accrued due after the institution of the former suit. The Court therefore is not precluded from re-trying the same question of law and if it finds that the question of law was wrongly decided in the former suit it may decide the suit on what it considers is the correct interpretation of the law. The Court said: It appears to us that a point of law can never be res judicata. The judgment also proceeded on the ground that the first suit was decided under the Indian Limitation Act 1871 while the second suit had to be decided under the Indian Limitation Act 1877 and that the law had been altered by the Act of 1877. *Chamanlal v. Bapubhai* (1898) 22 Bom 669.

(3) *Different causes of action decision though erroneous held to operate as res judicata*—*A* executes a *kabuliat* in 1880 in favour of *B*. The *kabuliat* contains a stipulation for payment of interest on arrears of rent at the rate of 75 per cent per annum. In 1898 the holding is sold in execution of a decree for rent obtained by *A* against *B* and it is purchased by *C*. In 1915 *A* sues *C* for arrears of rent and interest on arrears at 75 per cent per annum. The defence is that *C* being an auction purchaser is not bound to pay interest at the rate stipulated in the *kabuliat* and that it is in the nature of a penalty. This contention is not upheld and a decree is passed in favour of *A* with interest at 75 per cent per annum. In 1924 *A* brings another suit against *C* for arrears for a subsequent period and interest at 75 per cent per annum. *C* raises the same defence and also contends that the decision in the previous suit was erroneous. Held by a Full Bench of the Calcutta High Court that the decision in the previous suit even if erroneous operated as res judicata. *Tarini Charan v. Aedar Nath* (1929) 56 Cal 723 (—8) A C 777. *Chand Prasad v. Maharij Mahendra* (1901) 3 All 5 at pp 10 13.

In the cases in which it was held that an erroneous decision on a point of law where the causes of action were different does not operate as res judicata the Courts were influenced by the consideration that they would be perpetuating an injustice for all time if they were to hold that an erroneous decision on a point of law in a former suit was binding upon the parties in a subsequent suit instituted upon a new cause of action. It must however be recognized as stated by Mookerjee J in *Aghore Nath v. Kamini Devi* (k) that the effect of this is to substitute in the present section the expression "cause of action" for the matter in issue. In *Benkati v. Andarols* (l) Napier J took the extreme view that where a decision on a point of law whether it be on the construction of a document or of a statute or on common law or on customary law once settles a question that arises directly out of conflicting views as to the rights of the parties it is res judicata. A similar opinion was expressed by Shih J and Fawcett J in *Sitaram v. Laxman* (m) and by Das J in *Ramul v. Deodharji* (n). To get over the difficulties which might arise from this extreme view some judges have suggested a distinction between a decision on an abstract question of law such as a question of limitation and a decision on a concrete question such as the construction of a document entered into between the parties to a suit the latter question being treated as one to which the rule of res judicata applies and

(k) (1910) 11 (a) I J 461 4 1 6 I C 4  
(l) (1913) 3 Mad L J 63 68 9 3 I C 6  
(m) (1913) 4 B M 1 60 1 81 1 4 1 34 1 3

(n) 64 I C 16  
(1932) 2 Pat 1 3 74 I C 81 (4)  
4 1 63



the former as one to which the principle of *stare decisis* applies (o). It is difficult to see what the principle of *stare decisis* has to do with the rule of res judicata (p). In *Tarini Charan v Kedar Nath* (q) Rankin C.J. said that whether a decision was correct or erroneous it had no bearing on the question of res judicata and that what was res judicata between the parties to a suit was not the reasoning or any principle of law but the actual decision declaring the rights of the parties.

In this connection it is interesting to note the recent decision of the Privy Council in *Broken Hill Proprietary Co v Broken Hill Municipal Council* (r). The appeal was from a judgment of the Supreme Court of New South Wales. The question for determination was as to the correct method of ascertaining the annual value of a mine for rating purposes for the years 1919, 1920 and 1921. That question turned upon the construction of s. 153 (3) of the Local Government Act 1919 of New South Wales. The company was assessed for the years 1917, 1918 and 1919 by the Council on a particular construction of the section and that construction was upheld by the High Court of Australia. The Council adopted the same method for assessment for the years 1919, 1920 and 1921 and it was upheld by the Supreme Court. The company appealed to the Privy Council. It was contended on behalf of the Council that the question as to the matter of valuation was res judicata but this contention was overruled and the appeal was allowed. As to the plea of res judicata their Lordships said: "There is no substance however in this contention. The decision of the High Court related to a valuation and a liability to a tax in a previous year and no doubt as regards that year the decision could not be disputed. The present case relates to a new question—namely the valuation for a different year and the liability for that year. It is not *eadem questio* and therefore the principle of res judicata cannot apply. This case shows that according to the English law an erroneous decision on a question at least of the interpretation of a statute does not operate as res judicata. If a decision of every question of law were res judicata a decision that one of several co-sharers may alone maintain a suit for rent of the entire holding though in contravention of the express provisions of s. 194 of the Agra Tenancy Act 1901 would operate as res judicata in a subsequent suit between the same parties so as to preclude the tenant from raising the same defence in that suit but it has been rightly decided that such a decision has not the effect of res judicata (s)." (s)

**Estoppel against a statute**—Whether or not a finding on a point of law can be res judicata it is a settled principle that there can be no estoppel against a statute for estoppel cannot supercede the law of the land (t). Thus in *Hoomesh v Barala* (u) where a previous rent suit had been decreed at a rate which included illegal cesses the defendant was not precluded from questioning the legality of the claim. The Bombay High Court has allowed the plea of res judicata to sanction what is prohibited by law. This was in a case (v) where a mortgagor lessee of a portion of a bhag which was inalienable under the Bombay Bhagdari Act of 1862 when sued for rent was not allowed to plead that the bhag was inalienable because he had omitted to do so in a previous *ex parte* rent suit. In a more recent case (w) the Allahabad High Court dismissed a suit by a single co-sharer for rent because that form of suit was forbidden by section 194 of the Agra Tenancy Act. It was objected that the defendants had not raised this plea in previous rent suits and as to this the Court said that where the law forbids a certain

- (o) (1901) 45 Bom 160; 1 R 64 I C 16 per Macleod C.J. (1913) 3 Mac 1 J 63 37 I C 85 per Macleod J. Aiyar J.  
(p) *Asiatic Petroleum Co v Esso Petroleum Co* (1917) 44 I A 65 70 44 Cal 933; 1 C 19 and *Fate v Fate* [1915] 4 C 110.  
(q) (1922) 54 Cal 3 (24) A C 777.  
(r) [1924] A C 98.  
(s) *Ji Noh Lal v Dalro S* 98 (19) 49 All.

- 919 1771 C 39 ( ) A A 505.  
(t) *H v H* 144 Bom 144 (1918) 4 C 1 D 45 44 I A 15 v 15 (1914) 34 Bom 99 34 I C 131.  
(u) (1900) 9 Cal 1.  
(v) *CAA vs Lal v H* 144 (1909) 33 Bom 4 v 1 C 530.  
(w) *JI 40 v H Lal* (1927) 42 All 919 1 C 39 ( ) A A 50.

thing being done in a suit no amount of failure by a defendant in previous suits to plead the positive bar created by legislature will prevent its being taken up in a subsequent suit

## CONDITION II

## The same parties or parties under whom any of them claim

This condition is the principle that judgments and decrees bind only parties and privies (z)\* A privy is a convenient term of English Law to describe a person who claims under a party Latham J, in a Bombay case (y) classified persons other than parties as (1) privies (2) persons not claiming under parties but represented by them and (3) strangers A privy who claims under a party is bound for he who takes the advantage must bear the burden—*qui sentit commodum debet et sentire onus* Persons represented are in fact parties through their representatives—Explanation VI In the absence of fraud an adjudication is binding on the first two classes for as to strangers the maxim applies that *res inter alios acta nocere non debet*

Same parties—Parties are persons whose names are on the record at the time of the decision and he may be a person who has intervened in the suit (z) A party who withdraws or whose name is struck off ceases to be a party (a) A party who dies during the pendency of the suit but whose name erroneously remains on the record is not a party (b) If the parties are different there is no res judicata (c) Thus A sues B for rent The defence is that C and not A is the landlord A fails to prove his title and the suit is dismissed A then sues B and C for a declaration of his title to the property The suit is not barred for the parties to the two suits are not the same C not having been a party to the former suit (d)

Res judicata between co defendants—As a matter may be res judicata between a plaintiff and a defendant so it may be res judicata as between co plaintiffs or as between co defendants First as to res judicata between co defendants if in a suit by A against B and C there is a matter directly and substantially in issue between B and C and an adjudication upon that matter is necessary to the determination of the suit the adjudication may operate as res judicata in a subsequent suit between B and C in which either of them is plaintiff and the other defendant (e) In other words if a plaintiff cannot get at his right without trying and deciding a case between co defendants the Court will try and decide the case and the co defendants will be bound But if the relief given to the plaintiff does not require or involve a decision of any case between co defendants the co defendants will not be bound as between each other by any proceeding which may be necessary only to the decree which the plaintiff

(z) *Mohunt Das v Nil Komul* (1899) 4 C W N 283

(y) *Ahmedbhoy v Full ebhoy* (185) 6 Bom 703 09

(1) *C b ad v Taruck* (18 8) 3 Cal 145  
(a) *Kalee Coom r v Prun Kuloree* (187) 18 W R 29

(b) *Bep n E h ry v B oja Nath* (188) 8 Cal 3 7

(c) *Radha Bai v Sr Sre Gopal* (19 7) 1 Cal 7 0 54 I A 238 101 I C 873 (7)

A PC 1 5  
(d) *Dwarkanath v Pam Chand* (1899) 6 Cal 429 4

(e) *Ramechandra v Varajan* (1887) 11 Bom 216 *Mag ram v Mchd Hore n* (1904) 31 Cal 9 *Chaj v Umaroo* (1900) 2 All 386 *Balambh v Varaya bhat* (1901) 2 Bom 74 *B pu v Bhara* (1898) 22 Bom 245 *Muh mmad v Suranath* (1903) 6 Mad 937 *Ka div v Z morin of Calcutt* (1906) 9 M d 615 *Iss jw D* (1907) 30 Mad 447 *Gurdeo S ngh v Chandrika*

*S ngh* (1909) 36 Cal 193 1 IC 913  
*Hari Annay v Pas dev* (1914) 39 Bom 438 3 I C 944 *G garam v Pasdeo* (19 3) 47 Bom 531 3 I C 91 (3)  
A B 203 *Rajendra v Buncar p* (19 1) 3 Cal L J 1 3 64 I C 603 *nkoba chari v Radhab yamma* (19 4) 47 Mad L J 612 (4) A M 853 *Muhammad Ahmad v Zakur* (19) 44 All 334 338 67 I C 5 3 (2) A A 19 *Mehra v Devi Ditta Mal* (1891) 2 Lah. 83 6 IC 66 *Mau j Thue v Ma Shue* (19 4) 8 I C 4 3 (1) 4 R 9 *Ram Prasad v Mahab r* (19 4) 46 All. 0 9 J C 803 (4) A A 310 *Mahip v aia v V n u s gh* (19) 47 AU 78 83 I C 130 (25) A A 546 *Devan S ag v Gotul* (19 1) 2 Lah L J 295 *Prat pa v Swy* (19 6) 61 Mad L J 65 98 I C 44 (2) A M 50 *Mia Pan ynn v Mauny Sit Phawng* (19-3) 6 Rpn 5 5 (25) A R 315

obtains (f) These are the limits within which the doctrine of *res judicata* should be applied as between co defendants (g) Three conditions to be fulfilled are (1) a conflict of interest between the co defendants (2) the necessity to decide that conflict in order to give the plaintiff appropriate relief and (3) a decision of the question between the co defendants (h)

A Hindu *H* dies leaving two daughters *D1* and *D2* and a nephew *V* *D1* sues *D2* and *V* to recover certain property under an oral will of *H* *D2* claims the property under a will in writing executed by *H* *V* claims the property as undivided nephew of *H* The Court finds that *H* and *V* were divided that the will in writing is the valid will and dismisses *D1*'s suit Subsequently *D2* sues *V* to recover the property under the written will *V* contends that he and *H* were joint and that he became entitled to the property by right of survivorship The question whether *H* and *V* were joint is *res judicata* That question was directly and substantially in issue in the first suit and it was necessary to decide it in that suit to adjudicate upon *D1*'s claim and it was decided against *V* (i) Another type of cases in which a question between co defendants may become *res judicata* is where a suit is brought against two or more defendants and a will has to be construed by the Court to adjudicate upon the plaintiff's claim which is founded on the will In such cases the decision with regard to the construction of the will on the rival contentions of the defendants may be *res judicata* in a subsequent suit by some or one of them against the rest (j) but not if no rival contentions were raised at all (k) A decree for partition is in favour of each party to whom a share is awarded (l) and is *res judicata* not only as against the plaintiff (m) but as between the co defendants

**Res judicata as between co plaintiffs**—Next as to *res judicata* between co plaintiffs As a matter may be *res judicata* between co defendant so it may be *res judicata* between co plaintiffs subject to the same conditions which apply to the case of co defendants (n)

**Pro forma defendant**—A party may be joined as a defendant in a suit merely because his presence is necessary in order to enable the Court effectually and completely to adjudicate upon the questions involved see O 1 r 10(2) and sec 32 of the Code of 1892 In such a case no relief is sought against him and the matter in issue in the suit is not in issue between him and any other party and cannot therefore be *res judicata* against him For instance *A* claiming to be entitled to possession of a tank as tenant of *X* sues *B* for possession *X* is joined as pro forma defendant and no relief is claimed against him The suit is dismissed on a finding that *B* is the owner *X* then sues *B* for possession and *B* contends that the issue of ownership is *res judicata* This contention must fail for the issue was decided in the former suit between *A* and *B* and not between *X* and *B* for *X* was only a pro forma defendant (o) Another instance is the case of *Radha Kishan v Khursid Hossein* (p) where a prior mortgagee who was a pro forma defendant in a pawns mortgagee's suit for sale was not barred from subsequently enforcing his own security See the note on this case under O 34 r 1 below

**Parties in subsequent suit claiming under parties in former suit**—*Res judicata* not only affects parties but their privies i.e. persons claiming under them

(f) *Cottrell v Ert of Wrenbury* (1843) 3 Har 6 638

(g) *Falrel v Vagel* (1916) 40 Bom 10 16 31 I C 4 3

(h) *Jade v Kala* (1916) 9 C L J 3 34 I C 9 9 *Sulh D v Bha* (19 3) 71 I C 481 (3) A L 186 *Maf Tek v M H N* (19 5) 3 Rang 77 79 *Maf H N v M H N* (19 9) 7 Rang 80 83 117 I C 587 (9) A R 16

(i) *Fenka v Vargha* (1889) 11 Mad 204

(j) *Ia I asad v Mahabir* (19 4) 46 All 0 0 I C 803 (4) A A 310

(k) *Gajapada v Tuladananda* (19 5) 30 C W N 415 94 I C 3 (26) A C 568

(l) *Shelkh Kfo shel v V bde* (1887) 3 C I 551

(m) *Ea d r p v Vurn I* (19 0) 4 I C 3 5

(n) *Kri v n v Ka* (1898) 13 Mal 8 *Rukh-mi v Dio do* (191 1) 6 Bom 107 14 I C 466

(o) *B v Bel vi v Keda Nath* (1896) 1 C I 580 *Rat v Raz realch* (1901) 2 B m 89 *Malhi v Ima ud-d n* (190 1) All 59

(p) (19 0) 4 I A 11 4 C I 66 5 I C 9 9

and each party stands in the shoes of the party under whom he claims. If the decree in the first suit is between *A* and *B* then the finding is *res judicata* in the subsequent suit if the plaintiff claims under *A* and the defendant under *B* or vice versa. Or if the plaintiff is *A* and the defendant claims under *B* or vice versa. If however the second suit is between parties claiming under *A* alone or under *B* alone there is of course no bar (*q*).

### Illustrations

1. *A* sues *B* for a declaration of title to land and obtains a decree. *A* then sues *C* for possession. *C* contends that *B* is owner and that he is in possession as *B* a tenant. The defence is barred.

2. *A* sues *B* for a declaration of his right to a share in the rents of a bazaar and obtains a decree. *C* a tenant of *A* then sues *D* another tenant of *A* for a stall in *A*'s part of the bazaar. No finding in the first suit is *res judicata* (*r*).

Whether one person is bound because he claims under another is a question of substantive law. The following are some instances of cases decided on this point with reference to the rule of *res judicata* —

(1) *A lessee* claims under his lessor but a lessor does not claim under his lessee and so the dismissal of the lessee's ejectment suit against a trespasser does not bar a similar suit by the lessor (*s*).

(2) *A purchaser at an execution sale* acquires the right title and interest of the judgment debtor in the land sold and is bound by a decision between his landlord the decree holder and the judgment debtor as to its area (*t*). But where mortgaged property is sold in execution of a mortgage decree and it is purchased by the mortgagee a decision between the landlord and the mortgagor as to the rate of rent is not binding on the purchaser (*u*).

(3) *A purchaser at a revenue sale* does not claim under the defaulting proprietor and is not bound by a decree against him (*v*).

(4) *A son in a joint and undivided Hindu family* does not claim under his father (*w*) but a son claiming under a custom of primogeniture claims under his father (*x*).

(5) *A remainderman* does not claim under the life tenant and a remainderman under a will is not bound by a decree against a widow who has a life estate under the will (*y*).

*The title by which the parties in the subsequent suit claim must have arisen subsequently to the commencement of the former suit* — In order that a decision in a suit between *A* and *B* may operate as *res judicata* in a subsequent suit between *A* and *C* it is necessary to show that *C* claims under *B* by a title arising subsequently to the commencement of the first suit. Thus a purchaser mortgagee lessee or donee of a property is not estopped by a decree obtained in a suit against the vendor mortgagor lessor or donor commenced after the date of the purchase mortgage lease or gift (*z*).

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>(q) <i>Aspa v Maom</i> (1903) 30 C 1 6<br/> <i>Ighulga v Jathu</i> (188) 6<br/> <i>M d 43</i></p> <p>(r) <i>Apa v Maom</i> <i>supra</i></p> <p>(s) <i>Ranabhim v Bhu</i> (182) 11 C L R 12</p> <p>(t) <i>K. L. Dajal v U. K. Pra.</i> (19) 1 Lat 14 67 I C 266 (1) A 1 63</p> <p>(u) <i>Mohammad v Ghunath</i> (19 6) 1 Luck. 5<br/>       911 C 1015 (6) A O 1</p> <p>(v) <i>Qadafar v B. Bhalla</i> (190) 34 Cal 868</p> <p>(w) <i>Sunder v Chhatar</i> (1906) 29 All 1 Ba 1<br/> <i>N. N. v. B. N. R.</i> (1884) 10 All 411</p> <p>(x) <i>Kat. Charam v B. B. R.</i> (191) 18 C W N 81 1 I C 6</p> | <p>(y) <i>Abt. B. H. R. Gobi</i> (1919) 1 C 84</p> <p>(z) <i>S. C. R. v. H. R.</i> (1846) 8 All 34 J v<br/> <i>Chadras v. S. C.</i> (1905) 3 C 1 37<br/> <i>N. R. and J. R. R.</i> (1905) 3 C 1 37<br/> <i>Thara</i> (19 1) 41 All 1 L J 33 60 J<br/> <i>C. 9. 9. (le. anil. r.) Broj v. Rada</i><br/>       (1885) 1 Cal 280 [T B] <i>Sh. Gaddhat v</i><br/> <i>Juma</i> (19) 9 B M L R 4 101 I C<br/>       340 (7) A B D (le. or and l. w.)<br/> <i>N. R. R. v. R. R.</i> (1893) 15 All 104<br/> <i>Abt. L. R. v. R. R.</i> (1911) 3 Bom 79<br/>       10 I C 890 (don r and d nee) <i>R. M.</i><br/> <i>Ch. R. v. M. R.</i> (1916) 40 Bom 6 9<br/>       36 I C 413 <i>D. R. R.</i> (1916) 40 Bom 6 9<br/>       (19 4) 4 Mad 1 J v 84 I C 995<br/>       (1) 4 M 303 (N. R. and purchaser)</p> |
|--|---|

See notes below under the head Condition III Litigating under the same title

**Representative suit—Explanation VI**—This section deals with representative suits that is suits instituted by or against a person in his representative as distinguished from individual character. Suits brought or defended by one or more persons on behalf of themselves and others with the leave of the Court under O 1 r 8 are common instances of this class. Explanation VI provides that where persons litigate bona fide in respect of a public right or a private right claimed in common for themselves and others all persons interested in such right shall for the purposes of this section be deemed to claim under the persons so litigating. It refers to cases in which a decision in a suit may operate as *res judicata* against persons *not expressly named* as parties to the suit as where a suit is instituted by A and B on behalf of themselves and others or where it is instituted against A and B on behalf of themselves and others. The conditions under which the decision in such a suit may constitute *res judicata* against the parties not expressly named in the suit are—

- (1) that there must be a *right claimed* by one or more persons *in common* for themselves and others not expressly named in the suit
- (2) that the parties not expressly named in the suit must be *interested in such right* and
- (3) that the litigation must have been conducted bona fide on behalf of all parties interested (a)

Where a person claims a right for himself which happens to be common to him and others he cannot be said to be litigating on behalf of the others and the Explanation does not apply (b)

#### Illustrations

(1) A decree in a suit against certain members of a sect alleged to be wrongdoers in their individual capacity cannot operate as *res judicata* in a subsequent suit against the other members of the sect. *Sadagopa Chariar v Krishnamoorthy Rao* (1907) 30 Mad 185 34 I A 93 [The wrong complained of in the former suit was that the defendants carried an idol in procession through certain streets and that such processions were in violation of the plaintiffs rights. The suit was against the defendants in their individual capacity and not as representing the sect to which they belonged.]

(2) A alleging that he is the proprietor of a village sues B C and D for ejectment. The defence is that A is not the proprietor and that part of the village belongs to B C and D and the rest to X Y and Z. The Court finds that A is not the proprietor and A's suit is dismissed. A then sues X Y and Z and also B C and D for a declaration that he is the proprietor of the village and for possession. The question of A's title to the village is *res judicata* so as to bar the suit against B C and D who were parties to the former suit but it is not *res judicata* so as to bar the suit against X Y and Z who were not parties to the former suit. It cannot be said that B C and D litigated in the former suit in respect of a private right claimed in common for themselves and X Y and Z. They set up only their own right to a part of the property and as to the rest they alleged that it belonged to X Y and Z. *Jasmangal Deo v Bed Saran* (1911) 33 All 493 9 I C 819

(3) A and B as members of the Mahomedan community bring a suit against C for a declaration that a mosque and a garden attached to it are waqf property. The plaintiffs

(a) *Somarandara v K Landare lu* (1901) 5 Mad 47 [F B] *Surender Yath v B of Rath* (1898) 13 Cal 35 *Jasmangal Deo v Bed Saran* (1911) 33 All 493 9 I C 819 *Ramchand v Jha lu Bokshah* (1911) 46 All 110 79 I C 310 (4) A A 178 *Sona*

*chalam v Kumaravelu* (1913) 51 Mad 128 107 I C 6 (29) A M 77 [F B] (b) *Kumandy v Venkatasubra n a* (1917) 6 Mad L J 611 101 I C 58 (27) A M 615

fail to prove that the property is wakf property and the suit is dismissed. After some years a suit is brought by some other members of the same community against the same defendant *O* for the same relief. The suit is barred as *res judicata*. *Muhammad v Sumitra* (1914) 36 All 424 21 I C 97

The right referred to in this Explanation may either be a public right or a private right. The words public right have been added into this Explanation in view of the provisions of s 91 below. The right to have a public nuisance abated is a public right. The right of pasturage claimed by custom by the inhabitants of a village over a tract of land or to take water from a spring or well is a private right (c).

In some of the cases that arose under the Code of 1882 the opinion was expressed that the present Explanation so far as it relates to private rights must be confined to cases where leave to sue has been obtained under s 30 of that Code (now O 1 r 8 (1)) (d). But the Explanation is not confined to such cases and applies also where no such leave is obtained provided the litigation was carried on bona fide on behalf of all others interested in the right claimed (e). Suits by a Hindu widow or by a manager of a joint Hindu family or by a reversioner in her or his representative character are instances of this class.

*Shebait karnavan tru tee administrator etc*—If the parties in the subsequent suit can be said to have been represented by the parties in the former suit the decision in the former suit will bind the parties in the subsequent suit. Thus a shebait a trustee of a devasam a karnam a holder of vatan or saranjam lands an administrator of the estate of a deceased person a holder of an inam grant represents each his successor therefore a decree against him will bind his successor (f). A decree against the karnavan of a tarwad in his representative capacity binds the members of the tarwad (g). There are certain purposes for which the official assignee represents the insolvent (h). When however the official assignee brings the insolvent's property to sale for the benefit of the creditors he represents the whole body of creditors. When a claim to an attached house was dismissed and on the insolvency of the judgment debtor the claimant filed a suit to establish his title to the house as against the official assignee the suit was not barred by *res judicata* as the official assignee represented not the judgment debtor but the whole body of creditors (i). A benamidar represents the real owner and a decree against the benamidar binds the owner (j).

*Joint Hindu family*—The question whether the manager of a joint Hindu family represents the other members in a suit affecting the family depends very largely upon the facts of the case. If he was acting in the suit in the interests of the minor members and with the consent of the adult members they all are bound (k). If the cause of action

(c) *E. Ishunkur v Gopal Chunder* (1881) 6 Cal 49

(d) *T. Akoti v Minappa* (189) 8 Mad 496  
49. *Srinivas v Naglara* (1900) 3 Mad 28  
28. *Ba ju Lal v Bulak Lal* (189) 24 Cal 38  
38. *Somasundara v Kulandavelu* (190) 8 Mad 457 463

(e) *Sonachalam v Kumaravelu* (19 8) 51 Mad 128 107 I C 65 ( 8) A M 77 (F B)  
*Gopalacharyulu v Subbamma* (19 0) 43 Mad 487 55 I C 984  
*Muhammad v Sumit* (1914) 36 All 4-4

(f) *Madhavan v Kesha* (1888) 11 Mad 191 (tru tee) *Enkayyan v Sumamma* (1889) 1 Mad 23 (karnam) *Padabala v Anarav* (1855) 9 Bom 198 (vatan lands) *B. A. Jetherbai v Mayancho* (1905) 18 Bom 96 (administrator)  
*Raja Panju v Basu* (1908) 10 C W N 32  
*Jagula Das v Jalandhar* (191) 39 Cal 837 14 I C 14 (shebait) *Thakur v J. ulth* (19 4) 46 All 651 80 I C 406

(-4) A A 504 P. su o. *Kumari v Colab Cha* d (18 5) 14 Beng L R 450 459 - I A 145 (shebait) *Lye dra ath v Kumari* (1915) 4 Cal 440 7 I C 828  
*Subban Ali v Imam Begam* (19) 52 Cal 971 5 I A 294 83 I C 317 ( ) A P C 184 (inam lands) *Madhavarao v Anusuyab* (1916) 40 Bom 606 6 I C 505 (saranjam lands)

(g) *Komappa v Utkan* (1894) 17 Mad 14  
*Moravdit v Patham* (1907) 30 Mad 115

(h) *Miller v Lakhna* (1901) 18 Cal 412  
(i) *Official Assignee v A. ju* (19 5) 49 Mad L J 330 83 I C 8 (25) A M 688

(j) *G. R. Narayan v Sheo Lal Si. gh* (1919) 46 I A 1 46 Cal 568 49 I C 1 14 d  
*Kishore v Ahmad* (1896) 15 All 82

(k) *Ling gouda v Basangouda* (19 7) 51 Bom 450 54 I A 1 101 I C 44 ( ) A 1 C 6 K. Raj Man v J. Ganath (19 0) 40 All 359 5 I C 846

is a wrongful act of the father the son who is not a party is not bound (l) For mortgage suits see note under O 34 r 1

**Hindu widow and reversioners**—A decree passed against a Hindu widow as representing the estate of her husband in respect of a debt or other transaction binding on the estate is binding upon the reversioners (m) *unless* as was observed by their Lordships of the Privy Council in the *Shuaganga* case it could be shown that there had not been a fair trial of the right in that suit—or in other words *unless* that decree could have been successfully impeached on some special ground (n) The reason of this qualification is that though a Hindu widow represents the estate of the reversioners for some purposes it is her duty not only to represent the estate but also to protect it (o) The observations of their Lordships in the *Shuaganga* case were construed in many cases to mean that a decree passed against a Hindu widow or other limited heir did not bind the reversioners unless the decree was passed in a suit contested to the end and that neither a consent decree nor a decree on an award however bona fide the compromise or reference might be bound the reversioners But this view has now been definitely rejected by the Privy Council as it involves very extreme consequences one of them being that a Hindu widow must fight the case up to the Privy Council and another that her opponent can never suggest a compromise because he would know that any compromise would be upset The rule of law as now established is that a widow has power to compromise a suit and a decree passed against her though on a compromise or on an award binds the reversioners as much as a decree in a suit contested to the end provided the compromise was entered into by her bona fide for the benefit of the estate which she represents and not for her personal advantage (p) A decree however against a Hindu widow not in her representative but personal character does not bind the reversioners (q) A decree passed against the legal personal representative of a Hindu widow in respect of her husband's estate does not bind the reversioners for the representative of a widow does not represent the estate of the husband (r)

There is no authority for the proposition that a Hindu widow otherwise qualified to represent an estate in litigation ceases to be so qualified merely owing to a personal disability or disadvantage as a litigant although the merits of a suit by or against her are tried and the trial is fair and honest The mere fact therefore that she is personally estopped from denying the material facts of a case is no ground for withholding the application of the rule enunciated at the commencement of this paragraph namely that where the estate of a deceased Hindu has vested in his widow or other limited heir a decree fairly and properly obtained against her is binding on the reversionary heirs Thus where a Hindu widow instituted a suit for a declaration that an adoption made by her to her deceased husband was invalid and the suit was dismissed on the ground that the widow was estopped by her conduct from denying the validity of the adoption and it was further found upon the facts that the adoption was valid it was held in a suit brought by the reversionary heir after the widow's death for a declaration that

(l) *Varulnara v Sunka* (190) 1 Mad L J 107

(n) *Iata v Natelvar v Pajak f Sa g nga* (1863) 9 M I A 43 *Iert b Narana v Tral* (188) 11 C I 186 11 I A 19 *H v th v M th M J m* (1894) 1 Cal 8 O I A 183

(o) *A t m v t h v S t Bayah* (1863) 9 M I A 43 609 *(h dh i H u l v gh v H l u t S i gh* (1918) 4 I A 168 40 All 593 49 I C 553

(p) *v g n d e r h d r v e e t t y Kaman Do ee* (180) 11 M I A 41 47

(q) *I m n r a n I r a s a d v S h y n E m a* (19) 49 I A 34 1 Pat 41 69 I C 71 ( ) A I C (3 6 appg *M I e n d r a V a t h v S A m s a* (1915) 1 Cal L J 157 163 7 I C 94 *H r a B u b v S o h a n*

*Rub* (1914) 18 C W N 99 4 I C 309

*F C Behari v Daul* (1913) 3 All 40

18 I C 1 (settlement of family dispute) *S d b m a l v i d i j m a l* (1906)

30 M d 3 (decree on admission) *I o g a r a j v A d l e p H* (1912) 3 Mad 60 564

6 I I C 13 *G u v i v J a r a n* (191) 34 All 38 14 I C 184 (with drawl

*f a p p e l b y w i d o w* *S i b D o v R m* *P r a f* (19 4) 46 All 63 87 I C 938

( ) A A 2 (decree on award)

(g) *S d b v R a I u h a* (1918) 4 Bom 69

43 I C 33 *K a l l v K a j* (1904) 30 All 334 *S o a h v C i d r a* (19 3) 3 C L J 348 68 I C 3 ( ) A A C 04

(r) *K a l a v G r i j a* (191) 39 Cal 9 14 I C 299

the adoption was invalid that the reversionary heir was bound by the decision in the first suit as res judicata (s). The dismissal of a suit brought by a widow on the ground that it was barred by the provisions of s 47 below does not operate as res judicata so as to bar a subsequent suit by the reversioners (t).

A suit by the next reversioner for a declaration that an alienation made by a Hindu widow is not binding on the reversion is a representative suit on behalf of all the reversioners (u). A decree fairly and properly obtained against the reversioner in such a suit is binding not only upon him but the whole body of reversioners presumptive and contingent on the one hand and the alienor or his representative on the other (t).

**Consent decree in a representative suit on behalf of the public**—In the under mentioned case (w) the Privy Council left it an open question whether in India persons instituting a suit on behalf of the public can bind the public by a compromise decree.

**Judgment in rem**—As already explained a judgment in a suit is binding only upon the parties to the suit and their privies. As a general principle a transaction between two parties in judicial proceedings ought not to be binding upon a third for it would be unjust to bind any person who could not be admitted to make a defence or to examine witnesses or to appeal from a judgment he might think erroneous (x). There are however certain judgments which bind all the world and not only the parties to the proceeding in which they were passed and their privies. A judgment that is binding upon the parties and their privies only is called a judgment *in personam*. A judgment which binds all the world is called a judgment *in rem*. Judgments *in rem* are outside the scope of the present section. They are dealt with in the Indian Evidence Act s 41.

**Decree against minor**—A decree passed against a minor properly represented is binding upon him to the same extent as a decree passed against an adult. A minor however is entitled to impeach a decree passed against him if the next friend or guardian for the suit was guilty of fraud or gross negligence in allowing the decree to be passed (y). It has been said in one case that any act or omission on the part of the guardian ad litem which in the result has wrought prejudice to the minor's interest is gross negligence (z) but this indeed is going too far. An omission on the part of a guardian ad litem to bring to the notice of the Court a previous judgment between the parties for the purpose of raising the plea of res judicata has been held not to constitute negligence (a).

A decree passed against a minor not properly represented is a nullity and cannot operate as res judicata (b). But it has been held that if a suit is brought on the minor's behalf to set aside a sale in execution of such decree but the plea that the minor was not properly represented in the suit in which the decree was passed is not then taken it cannot be taken in a subsequent suit to set aside the decree and sale by reason of the rule contained in Explanation II to the section (c).

- (t) *Chaudhri Ismail v. Bhatti* (1918) 4 I A 169 40 All 593 49 I C 313  
(u) *Jalal v. Kanna* (1913) 43 Mad 129 6 I C 387 (w) *A.M. 31*  
(v) *Ganesh v. Lakshmi* (1911) 46 B N 66 I C 502  
(w) *Indian Rajawade v. S. P. Bha* (1911) 39 Mad 406 47 I A 1 9 I C 296  
(x) *Kul v. S. P. Bha* (1911) 44 All 19 64 I C 248 (2) *A. 301* 17 B 1  
1 a am av (p) *d. a. j.* (1918) 41 M d 69 46 I C 12 B 1 I C 11 I C 11  
n d v. *L. D. D.* (1914) 5 Lal 1 81 I C 41 (1) *A. L. 89* *Prattapalli v. Bhatti* (1911) 49 C 1 3 64 I C 980 (2) *A. C. 31* *M. T. I. d.*  
(y) *V. S. Bha* (1911) 1 A 399 47 All 893  
(z) *Thakur Singh v. M. Ullam* (1919) 13 Lah 613 118 I C 449 (9) A L 29  
(a) *Abd. Rahim v. M. Homed Fa* (1919) 55 I A 96 55 (a) 619 108 I C 361  
(b) *L. J. 1349* (6) *A. 36*  
(c) *J. 00* 8 I C 81 (1) *A. M. 5*  
(d) *P. M. L. J. 1* (1) *A. M. 44*  
(e) *M. D. 1919* 1 A 19 (4) *A. M. d. 6*  
71 I C 6-3 (4) *A. M. 608*



## CONDITION III

## Litigating under the same title

**Litigating under the same title**—The third condition of *res judicata* is that the parties in the subsequent suit must have litigated under the same title in the former suit. The expression same title means the same capacity. A verdict against a man suing in one capacity will not stop him when he sues in another distinct capacity and in fact is a different person. (d) Thus where a suit is brought by a person to recover possession from a stranger of math property claiming it as the heir of a deceased mohunt but the suit is dismissed on his failure to produce a certificate of succession to establish his heirship the dismissal is no bar to a suit by him as *manager of the math on behalf of the math*. (e) Where the trustees of a public charity fail in a suit to eject a trespasser they are not barred from suing again as members of the public with the consent of the Advocate General. (f) The dismissal of a suit by A against B, C and D in their individual capacity on a finding that a temple is public property does not operate as *res judicata* against A in a subsequent suit brought by B, C, D and others in their representative capacity against A for a declaration that the same temple is public property. (g) Similarly the dismissal of a suit brought by a son against his father for maintenance claimed under an agreement is no bar to a suit by him against his eldest brother for a declaration that he is entitled to maintenance out of certain lands in his hands held under a *sanad* from Government whereby it was alleged the lands were charged at the time of grant with the maintenance of the junior members of the family. (h) Where in a suit by A against B for the recovery of a property B sets up a joint tenancy in C and the Court finds that C has no title to the property and allows A a claim the finding does not operate as *res judicata* in a subsequent suit by B after C's death against A claiming the same property as the heir of C as it could not have operated as such against C himself. (i)

A mortgagee in possession does not lose the character of mortgagee and become a trespasser because he refuses to deliver up possession of the mortgaged property to the mortgagor on deposit being made by the latter in Court of the amount payable on the mortgage. A executes a usufructuary mortgage of his property to B and places B in possession thereof. At the proper time A tenders the mortgage debt Rs 500 to B and asks to be restored to possession. B refuses to accept the tender on the ground that more is due to him and to deliver up possession of the property to A. A sues B for redemption and deposits Rs 500 in Court. The Court finds that the tender was proper and directs B to deliver up possession to A. After entering into possession A sues B to recover mesne profits from B from the date of the deposit in Court to the date of the recovery of possession. The suit is barred for A might and ought to have claimed the mesne profits in the first suit. The suit is between the same parties litigating under the same title that is as mortgagor and mortgagee. The mortgage is not extinguished after the tender and deposit and B does not become a trespasser after that date. It cannot therefore be said that the suit against B for mesne profits is against him as a trespasser and not as a mortgagee. (j)

- (d) *D chess of Knighton's case* 2 Smith's L. C. 731. 59 See also *Al Moudin v Aombi* (188 ) 5 Mad 239. 41  
(e) *Babaj Rao v Laxmandas* (1904) 3 Bom 215. *Distinguishd Harrow v Ajulja* (1910) 34 Bom 416. 4 I C 241. *Ghela bha v Uderam* (1912) 36 Bom 29. 12 I C 57  
(f) *Lakshman Das v Jugai Kishore* (1898) 9 Bom 16

- (g) *Hari Kishan v Pagh dar* (1925) 1 Luck 480. 97 I C 83. (5) A O 578  
(h) *Ahmad v Vajnai ud D n* (1883) 9 Cal 945. 10 I A 45  
(i) *Jagannadham v Venkatasubba Rao* (197) 59 Mad 877. 104 I C 488. (27) A M 844  
(j) *R Khamravad v Venkatesh* (1907) 31 Bom 5. 7 *Satyabati v Harabati* (1907) 34 Cal 23. *Ram Din v Bhoop Singh* (1908) 30 All 5

The words between parties under whom they or any of them claim litigating under the same title cover a case where the later litigant occupies by succession the same position as the former litigant. There may be a succession by the ordinary rules of inheritance or succession by some very special rules as in the case of saranjam estates or vatan estates. The words of the section do not make any distinction between different forms of succession. A decree therefore against a saranjamdar may operate as res judicata against his heir and successor (l) so also a decree against a vatandar (l).

See notes above p 59 Shebait karnavan trustee administrator etc.

#### CONDITION IV

### "Court competent to try such subsequent suit or the suit in which such issue has been subsequently raised"

**Court of competent jurisdiction**—In order that a decision in a former suit may operate as res judicata in a subsequent suit it is necessary that the Court which tried the former suit must have been a Court competent to try the subsequent suit. Mere competency to try the issue raised in the subsequent suit is not enough. As stated by their Lordships of the Privy Council in *Gokul Maniar v Pudmanund* (m) a decree in a previous suit cannot be pleaded as res judicata in a subsequent suit unless the judge by whom it was made had jurisdiction to try and decide not only the particular matter in issue but also the subsequent suit itself in which the issue is subsequently raised. In this respect the enactment goes beyond s 13 of the previous Act 10 of 1877 and also as appears to their Lordships beyond the law laid down by the judges in the *Duchess of Kingston's case* (n). The words in s 13 of the Code of 1877 were "No Court shall try any suit or issue in which the matter directly and substantially in issue has been heard and finally decided by a Court of competent jurisdiction in a former suit between the same parties or between parties under whom etc." See 2 of the Code of 1859 was in similar terms. In s 13 of the Code of 1882 the words "Court competent to try such subsequent suit or the suit in which such issue has been subsequently raised" which also occur in the present section were substituted for the words "Court of competent jurisdiction" clearly restricting the operation of the principle of res judicata.

The Court which decided the former suit may be a Court of exclusive jurisdiction or a Court of concurrent jurisdiction or a Court of limited jurisdiction. As to superior Courts nothing is presumed to be out of jurisdiction except what is expressed to be so but with inferior Courts the presumption is to the contrary that nothing is within jurisdiction except what is expressed to be so (o).

Where the Court which decided the former suit is a Court of exclusive jurisdiction—If a matter directly and substantially in issue in a former suit has been adjudicated upon by a Court of exclusive jurisdiction the adjudication will bar the trial of the same matter in a subsequent suit. Thus Courts of Revenue have jurisdiction in respect of certain matters to the entire exclusion of civil Courts and the decision of a Revenue Court on such matters cannot be questioned in a civil Court (p). Similarly the Dekkan Agriculturists Relief Act gives exclusive jurisdiction to the Court under that Act over a particular class of suits and a decision in a previous suit tried by that Court will be res judicata if the suit falls within the class to which the Act applies (q).

(k) *Madh Rao v A. S. Y. B.* (1916) 40 Bom 606 36 I C 0

(l) *Fadli v A. and an* (188) 9 Bom 194

(m) (1907) 3 I A 136 Or 9 Cal 07 1  
Shob Rao v. Bab Rao (1903) 3 C 1  
3 3 3 9

(n) (1 6) 2 Smith's Leading Cases p 31

(o) See *R v. Ab. Inc.* (1808) 15 W R Cr 1

(p) *Ashore v. Gh. v. Bahadur Singh* (1919) 41

41 9 43 I C 40 *E. J. v. M. A. P. t.*  
(1919) 41 All 45 49 I C 118 *P. A. D. s.*  
*V. D. B. Koe* (19) 14 All 1 71 C  
133 ( ) 3 A 356 *B. I. v. Gh. v.*  
*v. ab. t.* (19 6) 43 All 4 25 I C 943  
( ) 3 A 0 (F B) *Mool Chandra v. S.*  
*M. f. s.* (19 9) 4 Luck 20 11 I C 83  
(9) A 0 36  
(q) See *I. f. s. v. S. f. s.* (191) 36 Bom 543  
16 I C 44

Where the Court which decided the former suit was not a Court of jurisdiction concurrent with that of the Court in which the subsequent suit is brought — In such a case the Court which decided the former suit cannot be a Court competent to try the subsequent suit within the meaning of this section (r)

Where the Court which decided the former suit was a Court of concurrent jurisdiction — In such a case the Court which decided the former suit might or might not have been competent to try the subsequent suit. If it was the decision would operate as res judicata but not otherwise

Summarising the above we may say that in order that a decision in a former suit may operate as res judicata the Court which decided that suit must have been either—

- 1 a Court of exclusive jurisdiction or
- 2 a Court of concurrent jurisdiction competent to try the subsequent suit

The following are the principal rules as to concurrent jurisdiction —

(1) *The jurisdiction of the two Courts must be concurrent as regards the pecuniary limit as well as the subject matter* — This rule was laid down by Sir Barnes Peacock in *Pdun v Bechn* (s) and it was approved by the Privy Council in *Misir v Sheo Balsh* (t). The learned Chief Justice said that there were in India many grades of Courts with different pecuniary limits of jurisdiction presided over by judges whose qualification differed widely that it would be improper that a finding as to the validity of an adoption or of a will in a petty suit in a Munsiff's Court should be conclusive in a suit for a property of a large amount in a High Court and that by taking concurrent jurisdiction to mean concurrent as regards the pecuniary limit as well as the subject matter this evil or inconvenience is avoided. In *Ran Bahadur v Luchu Koer* (u) the Privy Council said that if this construction of the law were not adopted the lowest Court in India might determine finally and without appeal to the High Court the title to the greatest estate in the Indian empire. It is essential therefore that the first Court was a Court competent to try and decide not only the particular matter in issue but also the subsequent suit in which the issue is subsequently raised (v)

*First as to pe uniary limit* — The jurisdiction of the Court which decided the former suit and that of the Court in which the subsequent suit is brought must be concurrent as regards the *pe uniary limit*. A sues B in Court X to recover interest due on a bond for Rs 12 000. For the defence it is alleged that the amount actually lent by A was Rs 4 000 and that A was not entitled to interest on more than Rs 4 000. The Court finds that the amount actually lent was Rs 4 000 and awards A interest on that sum only. Court X is a Court of which the jurisdiction is limited to suits of which the value does not exceed Rs 5 000. A then sues B in a High Court to recover the principal sum of Rs 12 000 alleging that that was the actual amount lent by him to B. B contends that the actual amount advanced was Rs 4 000 and that the question as to whether Rs 12 000 was lent or Rs 4 000 is res judicata. The question is not res judicata for the jurisdiction of Court X being limited to Rs 5 000 it was not a Court competent to try the subsequent suit in which the amount claimed is Rs 12 000. Pecuniary jurisdiction is determined by the plaintiff's estimate of the value of his claim and if the Court awards less than does

(r) *Jd v Bechn* (1868) 8 W R 1 p 179  
*Mir v Sheo Balsh* (1883) 9 Cal 439 445  
 91 A 197  
 (s) (1868) 8 W R 1 19  
 (t) (1883) 9 I A 19 204 9 Cal 439  
 (u) (1885) 11 Cal 301 1 I A 23  
 (v) *Misir v Sheo Balsh* (1883) 9 Cal 439 9  
 I A 197 *Clul Jladar v Padman d*  
 (190) 29 I A 196 20 29 Cal 97  
*R v Jay v F nklade* (1900) 4 Bom 46

*Gripa v Sabapath* (1906) 9 Mad 65  
*Shekh H su v Ram K mar S nph* (1894)  
 18 All 183 *Fy kat v Onl* (10 1) 45  
*Bom* 805 61 I C 76 *Shibo Ro t v*  
*Bab n Rout* (1908) 35 Cal 353 *Hud Lal*  
*v Gul a Lal* (19 7) 49 All 543 545  
 100 I C 601 (27) A A 97 *Venkata*  
*s Bha Rao v Vig suaradu* (19 9) 66  
*Mad L J* 5\* 110 I C 554 (28) A M  
 840

not shew that the suit was brought in the wrong Court (w) But the plaintiff cannot prevent a decision in a previous suit from operating as res judicata by overvaluing the second suit (x) Where A brought two suits in a Provincial Small Cause Court for compensation in each suit for loss of one parcel and the suits were dismissed and he subsequently brought a suit in the Munsiff's Court joining together the claims in the respect of both the parcels so as to bring the valuation above the Rs 500 limit it was held that the suit was barred on the principle of res judicata (y)

*Secondly as to subject matter*—The jurisdiction of the two Courts must be concurrent as regards subject matter Thus certain Courts have no jurisdiction to adjudicate upon questions of title though that question may be gone into incidentally in order to decide the principal question A finding on a question of title by such Court cannot operate as res judicata in a subsequent suit on title This generally happens in the three following cases —

(a) *Where the first Court is a Probate Court and the second Court a Civil Court*—There are cases in which it has been held that a decision in a proceeding in a Probate Court for a grant of probate or letters of administration as to which of the rival applicants is the nearest heir of the deceased or as to whether the applicant is the residuary legatee upon a true construction of the will of the deceased and therefore entitled to probate does not operate as res judicata in a subsequent suit by the defeated party for a declaration of his title to the property left by the deceased and for possession thereof so as to preclude him from litigating the same question against the suit ( ) The authority however of these decisions has been considerably shaken by the judgment of the Privy Council in *Sheoparsan v Ramnandan* (a) and it has been held by the High Courts of Pangoon (b) and Calcutta (c) that a finding in a proceeding for letters of administration that one of two rival applicants is the nearest heir of the deceased is res judicata in a subsequent suit for a declaration of title These decisions proceed on the ground that where a matter has been decided by a Court having jurisdiction to decide it the decision operates as res judicata though the Courts may not be the same It has similarly been held that if A alleging himself to be the executor of B's will applies for probate of the will and C B's widow opposes the application and probate is refused on the ground that the will is not proved A will be precluded in a subsequent suit by C against him to recover her husband's property from him from contending that he is executor and entitled as such to retain possession of the property Though the judgment of the Probate Court refusing probate to A does not operate in such a case as a judgment in rem it operates as res judicata between A and C under s 295 of the Indian Succession Act 1925 read with s 11 of the Code (d) Similarly a decision of the Probate Court that the testator executed his will as a free agent and not under undue influence precludes the party against whom the decision is given from attacking the will on this ground in a suit in a civil Court (e) As to s 357 of the Indian Succession Act 1851 see the under mentioned case (f) See also the Indian Evidence Act 182 s 41

- (w) *Lakshmi v Babayi* (1883) 8 Bom 31  
*Mahab S ngh B ha v L U* (1891) 13 All 30
- (x) *T masi vsa Syed M I masad* (1908) 50 All 306 104 I C 46 (3) A A 1  
*Ch te L v V h dr bhan* (1913) 4 All 59 80 I C 1041 (3) A A 16
- (y) *Mangan Lal v O I I Ry Co* (1904) All L J 74 83 I C 969 (4) A A 840  
*See I a B v gant h v F b* (1901) 4 Cal 8 a expl d in *Shib Rout Bob v R ut* (1904) 3 Cal 353 3
- (z) *Arunmo v Mole dra Nath* (1893) 0 C 1 848  
*Ch nt n v J im I ndra* (1910) 34 Bom 589 7 I C 944  
*L id Moh n Radia man* (1911) 1 C W N 101 10 I C 434  
*M q s I S h v I f h m d* (1918) P R no 49 1 16 43 I C 43

- (a) (1916) 43 I A 91 93 99 43 C 1 691 70 06 37 I C 914
- (b) *Mang H r t v Ma Hlay* (1913) 1 Ban 8 I C 491 (3) A R 7
- (c) *De v pada D A I p da Das* (1907) 31 C W N 894 100 I C 10 (7) A C 41 dss ntl fr m (1893) 0 Cal 848  
*pra ud* (1911) 15 C W N 101 10 I C 434 a pra
- (d) *I l i h I v S u b s* (1914) 34 Bom 303 3 I C 3 10 Br ndon v da b (1914) 33 Bom 3 I C 1
- (e) *B v Lal H r R Lal* (1913) P R no 13 p 60 41 I C 4 J
- (f) *M u I Dr v k h I D* (1904) 5 Lah 10 9 I C 133 (4) A L 493

(b) *Where the first Court is a Munsiff's Court and the second Court a District Court*—A sues B for rent in a Munsiff's Court. The defence is that C and not A is the landlord. The Court finds that A is not the landlord and the suit is dismissed. A then sues B in a District Court for a declaration of title to the land. The suit is not barred for a Munsiff's Court has no jurisdiction to adjudicate upon questions of title (g)

Similarly a decision in a suit for damages instituted in a Provincial Small Cause Court [a Court not competent to try a suit on title] does not operate as res judicata in a subsequent suit for establishment of title (h). A decision in a suit for rent in a Provincial Small Cause Court [a Court not competent to try a suit for possession] does not operate as res judicata in a subsequent suit for possession (i)

(c) *Where the first Court is a Revenue Court and the second Court is a Civil Court*—A decision of a Revenue Court on a question of title is no bar to the trial of the same question by the ordinary Civil Courts unless the Revenue Court is empowered by the Legislature to determine questions of title so as to constitute it *pro tanto* a Civil Court (j). The reason is that Courts of Revenue are generally Courts of jurisdiction limited to adjudicate upon questions of rent tenure etc (k). There are however some matters of which the decision by a Revenue Court is expressly declared by the Act constituting the Court to have the force of a decree in a civil suit (l) and some as to which it is declared that the decision shall be final (m). In such cases the decision of a Revenue Court will operate as res judicata so as to bar the trial of the same matter in a Civil Court. In a recent case (n) an occupancy tenant sued in a Revenue Court to evict the defendant alleging that he was a sub tenant. The suit was dismissed on the ground that the defendant was not a sub tenant but probably a sharer in the occupancy. The plaintiff then sued in the Civil Court to eject the defendant as a trespasser but the suit was dismissed on the ground that its object was to reverse the decision of the Revenue Court. This decision is submitted is incorrect. The finding of the Revenue Court that the defendant was not a sub tenant was final. But it had no such jurisdiction to declare who were sharers in the occupancy and in any event its finding on that point was only incidental. See notes. Where the Court which decided the former suit was a Court of exclusive jurisdiction on p 64 above. For other cases see foot note (o). See note. Where the Court which decided the former suit was a Court of exclusive jurisdiction on p 63 above.

(2) *When the first Court is a Criminal Court and the second Court is a Civil Court*—Criminal proceedings are not a suit hence no finding of a Criminal Court can be res judicata in a subsequent suit. It has thus been held that a conviction or an acquittal in a criminal case is not conclusive in a civil suit for damages in respect of

(g) *Ran D Pat v Luchu Joor* (188) 11 C 1 301 1 1 3

(f) *D I e Lal v Ha ar L* (1914) 1 All L J 8 J 30 I C 56. It is otherwise here the first suit is tri d s a r gul r suit. F m F qir v B d b S ngā (1919) 41 All 54 47 I C 83

(i) *F Lou v Raj ji* (19 4) 48 Bom 541 83 I C 4 ( 4) A B 4 4

(j) *B d Saran v B lag t Deo* (1911) 33 All 453 10 I C 9 4 B ha v Steobala (190 ) 3 All 601 tppa Rao v G aya (19 0) 43 Mad 8 9 60 I C 00 Tlak r H ma t v Ut Jh la (19 ) 0 All L J 340 60 I C 915 ( ) A A 9 B ru Val v Sun i r J i (19 3) 1 All L J 330 1 C 10 ( 4) A 4 10

(k) *Hurr S ler v Muft am* (1875) 15 B L R 38 F K shorav I J Ram (1904) 6 All 463 Ashraf v tl Ahmad (1904) 26 All 601 W heah v Rauf r (190 ) 7 All 163 Ina j t Al v Murad Ali (190 )

7 All 580 Dha a v v Gab r (1903) 30 Cal 339 R g jya v Ratnam (1897)

0 Mad 39 P dmalav v L km i an (190 ) 1 C W N 8 A s f e sa v Hemcha dr (19 ) 4 Cal 114 100 I C 33 ( ) A C 16

(l) *D rpa C r m v H teen* (190 ) 9 Cal 25 Sh o Var n v Parmesha (1896) 15 All

20 Jalka Praval v M mo'an Lal (1916) 38 All 0 310 33 I C 86

(m) *Mahendra v r rsh C a dra* (1918) 3 Pat L J 3 9 45 I C 1

(n) *Batwant Si gh v S abji* (19 6) 43 All 74 98 I C 983 ( ) A A 70 (F B)

(o) *Lal B Far v P kal* (19 0) 4 All 309 55 I C [qu tion of title not l d or decided] K damb v Lakshmi (1908) 31 Mad 6 B i j pall v B i jepall (1907) 30 Mad 3 9 Aa ha v D ga (1915) 37 All 3 7 I C 913 S d r v D a ath (1915) 37 All 80 8 I C 43 Mulo v I am Lal (19 0) 43 All 191 58 I C 772

the act charged against the accused (p) On this principle the finding of a Criminal Court that A assaulted or abducted B is not *res judicata* in a suit for damages against A for assault or abduction (q) nor is an acquittal a bar to a civil suit against the accused (r)

The High Court of Bombay has held that the judgment of a Civil Court may in a proper case be admissible in evidence in a criminal proceeding between the same parties Thus where A charged B with criminal breach of trust in respect of certain items and it appeared that all those items had been dealt with by the Civil Court and the contentions of the accused with reference to all of them had been found to be correct by that Court it was held that the judgment of the Civil Court was admissible in evidence in the criminal proceedings against the accused (s)

(3) To determine whether the Court which decided the former suit had jurisdiction to try the subsequent suit regard must be had to the jurisdiction of that Court at the date of the former suit and not to its jurisdiction at the date of the subsequent suit (t)—The words Court competent to try such subsequent suit refer to the jurisdiction of the Court at the time when the first suit was brought If at that time such Court would have been competent to try the subsequent suit had it been then brought the decision of such Court would operate as *res judicata* although on a subsequent date by a rise in the value of the property that Court had ceased to be a proper Court so far as regards its pecuniary jurisdiction to take cognizance of a suit relating to that very property The leading case on the subject is *Gopi Nath v Bhugwat* (u) In that case a suit was brought in the year 1860 to recover certain property of which the value at that time was less than Rs 1000 and therefore the proper Court to try it was that of the Munsiff A second suit was afterwards brought in the year 1860 between the same parties in the Court of the Subordinate Judge to recover the same property which had then risen in value and become worth more than Rs 1000 The matter directly and substantially in issue in both the suits was the same and the question arose whether the decision of the Munsiff in the first suit operated as *res judicata* in the second suit It was contended that as the Munsiff could not have tried the second suit in consequence of the value of the property being more than Rs 1000 his decision could not have the effect of *res judicata* But it was held that the decision operated as *res judicata* for if the second suit was instituted in the year 1860 that is at the time when the first suit was brought the Munsiff's Court would have been competent to try it Mitter J said The reasonable construction of the words in a Court of jurisdiction competent to try such subsequent suit seems to us to be that it must refer to the jurisdiction of the Court at the time when the first suit was brought that is to say if the Court which tried the first suit was competent to try the subsequent suit if then brought the decision of such Court would be conclusive under s 13 [of the Code of 1852] although on a subsequent date by a rise in the value of such property or from any other cause the said Court ceased to be a proper Court so far as pecuniary jurisdiction is concerned to take cognizance of a suit relating to that property The same view has been taken by the High Court of Madras (v) It has however been held by that Court that the augmentation of a pecuniary claim by accrual of interest is not similar to a rise in the market value of a property and that though in the latter case the decision in the prior suit may operate as *res judicata* it cannot in the former case (w)

- (p) *B. hon th v If ro* (1886) W R Doorga  
v D orgi (1860) 6 W R Cl Ref 76  
(q) *Al B kl v Shailah* (1860) 1 W R 47  
*Ra v Lal v T la 2 in* (185) 4 All 9  
See Evidence Act s 43  
(r) *K Amb v Manirudin* (1908) 1 C W N  
501 4 J C 53  
(s) *In re Ma 1* (1914) 41 Bom 1 33 I C  
633  
(t) *G pi v th v Bh gwat* (1884) 1 C 1 69

- I r j u th* I r C J d (188) 11  
(18) 1 1 3 J r C J d (185) 1  
W d 413 M n l a v th Sha a nestra  
(191) 19 C W N 1 40 I C 9 4  
(u) (18-4) 10 Cal 637 v r pa Khem Lal  
(19-9) 10 Lab 5 v (-) A L 9-9 113  
I C 90  
(v) *Tent tuckda 1 v 4 p rumal* (1919) 4  
W d 31 C 33  
(w) *C r i j a v bapat'y* (1906) 2 W d 6

But it will operate as *res judicata* if the claim for interest is not *bona fide* and is clearly untenable (z)

(4) *It is the competency of the original Court which decided the former suit that must be looked to and not that of the appellate Court in which that suit was ultimately decided on appeal (y) or of the executing Court (z)*—A suit is instituted in a Munsiff's Court. An appeal from the decree in that suit is preferred to a District Court. A subsequent suit relating to the same matter in issue is brought also in a District Court. The decision in the first suit cannot operate as *res judicata* in the subsequent suit for though the District Court that heard the appeal may have jurisdiction to try the subsequent suit the Munsiff's Court that is the Court which decided the former suit is not a Court of jurisdiction competent to try the subsequent suit.

Though an appeal lies from a decision of a Talukdar's Settlement Officer to the District Court yet the decision operates as *res judicata* in a subsequent suit in the District Court for a Settlement Officer is not a Court competent to try a civil suit he is merely an administrative officer (a)

(u) *A Court does not cease to be a Court of jurisdiction competent to try the subsequent suit if its inability to entertain it arises not from incompetence but from the existence of another Court with a preferential jurisdiction (b)*—Thus a finding by a Munsiff in a suit for possession under s 9 of the Specific Relief Act 1877 instituted in his Court that the plaintiff was wrongfully dispossessed by the defendant is *res judicata* on the issue as to wrongful dispossession in a subsequent suit brought by the same plaintiff against the same defendant for damages for wrongful dispossession in a Court of Small Causes.

(6) *A decision on a matter directly and substantially in issue in a suit tried by a Revenue Court may operate as res judicata in a subsequent suit brought in the same Court though the character of the suits may be such that in the one case an appeal lies to the Commissioner and in the other to a District Court*—The fact that in the two suits appeals lie to different Courts does not affect the application of the rule of *res judicata* (c)

**Explanation II**—This explanation is new. Under the Code of 1882 the High Courts of Bombay (d) and Madras (e) held that a decision in a suit in which no second appeal was allowed by law such as suits of a nature cognizable by Courts of Small Causes when the amount or value of the subject matter does not exceed five hundred rupees could not operate as *res judicata* in a subsequent suit in which such appeal was allowed. The High Court of Calcutta dissented holding that a decision in a suit could operate as *res judicata* notwithstanding that no second appeal was allowed by law in that suit (f). Explanation II affirms the view taken by the High Court of Calcutta that the competence of a Court does not depend on the right of appeal from the decision of such Court (g).

(z) *Vela juda v. Su dara* (19 6) 51 Mad L J 630 9 I C 969 (26) A M 8 9

(y) *Topon dlee v. Sre p ity* (1880) 5 C I 83

*Bh v. Saral Ch ader* (1896) 3 Cal

415 *Shubo I oot v. Baba Roat* (1908) 35

Cal 33 3 36 *Mal bha v. S raa gji*

(1906) 30 Bom 2 0 *I alenwara v. Muthu*

*kr A a* (1911) 1 M d L J 7 9 I C

686 *Anars gji v. De p a gji* (19<sup>o</sup>)

49 Bom 44 8 I C 588 ( ) A B 211

*Aa mu v. M sam m t F him n* (19<sup>o</sup>)

44 All 71 76 I C 93 ( ) A A 445

(z) *Office I Ass gn e of Mad as v. Ayya Dak*

*tha* (19 148 Mad L J 530 533

83 I 4 85 ( ) A M 683

(a) *Mal bh v. S s gji* (1906) 30 Bom 400

*Amars ngji v. Deepangji* (19 5) 49 Bom

44 87 I C 585 ( ) A B 211

(b) *Ghulappa v. R glavend a* (1904) 8 Bom

38 *Raja Simhad r v. R machund udu*

(190 ) 7 Mad 83 *Bodlu v. Mohan*

*S ngh* (1917) 39 All 717 4 I C 80

(c) *Ben Madho v. Indar Sal i* (1910) 3 All

67 3 I C 0

(d) *Goe d v. Dho dbarav* (1891) 15 Bom 104

(e) *Aranas v. Vachamm i* (1908) 3 M d 195

(f) *Pai Charan Ghose v. K m d Mohun* (1898)

5 Cal 371 *Bh gra b it v. Forbes* (1901)

9 Cal 8

(g) *Ram Fager v. B nd shra. Si gh* (1919) 41

All 54 38 47 I C 837

**Judgment of Court not competent to deliver it**—A judgment delivered by a Court not competent to deliver it cannot operate as res judicata [Evidence Act 1872 s 44]. For this purpose there is no distinction so far as Chartered High Courts are concerned between cases where a Court has no jurisdiction at all to try a suit and cases where it cannot exercise jurisdiction unless leave to sue has been obtained under cl 12 of the Charter. Therefore a judgment delivered by a Chartered High Court in a suit which it has no jurisdiction to try unless leave to sue has been obtained cannot operate as res judicata if leave to sue was not obtained (h)

**Judgment obtained by fraud or collusion**—A judgment obtained by fraud or collusion (i) cannot operate as res judicata [Evidence Act 1872 s 44]. Fraud is an extrinsic collateral act which vitiates the most solemn proceedings of Courts of Justice. Lord Coke says it avoids all judicial acts ecclesiastical or temporal (j). Where a decree is unpeached on the ground of fraud the fraud alleged must be actual positive fraud a meditated and intentional contrivance to keep the parties and the Court in ignorance of the real facts of the case and the obtaining of the decree by that contrivance. The mere fact that a decree has been obtained by perjured and false evidence is no ground for setting it aside on the ground of fraud (l)

### CONDITION V

**The matter directly and substantially in issue in the subsequent suit must have been heard and finally decided" by the Court in the former suit**

**Heard and finally decided**—Res judicata by its very words means a matter on which the Court has exercised its judicial mind and has after argument and consideration come to a decision on a contested matter (i). The section requires that there should be a final decision (m). The mere fact that a matter directly and substantially in issue in a suit was directly and substantially in issue in a former suit is not sufficient to constitute the matter res judicata it is also essential that it should have been heard and finally decided. This does not mean that there should be an actual finding on the issue in question it is sufficient if the decree necessarily involves a finding of the issue (n). It has thus been held that an issue may be res judicata if the judgment of the appellate Court shows that the issue was treated as material and was decided although the decree passed merely affirms the decree of the lower Court which did not deal with the issue (o)

In dealing with questions under the present head it is important to note—

- (1) that if a decree is specific and is at variance with a statement in the judgment regard must be had to the decree and not to the statement in the judgment (p)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| (h) <i>Idol Puri v Dool Bibi</i> (1913) 3 Bom 63 O L C 30  | 100 <i>M M Malvi v Jamchind</i> (1908) 31 C W N 58 97 I C 879 (7) A C 81  |
| (i) <i>Sultan ul v Diapa</i> (190) 1 All 24  | (j) <i>Jenks v Robertson</i> (186) 1 H L S App 14   |
| (k) Cited in <i>Dhess of Ang to es case</i> Smiths L C 31 See also <i>Nitar Das v Wunda Lal</i> (1899) 6 Cal 201 90  | (m) <i>Pattam G v Varabada G</i> (1899) 1 All 50 O L C 10   |
| (l) <i>J. L. P. v. Lachm</i> (1915) 37 All 53 30 I C 89 <i>M. Hanif v. Mahomed S. Hanif</i> (1904) 1 C L J 61 619 <i>N. A. d. K. v. Jamjwan</i> (1914) 41 C L J 990 33 I C 337 <i>Chaitu S. gh v. P. P. Path</i> (1919) 4 Lat L J 18 50 I C 41 <i>I. M. Pat. n. v. B. P.</i> (1916) 34 All 30 1 C 73 <i>Gowid v. Othas</i> (1935) 5 Bom L R 833 1 C 66 (4) A B | (n) <i>Sorjmo e Daye v S. d. d</i> (1840) 1 B L R 304 1 A Sup Vol 1 <i>J. M. K. v. I. P. d</i> (1801) 15 Bom 89 <i>P. P. v. Sh. v</i> (1913) 4 Cal W N 3 54 I C 9 |
|  | (o) <i>M. P. v. Z. m. d. v. C. L. d. v. N. e. A. N. a. d.</i> <i>I. o. y</i> (1945) 51 I A 93 51 Cal 631 60 I C 1 (4) 4 P. 144                                    |
|  | (p) <i>I. d. v. P. d. v. P. d. v. P. d.</i> (1935) 15 All 30  |



- (2) that neither an obiter dictum nor a mere expression of opinion in a judgment has the effect of *res judicata* (q)
- (3) that when a Court merely for the purpose of preventing a remand records its finding on an issue not necessary for the decision of the case it does not operate as *res judicata* (r)

See notes Examination of pleadings and judgment on p 39 above

A matter will be said to have been heard and finally decided notwithstanding that the former suit was disposed of in any of the following ways —

- (i) *ex parte* (s) or
- (ii) by dismissal under O 17 r 3 (t) or
- (iii) by a decree on an award (u) or
- (iv) by oath tendered under s 8 of the Indian Oaths Act 1873 (v)
- (i) by dismissal owing to plaintiff's failure to adduce evidence at the hearing (w)

The decision in the former suit must have been one on the merits — In order that a matter may be said to have been heard and finally decided the decision in the former suit must have been one on the merits. Hence it could not be said of a matter that it was heard and finally decided if the former suit was dismissed —

- (i) for want of jurisdiction (x) or
- (ii) for default of plaintiff's appearance under O 9 r 8 (y) [but a fresh suit on the same cause of action may be barred under O 9 r 9] or
- (iii) on the ground of non joinder of parties (z) or misjoinder of parties (a) or multifariousness (b) or on the ground that the suit was badly framed (c) or on the ground of a technical mistake (d) or
- (ii) for failure on the part of the plaintiff to produce probate or letters of administration or succession certificate when the same is required by law to entitle the plaintiff to a decree (e) or
- (i) for failure to furnish security for costs under O 20 r 2 (f) or
- (ii) on the ground of improper valuation (g) or for failure to pay additional court fees on a plaint which was undervalued (h) or

(q) *De ar lonis De alonits* (1881) 4 M 1  
134 *Ja ant n n Luff us* (1894)  
All 600 *A l l lupp* (1894)  
8 M d 7 *Mol v F D ad* (1890)  
45 All 843 *Ramaya v At m l* (19 4)  
45 M 1 L J 95 81 ( 9 1 ( 4 ) A M  
604 *Rekhab Das Vt v d n* (19 3)  
45 All 466 46 74 I C 6 6 ( 3 ) A A  
49 [Lvid n e Act 18 2 109]  
(r) *P t h v Bla ti* (19 4) 4 M d L J 3  
8 I C 49 ( 4 ) A M 833  
(s) *Moth d n B* (1899) 16 C 1 00  
(t) *I e k l a c a l n Mahat Ishma a* (1894)  
10 M d 1 *Sh l Sat b v M f l*  
(1890) 19 M d 510 *H g Jh r*  
(1918) 0 All 590 46 I C 390  
(u) *Gyankat al v Sakhar* (189 ) 1 Bom  
46  
(v) *Ah ved v Mo din* (1901) 4 Mad 444  
*Sa y v v Arancaro* (1913) 36 M d  
3 18 I C 53  
(w) *W t n v C lector of R j halve* (1869) 13  
M f A 160 *Kartuk v S dhar* (1886)  
1 C 1 63  
(x) *Lak h an v R hanira* (1881) Bom  
48 I A 18 *I t d v Tulja* (1879)  
3 B m 3 *Blukta das v Lall bla*  
(189 ) 1 Bom 56 *Ra m Gor dha v*  
*M ng v R m* (1883) 13 C L R 83  
*Abd l A d Doolanbibi* (1913) 3 Bom  
63 0 I C 530 See also Evidence  
Act 18 s 44

(y) *Ralla J rehad v Lal Yahab* (1890) 1 I A  
1 0 13 All 3 *Cl and hoir v I rtob*  
*Si gh* (1893) 16 C 1 99 1 I A  
156 *Panchandra v Va haclarya*  
(1900) 4 Bom 251 54 As to suits  
for partition see *Bisheela Das v R m*  
*I a ad* (1908) 25 All 6 *M lon M f n*  
*v Ba ka ts Voth* (1906) 10 Cal W N  
819 *Padihe v Jai Mul hani* (10 4) 46  
All 8 0 8 1 80 I C 033 ( 4 ) A A  
90  
(z) *S h e a g S t am* (1897) 4 Cal 616  
41 A 0 *Sa l a v D l* (19 )  
43 Mad L J 57 3 I C 491 ( )  
A M 59 *Jata Voth Am lja* (19 7)  
46 C L J 118 104 I C 5 6 ( 7 ) A C 794  
(a) *M t an m d v bian* (1898) 8 All 9  
(b) *Palt h Singh v Lachm* (18 4) 13 B L R  
App 3  
(c) *Deodar v Lala S osaran* (18 8) 3 Cal  
L R 39  
(d) *J l d la v Amb la Prasad* (191 ) 2 Pat  
L J 313 39 I C 1 6  
(e) *Peltape umal v Murujand* (189 ) 18 Mad  
466  
(f) *Har ram v L l d* (190 ) 6 Bom 837  
(g) *D l l h v Var j m* (1863) 4 Bom H C  
A C 110  
(h) *Iruva v S tappa* (1911) 3 Bom 33 7 I C  
95 *M h mmad v v dia* (1886)  
8 All 5



not liable to be evicted. The finding in the first suit that the land was not majhes land does not operate as *res judicata* so as to preclude *B* from raising the same contention in the subsequent suit the reason being that *A*'s suit having been dismissed *B* could not have appealed from the finding that the land was not majhes land. The Court having found in the first suit that *A* had not given notice to quit it was not necessary for the determination of the suit to decide whether the land was majhes land or not. The first suit was dismissed in spite of the finding in *A*'s favour that the land was not majhes land. *Thakur Magundoo v Thakur Mahadeo* (1891) 18 Cal 647. *Aundo v Bidhoo* (1886) 13 Cal 17.

Suppose that in the above illustration *B* had not raised the defence that the land was majhes land in the first suit. Would he be precluded from raising that defence in the second suit on the ground that he *might and ought* to have raised that defence in the first suit? No the reason being that when a point of defence that has been actually raised and disallowed cannot operate as *res judicata* against a defendant it certainly cannot operate as such when it has not been raised at all though it *might and ought* to have been raised (g).

(2) *A* sues *B* for possession of certain lands after the expiry of a lease granted by him to *B*. *B* pleads (1) an occupancy right and (2) that the suit is premature as he [*B*] had a right of renewal. The trial judge finds that there was no occupancy right but that the suit was premature and the suit is dismissed. *A* files an appeal to the High Court. *B* files a cross objection to the finding against him namely that he had no occupancy right. The High Court affirms the decree on the ground that the suit was premature and upon the cross objection affirms the finding that *B* had no occupancy right. After some years *A* after giving notice to *B* again sues *B* for possession. *B* again pleads an occupancy right. *A* contends that the finding of the High Court in the previous suit that *B* had no occupancy right is *res judicata*. Held by the Judicial Committee that the finding is not *res judicata* the reason being that *B* having succeeded on the plea that the suit was premature he had no occasion to go further as to the finding against him. *Midnapur Zamindari Co Ltd v Naresch Narayan Roy* (19-1) 48 I A 49 48 Cal 660 60 I C 833. The decision to the contrary in *Mota v Lital* (1916) 40 Bom 66 36 I C 74 is not good law.

(3) In a suit by *A* against *B* for damages for not removing filth from *A*'s land *B* contends (1) that no notice was given as required by the Bengal Municipal Act and (2) that he was not bound to remove the filth. The suit is dismissed upon two grounds namely that no notice was given as required by the Act and that *B* was not bound to remove the filth. *A* then sues *B* for damages for not removing filth during a subsequent period after giving notice to *B*. *B* contends that he is not liable to remove the filth and that the question of his liability is *res judicata* by reason of its having been decided against *A* in the first suit. *A* contends that the question is not *res judicata* for the Court having decided in the former suit that the suit must fail for want of notice it was not necessary for the Court to decide the issue as to *B*'s liability to remove the filth. Held by the Calcutta High Court that the question is *res judicata* and *A* cannot raise it again in the second suit. *Peary v Ambica* (1897) 24 Cal 900. The Allahabad High Court would seem to take a different view. *Shib Charan v Raghu* (1895) 17 All 174 190.

**RULE II**—If the plaintiff's suit is decreed in its entirety no issue decided against the plaintiff can be *res judicata* for the plaintiff cannot appeal from a finding on any such issue the decree being wholly in his favour (r). But every issue decided against

(g) *Abdullah v Kh* a (1908) 3 Bom 31

(r) *Ra go v Mudirappa* (1899) 23 Bom 296

*Abdullah v Ojasmah* (19-9) 56 Cal 639

the defendant is res judicata for the defendant can appeal from a finding on such issue the decree being against him (s)

### Illustration

*A* alleging that he is the adopted son of *X* sues *B* to recover certain property granted to him by *X* under a deed and forming part of the estate of *X*. The Court finds that *A* is not the adopted son of *X* but that he is entitled to the property under the deed and a decree is passed for *A*. The finding that *A* is not the adopted son of *X* will not operate as res judicata in a subsequent suit between *A* and *B* in which the question of adoption is again put in issue for the decree being in favour of *A*. *A* could not have appealed from that finding. The Court having found that *A* was entitled to the property under the deed the finding on the question of adoption was not necessary to the determination of the suit. The decree far from being based on the finding as to adoption was made in spite of it. *Rango v Mudiyappa* (1899) 23 Bom 296.

Finality' of decree in redemption suits—If the mortgagor files a suit for redemption and no order for foreclosure extinguishing the right of redemption in default of payment is made the preliminary decree for redemption does not have that effect. The right of redemption continues until a decree absolute for foreclosure is passed ( ) or the sale is confirmed (u). In such a case there is a conflict of decisions as to whether the mortgagor can enforce his right of redemption by a second suit after a preliminary decree on which no further proceedings have been taken. According to Allahabad, Bombay and Lahore decisions he can (v); on the other hand according to Calcutta and Madras decisions he cannot (w). But though according to the Allahabad and Bombay High Courts a second suit for redemption is not barred, the same High Courts have held that any matter decided in the earlier suit, e.g. the amount of the mortgage debt, cannot be reopened in the subsequent suit (x).

In the converse case of the mortgagee not taking further proceedings on his decree for sale there is also a conflict of decision as to whether the mortgagor if he does not redeem under the decree may file a redemption suit. The Bombay High Court says that he can (y) but the Madras High Court holds that he is barred by this section ( )

Where a decree is appealed from it is the appellate decree that must be looked to to determine the question of res judicata and not the decree appealed from—a decision *liable to appeal* may be final within the meaning of this section *until* the appeal is preferred. But once the appeal is filed the decision loses its character of finality and what was once res judicata again becomes res sub judice that is matter under judicial inquiry. The appeal destroys the finality of the decision; the decree of the lower Court is superseded by the decree of the appellate Court and it is the latter decree that should be looked to to determine the question of res judicata (a).

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| (a) Barjorj v <i>Sh ipatpra adjs</i> (19-7) 9 B m<br>L R -1 1001 1 1033 (7) A B 145  | (w) <i>Si a v Nu d</i> (14-1) 18 (1 13) 1 la<br>p tt v <i>oll ba</i> (18-1) 1 M 1 301   |
| (t) <i>Som sh v La kshatna</i> (1900) 7 Cal 0  | ( ) <i>P mj v Pan ta path</i> (1919) 43 Lom 334<br>49 I C 894 (1 1) 1 gh 14 S ngl v   |
| ( ) <i>Fa f P g Na n</i> (190 ) 9 All 339<br>341 A 10  | (j) <i>P a Bh g h id</i> (13-1) 139 B m 41<br>I C 43  |
| (e) <i>St a j m Madhe Lal</i> (190 ) 4 All 44<br>(1 L) <i>Pi a f im v f i ng</i> (19 ) 44<br>All 30 63 I C 187 ( ) A A 37<br><i>Mad d Bez m</i> 7 <i>fi l la m</i> (13 6)<br>45 All 1 ) I C 60 (26) A 4 0<br><i>I at noth v gh v Shro r tap dngl</i><br>(19 9) 7 All L J 61 <i>Lamj</i><br><i>Pand at?</i> (1910) 43 Lom 334 49 I C<br>894 (1 L) <i>la cla trau B ibhim</i> (19 3)<br>Lom L R 11 I C 315 (3) A 1<br>1 H na v <i>Sh l</i> (19 3) 4 Lom<br>( ) I C 5 6 (3) A B 300 Ar<br>( ) <i>B v gh</i> (19 4) 5 Lah 31 84 I C<br>67 ( ) A I 31 <i>vala Ram</i> CA s j<br><i>L l</i> (1910) 3 All 1 51 C 69 | (f) <i>P g Na r s</i> (1910) 33 M d 896 3<br>I C 30 <i>Ell jom</i> 7 <i>g ac</i> (19 6)<br>4) M 11 611 96 I C 607 (6)<br>A M 816<br>(t) <i>Si o r r v t r</i> (18-1) 4 C d 616 4<br>I A 0 <i>lod I A v</i> ( ) I D (1914)<br>45 Cal 44 44 I A 14 4 I C 9 5<br><i>lcuru v r</i> (18-1) 6 F m 110<br>( ) d <i>l ho</i> (13-1) 11 C L R -<br><i>r la v G r ja</i> (191 ) 32 Cal 9 14<br>I C 9 <i>all a n v A</i> I L<br>(1- ) 11 All 148 CA 7 I L v<br>1 I t Ar (1916) 30 M 1 L J<br>39 33 I C 9 |

*A* sues *B* for damages for cutting and removing trees from his land. The suit is dismissed on the grounds (1) that the land did not belong to *A* and (2) that *B* did not cut the trees. *A* appeals from the decree on both these grounds but the appeal is dismissed on the ground that *A* had failed to prove that *B* had cut the trees. Note that the appellate Court does not decide the question of *A*'s title. *A* then sues *B* for possession of the land claiming that the land belongs to him. *B* contends that the suit is barred as res judicata as the first Court had found in the former suit that the land did not belong to *A*. The suit is not barred for the question of *A*'s title became res sub judice when the appeal was preferred and it did not become res judicata as the appellate Court did not adjudicate upon that question. But a judgment of an appellate Court will operate as res judicata as regards all findings of the lower Court which though not referred to in it are adopted by a decree which grants a relief that is possible only on such findings (b). An issue again is res judicata where the judgment of the appellate Court shows that the issue was treated as material and was decided although the decree passed merely affirms the decree of the lower Court which did not deal with the issue (c).

The Rangoon High Court has held that a decree may be final as regards a party *A* who has not appealed although another party *B* has appealed if *A* has not been made a party by *B* in his appeal. The mere possibility that the Appellate Court might make *A* a party and proceed under O 41 r 33 does not make it less final (d).

**Consent decree and estoppel**—The present section does not apply in terms to consent decrees for it cannot be said in the case of such decrees that the matters in issue between the parties have been heard and finally decided within the meaning of this section (e). A consent decree however has to all intents and purpose the same effect as res judicata as a decree passed in *in iudicio* (f). It raises an estoppel as much as a decree passed in *in iudicio* (g). So long therefore as a consent decree stands it is not open to either party thereto to give it the go by even if it contains clauses that are bad in law (h). A consent decree however is a mere creature of the agreement on which it is founded and it may be set aside on any ground which would invalidate an agreement between the parties (i). But unless all the parties agree an application cannot be made to the Court of first instance in the original suit to set aside the decree (j) though it may be done in the case of an interlocutory order (k). See notes to s 96 Procedure for setting aside consent decree.

**Explanation V Relief claimed but not expressly granted**—If a relief is claimed in a suit but is not expressly granted in the decree it will be deemed to have been refused and the matter in respect of which the relief is claimed will be res judicata.

- (b) *Aa a m an v Fan om m* (1905) 2 Mad 338; *Gokil v Sri* (1904) 6 Bom L R 98; *M. Ramani v Secret ry of State for India* (1916) 33 M d 10 1208 81 C 817.
- (c) *Mid ap v Z m dary C. Ltd. Varsh* *Aa a m an v Sri* (19 4) 51 I A 93 1 Cal 831 80 I C 87 7 (4) A PC 141 *v. vab v Janj ba* (1900) 4 Lah L J 449.
- (d) *Ch k l g m v M. g Tia O* (19 6) 4 Rang 8 9 I C 104 (46) A R 1.
- (e) *M. l v Aa a ty* (1906) 30 Bom 39 404. *B t ace Blawbanker v Morarj* (191) 36 Bom 83 at p 8 10 I C 3 where it is said that in the case even of a consent decree the matter is in issue in the suit not but he said to have been heard and finally decided. If so why is it said in the judgment (p 36) that a consent decree is to all intents and purposes the same effect as res judicata?

- (f) *Bhawal ker v Morarj* (1911) 38 Bom 83 246 1 I C 63. *In re South America v Mex can Co* (189) 11 Ch 37.
- (g) *Verol v v i phar* (1897) 24 Cal 18 37. *Ishminbankar v v i v m* (1900) 4 B m *Rajm Funn v Tia a* (191) 35 Mad 9 I C 875. *Tir vambata v M. mulla a ba* (1917) 40 Mad 17 189 34 I C 57 9. *ad v v i v d n d a* (19 8) 43 C L J 115 94 I C 844 (8) A C 67. *Durga P ad v v i v d n d a* (19 9) 4 Luck 181 115 I C 94 (9) A O 63.
- (h) *Cow j. I a d s* (1911) 3 Bom 3 1 11 I C 984.
- (i) *H d i e r f i d Bank g Co v Henry Lister d Son* (189) 10 Ch 3. *Gre t North West Central Rail ay v Chalibous* [1899] A C 114.
- (j) *H m m on v I m y* (1) 2 Ves Sen 488. *St r l v Harris* (1871) 19 W R 18 1811 11 ac rth v B l d i g (1896) 1 Ch 63.
- (k) *Mil v v Howell* (79) 11 Ch D 63.

Thus where in a suit by a mortgagee (1) for a money decree and (2) in default of payment for sale of the mortgaged property the mortgagee was content to take a money decree only it was held that a subsequent suit by him on failure of the mortgagor to satisfy the decree to have the amount of the mortgage debt paid to him by the sale of the property was barred as *res judicata*. The relief as to sale having been claimed by the mortgagee but not having been expressly granted in the former suit, must be deemed to have been refused so as to bar the subsequent suit (1).

**Liberty to bring a fresh suit**—Where a former suit between the same parties in the same Court and for the same relief results in a decree of dismissal but the judgment leaves it open to the plaintiff to bring a fresh suit and leaves open untouched and undecided all matters affecting the rights of the parties the decree does not constitute *res judicata* as such matters cannot be said to have been heard and finally decided within the meaning of this section (m). But if the Court has in the particular circumstances of a case no power to reserve liberty to a party to bring a fresh suit, the subsequent suit may be barred as *res judicata* notwithstanding the liberty to bring a fresh suit. Thus in *Watson v Collector of Rajshahye* (n) the former suit was dismissed for the plaintiff's failure to produce evidence but a direction was given that the plaintiff could institute a fresh proceeding as if no suit had been brought. Nevertheless the Privy Council held that the subsequent suit was barred by *res judicata* for the reservation was of no effect. Again *Fateh Singh v Jagannath Balsh* (o) recently decided by the Judicial Committee is a case directly on this point. In that case the plaintiffs brought a suit to set aside a gift made by a Hindu widow out of her husband's estate they alleged that they were presumptive heirs. The widow died pending the suit. After her death the plaintiffs applied to amend the plaint by setting up a family custom of inheritance. Upon that application failing and the plaintiffs admitting that apart from the alleged custom they could not succeed the trial Court dismissed the suit but gave them liberty to file a fresh suit for possession. Subsequently the plaintiffs brought another suit to recover from parties to the former suit a share in the property basing their claim upon family custom. It was held that the suit was barred by *res judicata* since the custom was a matter which might and ought to have been set up in the former suit and further that the trial Court having dismissed the suit it had no power under O 23 r 1 (1) to give liberty to bring a fresh suit.

**When Explanation V applies**—Explanation V does not apply unless the relief claimed was (1) *substantial relief* and (2) it was such as it is *obligatory* on a Court to grant. We proceed to consider these conditions in order.

1 *The relief claimed must have been substantial and not merely auxiliary*—A sues L (1) to recover her share in the estate of D claiming the same as D's widow and (2) for a declaration that she was lawfully married to D a fact which B had denied. A decree is made by consent awarding Rs 50,000 to A in full satisfaction of her claim against the estate of D. The decree does not contain any declaration as to A's marriage with D. This circumstance will not bar a subsequent suit by A as D's widow against B to recover her share in the estate of a deceased relative for the relief claimed in the former suit in respect of the legality of marriage was not claimed as a specific or substantial relief. It was auxiliary to the principal relief in respect of her share in the estate of D (p).

(l) *Shab v Chandra Mohan* (1906) 33 Cal 849  
 1 A 111 v 1 A 111 (1903) 31 All 13  
 11 C 6  
 (m) *I r t r v G r o d a G r* (1899) 61 A  
 1 All 0 *Dub L t Ishri I sand*  
 (18 8) 2 All 58 86 588 *Dec J u t a*  
 1 th (191) 1 R no 16 p 09 1  
 1 C 930 The result is the same if the  
 Court has expressly excluded a matter  
 from decision though liberty to bring a

fresh suit is not refused *Ram Chandra v*  
*I aru d i* (1884) 10 Cal 86 *Madan*  
*Mohan v I r o o a h* (1918) P R no 0  
 p 3 411 (8 8)  
 (n) (1863) 13 M 1 A 100 1 W R 43 P C  
 (o) (19) 1 A 100 4 All 158 91 P C  
 20 ( ) 4 P L 5 5 A L a i v *Bahad*  
 (1883) 11 All 15 17 B)  
 (p) *Fatmadad v A d h b a i* (1 2) 13 Bom. 42,  
 49

(7) *The relief claimed must have been one which the Court is bound to grant and not one which it is discretionary with the Court to grant*—Cases under this head relate principally to mesne profits. It was enacted by sec 244 of the Code of 1882 that nothing in this section shall be deemed to bar a separate suit for mesne profits accruing between the institution of the first suit and the execution of the decree therein where such profits are not dealt with by such decree. That clause has been omitted in the present Code and under O 20 r 12 mesne profits subsequent to the date of the suit are to be ascertained and provided for in the final decree.

*A sues B for possession and for mesne profits both prior and subsequent to the suit. A decree is passed in A's favour for possession. The decree is silent as to mesne profits.*

In the case put above there is no doubt as to mesne profits prior to the date of the suit that the plaintiff having claimed a relief in respect thereof and the relief not having been granted by the decree the matter is *res judicata* and A cannot institute a fresh suit for such profits (q).

As to mesne profits subsequent to the date of the suit it was held in cases under the Code of 1881 that it being discretionary with the Court to grant such relief the fact of the decree being silent as to such mesne profits did not operate as a bar to a fresh suit (r). In cases under the present Code it has been held by the High Courts of Madras (s) and Allahabad (t) that where in a suit for possession and for past and future mesne profits the Court gives a decree for mesne profits up to the date of the suit and says nothing about subsequent mesne profits a fresh suit to recover subsequent mesne profits is not barred under the present Code any more than under the Code of 1882. In the Madras case Wallis C.J. said: "The word relief in the Explanation means relief arising out of a cause of action which had accrued at the date of the suit and on which the suit was brought and did not include relief such as mesne profits accruing after the date of suit as to which no cause of action had then arisen but which the Court was nevertheless expressly empowered to grant. The Explanation having been reproduced in exactly the same words the presumption is that it was intended to have precisely the same effect. I do not find any sufficient indication to rebut this presumption in the fact that sections 211 and 212 of the old Code were amalgamated to form Order XX rule 12. The change introduced by the new rule is that the award of mesne profits in all cases is to be by preliminary decree and that when ascertained they are to be embodied in a final decree whereas under sections 211 and 212 they were to be ascertained in execution. This change does not appear to me to affect the construction of Explanation V to section 11 nor do I think is affected by the omission in section 47 of the new Code of the proviso to the corresponding section 44 of the old Code. On the other hand it has been held by the High Court of Bombay (u) that where a decree is silent as to future mesne profits claimed in a suit a fresh suit for such mesne profits is barred under Explanation V to this section the reason given being that the omission of the clause which appeared in section 244 of the old Code indicated that a separate suit should not be allowed for such mesne profits."

Where a plaintiff in a mortgage suit contains a prayer for a personal decree but the preliminary decree is silent about it the plaintiff is not precluded from applying for a personal decree under O 34 r 6 for the balance of the mortgage claim after the sale of the mortgaged property as such a decree could not properly be passed until after sale (z).

(q) *Juba v. Durga* (1894) 1 C 120 K ch v  
*Enl. hons. m. j.* (1901) Born 115  
 (r) *Moon M. h. n. v. eral ry. State* (1890) 1  
 C 1064 Il. acy. *Sut. r.* (189) 19  
 B m. 3 *I. i. D. i. v. Mad.* (1893)  
 1 All 4 *Il. j. v. Pad. a. i.* (190)  
 3 C 1118 h. pp. *v. i. n. l. a. t. a. r. a. v.*  
 (190) 1 M d L J 46

(s) *Do. v. Durga* 1 C 120 K ch v  
 1894 1 C 120 K ch v  
 (t) *M. j. m. i. l. a. d. R. n.*  
 (1818) 49 All 3 411 C 85  
 ( ) *Afm. m. Far akra* (190) 44 Bom 0 1  
 591 C 419  
 ( ) *Go. d. s. m. v. Kandancami* (1907) 53  
 Mad L J 439

**Section not exhaustive**—The section is not exhaustive of the circumstances in which an issue may be res judicata (u) The plea of res judicata rests on the principle that there should be finality in litigation and the plea still remains apart from the limited provisions of the Code (x) In *Ram Airpal v Rup Kuari* (y) the Privy Council referred to the binding effect of an interlocutory judgment even in execution proceedings as depending not on the section of the Code but on general principles of law That decision is an authority for the proposition that an issue may be res judicata though it may not have been decided in a former suit It has accordingly been held by the Privy Council that a decision on a dispute between rival claimants as to compensation deposited in Court under sec 31 (2) of the Land Acquisition Act I of 1894 operates as res judicata in a subsequent suit between the same parties Their Lordships said It has been suggested that the decision was not in a former suit but whether this were so or not makes no difference for it has recently been pointed out by the Board in *Hook v Administrator General of Bengal* ( ) that the principle which prevents the same case being twice litigated is of general application and is not limited by the specific words of the Code in this respect (a) A decision in an administration suit whether a gift once was valid may be res judicata in a subsequent proceeding in the same suit (b) An order passed after a contentious proceeding for probate of a will may be res judicata between the parties (c) A decision on a question of relationship in a proceeding on an application for letters of administration after trial of the issue is binding as res judicata in a subsequent suit between the same parties (d) Again the expression former suit does not exclude the application of the rule when suits are tried together nor to interlocutory orders in the same suit or orders in execution proceedings The application of the rule to suits tried together has been discussed on pp 36 37 above

**Orders in execution proceedings**—The leading case on the application of res judicata to interlocutory orders and to execution proceedings is *Ram Airpal v Rup Kuari* (e) decided by the Judicial Committee in 1883 The principle of that decision is that s 11 is not exhaustive and that the principle of res judicata still remains apart from the limited provisions of the Code Prior to that decision the Courts in India generally held that sec 13 of the Code of 1882 (corresponding with the present section) was not applicable to execution proceedings The Judicial Committee held that though the section in terms did not apply to execution proceedings the principle of res judicata applied to such proceedings The question in that case was whether a decision in the course of execution proceedings that the decree awarding to its true construction awarded future mesne profits operated as res judicata so as to preclude the Court from trying the question over again at a subsequent stage of the proceedings The High Court of Allahabad held that it did not Their Lordships of the Privy Council held that it did Their Lordships said —

The matter decided by Mr Probyn was not decided in a former suit but in a proceeding of which the application in which the orders reversed by the High Court were made was merely a continuation It was as binding between the parties and those claiming under them as an interlocutory judgment in a suit is binding upon the parties in every proceeding in that suit or as a final judgment in a suit is binding upon them in carrying the judgment into execution *The binding force of such a judgment depends*

- (u) *Ma v Kaidas* (1834) 19 Bom R 6  
(x) *Hook v Administrator General of Bengal* (1911) 45 I A 18 48 Cal 423 60 I C 631  
(y) (1881) 11 I A 37 6 All 69  
(z) 48 I A 187 48 Cal 492 60 I C 631  
(a) *Ram Airpal v Rup Kuari* (1903) 49 I A 18 4 M d 30 6 I C 44 ( ) A 1 C 80 See also *Wadhwa v Fardol* (1914) 35 I A 10 46 Cal 466 114 I C 6 ( ) A L 1

- (b) 48 I A 187 48 Cal 499 60 I C 631  
B d a B H b b M rican Voo din  
(1903) A C 615 6 J  
(c) *V J d l i M a K r t l a* (1903)  
31 I A 156 *Kalpana d* (1914) 35 I A 10 46 Cal 466 114 I C 6  
I t 1 a d r (1914) 48  
Mad L J 33 3 I C 41 ( ) A M  
5 8  
(d) *M J H t v M H t a* (1913) 1 Ran  
a 61 I C 44 ( ) A R  
(e) (1883) 11 I A 3 6 All 269



not upon sec 13 Act V of 1877 [s 11 of the present Code] but upon general principles of law. If it were not binding there would be no end to litigation. The parties were bound by the decision of Mr Probyn who whether right or wrong had decided that it did [that is that the decree awarded future mesne profits] a decision which not having been appealed was final and binding upon the parties and those claiming under them.

The ratio decidendi of *Ram Airpal's* case is that if a particular construction is put on a decree in proceedings on a former application for execution it is not competent to the Court to treat that construction as erroneous and put another construction on it at a subsequent stage of the execution proceedings (f). Parties cannot raise a second time in the same suit or execution proceeding an issue that has already been determined (g). Thus the Judicial Committee held in *Mungul Pershad v Griya Kant* (h) that a decision on an application for execution after hearing both the parties that the application is not barred by the law of limitation though erroneous is binding on the parties in subsequent proceedings in execution. Their Lordships said: The order was made by a Court having competent jurisdiction to try and determine whether the decree was barred by limitation. No appeal was preferred against it. Admitting for the sake of argument but only for the sake of argument that the decree was barred when the application was made still his order though erroneous was valid not having been reversed. Similarly a decision that an application for execution is barred by limitation though erroneous is conclusive between the parties and the question cannot be re-tried on a subsequent application for execution (i).

The principle laid down in *Ram Airpal's* case referred to above is that when a question has been raised in an execution proceeding and decided the decision even if erroneous is binding on the parties and the same question cannot be re-tried in a subsequent proceeding in execution in other words that the principle of res judicata is applicable to proceedings in execution. This principle has been followed by the High Courts of India (j). But this principle does not apply unless the parties to the subsequent proceeding were also parties to the former proceeding (k) and had litigated under the same title (l). Nor does it apply unless the former application was heard and decided. Hence an order dismissing an application for execution for default of appearance (m) or allowing it to be struck off for the present (n) or allowing it to be withdrawn with liberty to present a fresh application (o) is no bar to a fresh application for execution. Similarly where an application for execution under O 21 r 32 is dismissed on the ground that the decree holder had not given the judgment debtor an opportunity of obeying it a second application for execution after such opportunity had been given is not barred as res judicata (p). Further the decision in the former application must have been necessary for the determination of the application. Thus if A applies for execution and B pleads limitation and neither party appearing on the date fixed for the hearing of the

(f) *Ben F m v V. H. Mal* (188) 11 I A 181 7 All 107 *Senkata aramsha v Papa* 1 m h (1896) 19 Mad 4

(g) *Behara Lal v Majid Ali* (1901) 4 All 139 *Bhawmha v Varanasi* (1893) 23 Bom 36 *Doore v C. dasamaj* (191) 40 Mad L J 56 63 I C 189

(h) (188) 8 I A 123 8 Cal 51 *Paya Ramnath v El Sam Teras* (191) 48 I A 45 40 Mad L J 19 53 I C 840 *Sheroaj v I me ha* (190) 4 All 3 *D. this a d Lond B k v Ork rd* (187) 41 A 1 3 Cal 4 is n t i n e o n l i t n t w i t h t h l a t r d e c i s i o n s . S e e M r L e i t h s r e p l y a s r e p r e s e n t i n g C l o n p 5

(i) *M. J. Ath v I. I. H. A. (184) 6 Bom 4* *B. Icy v P. S. H. Ch. nd r* (1843) 9 C. 1

(j) *Kop. r. Ch. d. v. Ka. h. m. Lal* (193) 4 All 3 41 C 513 (4) A A 34 in app

from (19) 44 All 130 65 I C 29 (2) A A 24 [de l i n a s t o w h i c h p e r u a r e h a b l e i n e x e c u t i o n a d w h a t p r o p e r t y i s h a l l t o b e t a k e n i n c u s t o m l D o o r e s v G o t a f i w a m i (101) 40 Mad L J 56 63 I C 189 i p p l i c a t i o n f o r e x e c u t i o n t o w r o n C o u r t]

(k) *G. ana. bal v. Par. th* (189) 15 Mad 47 49 *H. ar. ndra Lal v. Sh. m. Lal* (1900) 7 Cal 10

(l) *Go. rmo v. Jugut Cha. dr* (1890) 17 Cal 57 63

(m) *Lal. km. bai v. Pa. ji* (1909) 31 Bom L R 400 116 I C 00 (9) A B 17

(n) *Thaku. Pershad v. Sheikh. Fakirullah* (189) 1 I A 44 17 All 108

(o) *H. r. v. Lam. ab. i* (1899) 23 Bom 3

(p) *K. Por. B. Mah. t. v. I. ro. n. o. Coomar* (1894) 21 I A 89 1 Cal 84

objection *A*'s application is dismissed and *B*'s objection is disallowed *B* is not precluded from raising the plea of limitation on a fresh application for execution made by *A* the reason being that *A*'s application being dismissed for default it was not necessary for the Court to decide the question of limitation (*q*)

Where a decree holder applies for execution and the judgment debtor being entitled and having an opportunity to raise a plea in bar of execution e.g. a plea of limitation fails to do so and an order is made on the application the principle of Explanation IV applies and the judgment debtor is precluded from raising that plea at a subsequent stage in the execution proceedings (*r*) Thus where *A* applies for execution of a decree against *B* and an order is made directing execution to issue *B* cannot in a subsequent application for execution raise the plea that the first application for execution was barred by limitation (*s*) In one case the Allahabad Court held that the principle of Explanation IV does not apply to a case where a judgment debtor omits to object to the amount erroneously set forth in the application for execution and that he is entitled to raise the objection at a later stage of the execution proceedings (*t*) This decision however may be supported on the ground that the Court had inherent power to rectify the error The undermentioned cases (*u*) contain observations to the effect that Explanation IV should not be extended to execution proceedings and that an order made in execution proceedings should not have the force of res judicata unless the point raised in the subsequent proceedings was actually raised in the former proceedings and decided But these observations are obiter And so are the observations in a Madras case that Explanation V does not apply to proceedings in execution (*v*)

*Ex parte orders*—An ex parte order in execution proceedings passed after issue of notice and after the Court is satisfied that the notice was served is on general principles binding as res judicata (*u*) But the order will not have the force of res judicata unless the notice clearly specifies the nature of the claim (*x*)

*Consent orders*—An order made by consent of parties in an execution proceeding is as binding on the parties as an order after a contentious trial (*y*)

*Application for amendment of decree*—Though an application for amendment of a decree is not a suit within the meaning of this section yet if such an

(*q*) *Rhotanath v Prof Hz* (1901) 8 Cal 1  
*Kashinath v Barich dia* (1883) 1 Bom 408

(*r*) *Vanda Rai v Paqhanan Iin* (188) 7 All 8  
[limitation] *Desai ppa Duniappa*  
(13 0) 44 Bom 1 C 3 9 [limitation]  
*G d geyya Studappa* (19 4) 48  
Bom 614 83 I C 15 (4) 4 B 49  
[limitation] *Prabhul ngappa v f r U*  
(19 0) Bom L P 1389 59 I C 74  
[limitation] *Raghudhar v Kokaran* (19 6)  
1 Luck 171 93 I C 833 (46) A O 291  
*Jaytagiripath v Blau na* (19 3) 47  
Mad 611 80 I C 103 (4) A M 63  
[transfer of decree limitation] *Sherr*  
*8 ngh v Daya Pann* (1821) 13 All  
64 (execution barred under O 3 r 1)  
*Damb r 8 ngh v hal ans ngh* (19 ) 44  
All 350 6 I C 99 (2) A A 7 [decree  
not capable of execution] *Brayal*  
*Alim o* (19 0) 5 Pat L J 633 5 I C  
07 [non service of notice on transferee  
under O 1 r 16] *Taj 8 ngh v J q n*  
*Lal* (1916) 38 All 1 43 35 I C 34  
[validity of transfer of decr.] *Gori da*  
*v Fr k* (13 3) 4 M d L J 1  
I C 397 (3) A M 649 [whether decree  
capable of execution] *Uakund v Saras*  
*re ti* (1919) 29 Cal L J 245 51 I C 98  
[sum for me no p onts] *Madi d v*  
*Sutti* (1918) 35 Mad L J 31 44 I C 4  
[propriety of order of attachment]  
L it *J an c dra v Shri was* (19 )

46 B m 48 68 I C 940 ( ) A B  
38 *Mahade v Trimb khat* (1919) 1  
Bom I R 344 50 I C 97 *Dip Pralash*  
*v Eotra Doo ka Prasad* (19 6) 44 All  
01 90 I C 83 (26) A A 71 [disobe  
dience to decree for injunction]

(*s*) All 48 *supra* 44 Bom 7 s *pro* 49  
Lom 638 *supra* 1 Luck 1 l *sup*

(*t*) *Kalman Si q t J qan Prasad* (191 ) 37 All  
589 0 I C 5 3 See also *Shro Mang l*  
*v Mus mmot Hula* (19 1) 44 All 119

( ) *Prith v J stid* (19 ) 1 P t 593 599  
600 6 I C 6 6 (2) A l 40 G r  
m 1 v *Jugal Chandra* (1930) 1 Cal  
63 S na ada m (1011 ng  
(191 ) 40 Mad 80 33 I C 806  
*v dra a ua Page v r* (191 ) 40 M l  
1016 10 0 33 I C 6 7 directed from in  
*I gl ta v l aran* (19 8) 1 Lu k  
1 1 93 I C 833 (6) A O 91

(*u*) *Vay a i v G j p t* (1901) 4 Mad 681  
(*w*) *Siddha v P n alhan* (1914) 3 M d 46  
4 3 4 6 I C 493 *Lalsh a an v*  
*ha a v* (1901) 1 M d 689

(*x*) *Va a m a v G j at Krish* (190 ) 3 Mad  
3 *Shel L f t v f nch re* (198 )  
11 Bom 3 *Ch d mba am v Tha a a*  
(19 3) 46 Mad 63 4 I C 15 (4)  
A M 1

(*y*) *K i d P m a* (19 0) 4 C l 446 454  
5 I C 149 See also *C entry v Tulshi*  
(1904) 31 Cal 6 —

application is heard and finally decided it will debar a subsequent application for the same purpose upon general principles of law analogous to those of *res judicata* (z)

**Application for review**—Where an application is made for a review of judgment and the application is refused it does not operate as *res judicata* so as to bar a subsequent *suit* for the same relief and on the same grounds as those put forward in the application for review. Neither s 11 nor any doctrine of constructive *res judicata* can rightly be applied to such a case (a)

**Waiver of plea of *res judicata***—The plea of *res judicata* is not one which affects the jurisdiction of the Court. It is a plea in bar which a party may waive. If a party does not raise the plea of *res judicata* it will be deemed to be a matter directly and substantially *laid* and decided against him (b)

**Conflicting decrees**—Where there are two or more conflicting decrees the last decree alone is the effective decree and it is this decree and not any other which can operate as *res judicata* (c)

**Income tax proceedings**—A decision of the Commissioner under s 33 of the Income tax Act 1922 in respect of the assessment for a particular year does not operate as *res judicata* so as to prevent that decision from being re opened in assessments for subsequent years (d)

**12 [New]** Where a plaintiff is precluded by rules from instituting a further suit in respect of any particular cause of action, he shall not be entitled to institute a suit in respect of such cause of action in any Court to which this Code applies

Bar to further suit

**Rules precluding institution of a [further suit in respect of the same cause of action]**—This section is new and is necessitated by the transfer of certain of the provisions of the Code of 1882 to Rules. The following is a list of the Rules that bar a fresh suit in respect of the same cause of action—

- O 2 r 2—Omission to sue in respect of part of a claim
- O 9 r 9—Decree against plaintiff by default bars a fresh suit
- O 27 r 9—Abatement of suit bars a fresh suit
- O 23 r 1—Withdrawal of suit without leave of Court bars a fresh suit

**13 [S 14]** A foreign judgment shall be conclusive as to any matter thereby directly adjudicated upon between the same parties or between parties under whom they or any of them claim litigating under the same title except—

When foreign judgment not conclusive

- (a) where it has not been pronounced by a Court of competent jurisdiction,
- (b) where it has not been given on the merits of the case,

(z) *Lalji v. Ghosh* (1911) 39 C 1  
 (a) *Srinivas v. Tringa* (1913) 40 Cal 541 181 C 444  
 (b) *Motilal v. Sri P. J. Venk. Iyer* (1916) 31 M 1 J 19 *Rajani v. Ajmudd n* (1918) 48 C L J 577 114 I C 19 (9) A C

(c) *R. J. v. Ajmudd n* (1918) 48 C L J 577 114 I C 129 (9) A C 163  
 (d) *Commissioner of Income tax v. Massey & Co. Ltd* (1919) 56 Mad L J 451 115 I C 814 (9) A M 453 [F B]

- (c) where it appears on the face of the proceedings to be founded on an incorrect view of international law or a refusal to recognise the law of British India in cases in which such law is applicable,
- (d) where the proceedings in which the judgment was obtained are opposed to natural justice
- (e) where it has been obtained by fraud,
- (f) where it sustains a claim founded on a breach of any law in force in British India

Alterations in the section—Clause (a) is new. The last clause of sec. 14 of the Act of 1882 has been omitted as to which see note below. How a foreign judgment may be enforced in British India. Other alterations are verbal.

Foreign judgment—The expression foreign judgment is defined in s. 2 as meaning the judgment of a foreign Court that is a Court situate beyond the limits of British India which has no authority in British India and is not established or continued by the Governor General in Council. The present section provides that a foreign judgment may operate as *res judicata* except in the six cases specified in the section and of course in order to so operate the other conditions of sec. 11 must be fulfilled. The foreign Court must be competent to try the suit not only as regards the limits of its jurisdiction and the subject matter of the suit but also with reference to its territorial jurisdiction. So a decision of a Kattiawar Court as to custom of partition will not be *res judicata* in a suit for partition between the same parties in British territory. (f) In matters of foreign judgments the Courts here are guided by very much the same principles as those adopted by the Courts of England. An act of State is not a judgment and it cannot therefore have the effect of *res judicata*. Thus it has been held that an order of the Political Agent of Meywar and the Peshwa of Udepore deposing a high priest from his *gadi* is not a foreign judgment but an act of State and it cannot therefore operate as *res judicata*. (h)

How a foreign judgment may be enforced in British India.—The judgment of a Court of British India can only be enforced by proceedings in execution. A foreign judgment however may be enforced by proceedings in execution in specified cases only (s. 44). In other cases a foreign judgment can only be enforced upon the judgment. That is to say if A has obtained a decree for Rs. 5000 in a French Court at Pondicherry and if B has got no property in France to satisfy the decree but has got property in Bombay A may bring a suit in Bombay to recover the amount of the judgment. The suit must be brought within six years from the date of the judgment (i) and if a decree is passed in favour of A he may proceed to execute it by attachment and sale of B's property in India (s. 44).

It was at one time doubtful whether a suit could be maintained in India upon the judgment of a Court of a Native State in India or whether the judgment upon the original cause of action. The Madras High Court held that a suit could be maintained on the judgment. (j) The Bombay High Court held that a suit could be maintained on the judgment. (k)

(e) *Indra Prastha* (1911) Lah 10 63 I C 387  
(f) *P. Th. v. P. Th.* (1903) 6 Pom L R 94. *Indra Prastha* (1911) 13 B M 4  
(g) *U. Th. v. U. Th.* (1911) 13 B M 114

(h) *U. Th. v. U. Th.* (1911) 13 B M 114  
(i) *U. Th. v. U. Th.* (1911) 13 B M 114  
(j) *U. Th. v. U. Th.* (1911) 13 B M 114  
(k) *U. Th. v. U. Th.* (1911) 13 B M 114

maintainable<sup>(l)</sup> and that the only remedy was by way of suit on the original cause of action. The general rule is that a Court which entertains a suit on a foreign judgment cannot institute an inquiry into the merits of the original claim or the propriety of the decision<sup>(h)</sup>. The Bombay High Court was apprehensive that a suit on the judgment of a Native State Court might lead to miscarriage of justice as judicial inquiries in Native States are not ordinarily conducted with intelligence and integrity. To enforce the view of the Madras High Court and to remove the apprehensions expressed in the Bombay judgments a clause was added to sec 14 of the Code of 1882 by sec 5 of Act 7 of 1888 to make it clear on the one hand that a suit was maintainable on the judgment of a Court of a Native State or any other Court in Asia or Africa<sup>(m)</sup> and on the other hand to provide that in such a suit the British Indian Court should not be precluded from inquiry into the merits of the case<sup>(n)</sup>. The clause has now been omitted as the reason for the distinction between Courts of Asia and Africa and Courts of other countries has disappeared especially in the case of Japan. The result is that a suit will lie upon a foreign judgment of any Court in Asia or Africa and such a suit now stands upon the same footing as a suit brought on the judgment of a foreign Court in Europe or America.

Though a foreign judgment may be enforced by a suit in British India it is not to be supposed that British Indian Courts are bound in all cases to take cognizance of the suit and they may refuse to entertain it on grounds of expediency<sup>(o)</sup>.

**Operation of the section**—The operation of the section may be illustrated by the following cases—

(a) *A* sues *B* in a foreign Court. If the suit is dismissed the decision will operate as a bar to a fresh suit by *A* in British India on the original cause of action unless the decision is inoperative by reason of one or more of the circumstances specified in the section<sup>(p)</sup>. If a decree is passed in favour of *A* in the foreign Court and *A* sues *B* on the judgment in British India *B* will be precluded from putting in issue the same matters that were directly and substantially in issue in the suit in the foreign Court unless the decision of the foreign Court is inoperative on any one of the six grounds specified in the section.

(b) *A* obtained a decree against *B* in the Cochin Court and applied for execution of the decree in the High Court of Bombay. [Decrees of the Cochin Court may be executed in British India under s. 44.] It was proved that *A* obtained the decree at Cochin by concealment of essential facts and by fraud [see cl. (c) of the section]. It was held that execution of the decree should be refused<sup>(q)</sup>.

A British Indian Court will not give effect to a foreign judgment pronounced by a Court without jurisdiction—The leading case on the subject is *Gurdial v Paja of Faridkot*<sup>(r)</sup>. In that case *A* sued *B* in the Court of the Native State of Faridkot claiming Rs. 60,000 alleged to have been misappropriated by *B* while in *A*'s service at Faridkot. *B* did not appear at the hearing and an ex parte decree was passed against him. *B* was a native of another Native State Jhind. In 1869 he left Jhind and went to Faridkot to take up service under *A*. In 1874 he left *A*'s service and returned to Jhind. The suit was brought against him in 1879. At the date of the suit *B* neither resided in Faridkot nor was he a domiciled subject of the Faridkot State nor did he owe allegiance to that State. On these facts the Faridkot State had on general principles of International Law no jurisdiction to entertain the suit against *B* in

(k) *Himmat Lall v Shafiq* (1934) 8 Bom 33.  
 (l) *Ganga Lal v Ganesh Lal* (1934) 46 All 119 79 I C 33 (4) A A 161.  
 (m) *Ganga Lal v Raja of Faridkot* (189) 2 Cal. 37 1 L A 11.

(n) *Mayaram v Rao* (1900) 24 Bom 86.  
 (o) *Muhammad v A. M. Lal* (1900) 3 Mad 458.  
 (p) *R v Bhat v A. A. R. Bhat* (1889) 13 Bom 4.  
 (q) *Hajim v A. F. Rao* (1891) 1 Bom 16.  
 (r) (189) 9 Cal 171.

respect of the claim which it should be noted was a mere *personal* claim as distinguished from a claim *relating to land or movables* (s). The decree of the Faridkot Court was therefore an absolute nullity. A then sued B in a British Indian Court on the judgment of the Faridkot Court. The Court of first instance dismissed the suit on the ground that the Faridkot Court had no jurisdiction to entertain the suit. This decision was upheld by their Lordships of the Privy Council. The mere fact that the alleged *emtez lemen* took place at Faridkot was not sufficient to give jurisdiction to the Faridkot Court. The result would be the same if the suit were for damages for *breach of a contract* entered into by B with A at Faridkot (t). In other words a foreign Court cannot assume jurisdiction in cases where the claim is a *personal* one merely because the *cause of action* arose within its jurisdiction. But if B was *residing* at Faridkot at the date of the suit, the Faridkot Court would have had complete jurisdiction. In the case of *personal* claims it is *residence* alone that gives jurisdiction in a suit against a foreigner (u). The same rule applies where the country in which the judgment was passed and that in which it is sought to be enforced have separate and distinct systems of administration and judicature though owing allegiance to the same Sovereign. Thus a decree passed by the Ceylon Court [which is a foreign Court within the meaning of s. 2] in a suit on a *contract* against a native of British India who was not at the time of the action residing in Ceylon is a nullity and it cannot be enforced by a suit in a Court of British India (v).

Suppose that in the above case the Faridkot Legislature had passed an Act empowering the Courts of Faridkot to entertain suits in cases where the *cause of action* had arisen in Faridkot though the defendant was a foreigner neither residing in Faridkot nor owing any allegiance or obedience to the Faridkot State. Could effect be then given to the judgment of the Faridkot Court in a suit brought upon the judgment in a Court in British India? It could not—for jurisdiction conferred against the general principles of international law is not recognized and no one State can by its legislation confer jurisdiction upon its Court to entertain a suit in respect of a *personal* claim against foreigners who at the date of the suit were neither resident in that State nor owed any allegiance or obedience to that State (w). But British Indian subjects owe allegiance to the Sovereign of Great Britain and the *British Parliament* may therefore by legislation confer jurisdiction upon the Courts of England as it has in fact done against British Indian subjects in British India (x). Hence a judgment passed by the Queen's Bench Division of the High Court of Justice of England (a foreign Court) against a British Indian subject residing in British India in an action founded on a breach of a contract committed within the jurisdiction of that Court is not a nullity and a suit may be brought on the judgment in British India (y).

In the case of the *Raja of Faridkot* the decree passed against the defendant by the foreign Court was an *ex parte* decree that is to say the defendant did not appear before the foreign Court and the decree was passed in his absence. But what if the defendant had appeared and defended the suit in the foreign Court? This question is considered in the following paragraph.

**Submission to jurisdiction of foreign Court.**—Where a suit is instituted in British India on the judgment of a foreign Court effect will be given to the judgment though that Court had no jurisdiction over the defendant if the defendant appears and defends the suit brought against him in that Court without making any objection

(s) *Lakshmiha Kar v. Vistram* (1900) 4 B.N. 11. *Ha v. Mafo* d (184) 0.  
(t) *Matlappa v. C'ellappu* (18 6) 1 Mad 196.  
(u) *Jirappa v. J. G.* (1916) 40 Bom 551. 36 I.C. 363. *J. m. v. Isf* (190) 9 Cal 500. *Isf v. P. d. v. Sra Pann* (19) 5 A.L.J. 857. 10 I.C. 186 (27) A.A. 10.

(v) *Shakti Aitha v. D. & C.* (1909) 3 Mad 469. 3 I.C. 150.  
(w) *Crest v. D. & C.* (1899) 6 Cal 931. *H. d. v. P. d.* (184) 4 Mad 3 9.  
(x) *S. R. S. v. O. R. S.*  
(y) *Hoss in Khe v. P. d.* (1901) 3 Cal 641. *S. v. P. d.* 1900. *Key v. P. d.* (1916) 39 Mad 9. 100 I.C. 3 6. *affirmed* 40 Mad 11. 41 I.A. 6. 3 I.C. 6. 3.

to its jurisdiction ( ) for having taken a chance of judgment in his favour it is not right that he should take exception to jurisdiction when judgment goes against him (a) But if he protests against the jurisdiction and the suit is then proceeded with against him the judgment is a nullity and no effect will be given to it in a suit brought on the judgment The protest against jurisdiction must be made at an early stage of the proceedings hence where no objection to the jurisdiction was made until the case had reached the stage of appeal it was held that there was submission to jurisdiction (b) Nice questions sometimes arise as to what amounts to submission to jurisdiction A defendant who employs a pleader in a suit in a foreign Court will not be said to have submitted himself to the jurisdiction of that Court if the pleader states at the hearing that he has no instructions from his client (c) But if a defendant while protesting against the jurisdiction appears on the argument of the point of jurisdiction there by taking the chance of getting a decision in his favour he will be deemed to have submitted himself to the jurisdiction of the Court (d) A fortiori it is so if he also pleads on the merits (e) So also if he applies for a review of the order made against him in a foreign court (f) But submission is not voluntary if the appearance is made only to release property seized by a foreign tribunal in attachment or other proceedings in such a case the judgment of the foreign tribunal is not binding on the party Whether submission was voluntary or it was for the purpose of saving property is a pure question of fact (g) A person who sues in a foreign Court as plaintiff voluntarily submits to the jurisdiction and cannot afterwards dispute it (h)

*Agreement to submit to foreign jurisdiction*—Where there is an express agreement to submit to the jurisdiction of a foreign Court a judgment pronounced by such Court binds the parties and effect will be given to such judgment in British Indian Courts (i)

The mere fact of entering into a contract of partnership in a foreign country does not involve an agreement that all matters and disputes arising in connection with the partnership shall be submitted to and therefore lie within the jurisdiction of the Courts of that country (j)

*Carrying on business in a foreign country through an agent*—Persons who carry on business in a foreign country through an agent submit to the jurisdiction of the Courts of that country by giving the agent a general power of attorney including the right to institute or defend suits relating to matters connected with their business or otherwise (k)

*Possession of immovable property in a foreign country*—The possession of immovable property in a foreign country gives the Courts of that country jurisdiction to deal with the property itself (l) but not jurisdiction *in personam* over the possessor even in regard to obligations connected with that property (m)

- (2) *C. s. 119* *g. 1* *Fr. ad v. C. s. 119* (18 3) 45 All 119 9 I C 33 ( ) 4 A 161 97 tel 4tham v D r d (1903) 3 M a 1 463 3 I C 190
- (a) *J. a. d. v. v. t. b. l. 1* (14 6) 8 Mad H ( 14 (1) *K. l. r. v. Chel. l. g. 1* (18. 4) M 1 10 ( ) *S. r. v. 16* (18 ) 18 M 1 3 (d) *I. o. H. v. Taylor* (191 ) 2 K B 40 De 10 H. l. a. v. J. Paper Co v L. j. l. t. 19 01 H v 314
- ( ) *H. a. h. d. v. t. l. b. l. a. t* (1914) 39 B m 31 61 ( ) 6 J. a. n. v. J. h. m. (1916) 33 M 1 33 3 I C 3 [F B] o. e. r. d. l. l. g. I rry d. l. o. lpp a. s. (18 3) Mad 40
- (f) *H. r. d. g. v. M. f. m. ad* (10 ) 8 Tal 4 10 14 3 ( ) 41 00
- (g) *I. e. r. a. g. l. a. v. y. r. M. u. j. a. s. t* (1916) 33 M d 1 61 ( ) 8
- (h) *V. l. l. d. v. I. n. m. t.* (18 9) M d 400 404
- ( ) *I. v. d. v. L. l. o. y. d. S. t. e. o. h. p. t. o. v. G. r. h. a. s. I. f. o. l. a. s. s. u. r. a. n. c. e. v. s. e. t. j.* [1903] 1 K B 43 11 I. f. i. s. d. C. v. G. r. b. a. n. [1900] 1 (1) 413 Bury E. l. l. e. C. i. t. L. e. r. I. t. t. (13 ) 43 B m 8 4 89 I C 866 ( ) A B 413 Hay Abd H. v. S. t. a. p. (13 8) 6 B v. J. R. 1 40 I C 3 ( ) A B 341
- (i) *F. l. v. S. j. i. m.* [1904] 1 K B 30
- (k) *I. t. a. t. v. A. o. l. t. h.* (191 ) 3 Mad 163 1 14 14 1 ( ) 183 J. o. o. v. M. h. a. t. l. (19 4) 67 M d 8 8 I C 4 ( ) 4 M 15
- (l) *D. l. o. t. v. F. o. r. e. s. t.* (18. 8) 4 Bing 646 *G. l. a. t. v. N. o. r. t. h. B. e. r. n. I. j. C. o. v. L. n. e. a. y.* (18 3) 3 Macq 99
- ( ) *E. n. d. v. S. y. o. n.* [1903] 1 K B 30

**Irregularities not affecting jurisdiction**—In cases where a foreign Court has jurisdiction or where the defendant has submitted himself to the jurisdiction of a foreign Court the judgment of such Court is not vitiated by irregularities which do not affect the jurisdiction of the Court even when they are such as would in the view of the foreign Court render the judgment there a nullity (n)

**Foreign judgment against a foreign firm**—A B and C carry on business at Singapore in partnership in the name of X Y D a creditor of the firm brings an action against the firm in the supreme Court of Singapore but A alone is served with the writ of summons B and C are British Indian subjects and they did not reside at Singapore at the date of the suit or at any other time A decree is passed against the firm by the Singapore Court A suit is then brought by D in British India on the judgment of the Singapore Court against A B and C for a personal decree against them No personal decree can be passed against B and C as they were not served though such a decree may be passed against A (o) Compare O 21 r 50

**Foreign judgment on a decree of a British Indian Court**—The judgment of a foreign Court obtained on a decree of a Court in British India is no bar to the execution of the original decree in British India (p)

**Foreign judgment as res judicata**—This section applies not only to suits on foreign judgments but also to cases in which the defendant relies on a foreign judgment as a bar to a suit in British India (q)

**Clause (b)**—In order that a foreign judgment may operate as res judicata it must have been given on the merits of the case whether it was the judgment of a foreign Court in Europe or America or of a foreign Court in Asia or Africa (r) In *Amyer v Visianatham* (s) an action was brought in the King's Bench Division of the High Court of Justice in England to recover a liquidated amount The defendant failed to comply with an order to answer interrogatories and his defence was struck out and judgment was entered for the amount claimed for the plaintiff under I S C O 31 r 21 corresponding to O 11 r 21 below The plaintiff subsequently instituted a suit on the judgment in the Madras High Court It was held by the Judicial Committee affirming the judgment of the Madras High Court that the judgment sued on was not given on the merits of the case and that the suit was not maintainable It has also been held by the same tribunal that a judgment on an award obtained in England by default cannot be sued on in India since it is not a judgment on the merits of the case (t) A foreign judgment passed on default of appearance of the defendant duly served with summons on the allegations contained in the plaint without any trial on evidence is not one passed on the merits of the case and a suit cannot be brought on such judgment in any Court in British India (u) but it is otherwise if a decree though ex parte is passed after hearing evidence adduced by the plaintiff (v) Where a suit in a foreign Court is adjourned for settlement and it is agreed between the parties that if the suit is not settled judgment should be passed for the plaintiff and there being no settlement the plaintiff appears on the adjourned date but the defendant does not appear and

(n) *Cda v Maigil* (190) 30 M d 2

*Perderton H gh* [1893] 1 Ch 41

(o) *Sahb Thab* L H r d [1913] 36 Mad 414

12 J C 1006

(p) *Kalrde v Official Trust of Bengal*

(1881) 7 L S

(q) *Cholli g v D rax mms* (19 3) 1 Mad

0 108 I C 30 ( 8) A M 3

(r) *Saia gh Rlia Seng* (1919) 1 R no

14 1 30 49 I C 343

(s) *Kjmer* *Visianatham* (191) 44 I A 6

40 M d 11 34 I C 683 affirm g JJ

Mad 9 I C 346

(t) *Oppahim d Co v M med H neef*

(19) 43 I A 144 Mad 436 4 I C

616 ( ) A 1 C 10

(u) *M l med Kd* v *P kr* (10 ) 50

Mad 61 100 I C ( ) A M 63

(k B) *rrulling Ja oo* *M Jan d* (19 4)

47 Ma 18 8 I C 4 ( 5) A M 155

*I r r P as v S r l r* (19 ) 40 All 0

10 I C 186 ( ) A 4 510 *hd I*

*r* ( ) Mad 47 (19 4) 6 R n

5 ( ) A R 319 *rr achellam v*

*M r omed* (19 8) 10 I C 810 ( 4) A M

133

( ) *col* *r p* (1910) 41 All 1 50 I C

0



judgment is passed for the plaintiff according to the agreement the judgment is one on the merits of the case and a suit can be brought on such a judgment in a Court in British India (u) It cannot be said of a judgment that it was not given on the merits merely because it proceeds on a wrong view as to the burden of proof or the legal liability of a party (x)

Clause (c) —The mistake must be *apparent on the face of the proceedings* In England it has been held that a mere mistake as to English law will not vitiate a foreign judgment even though the mistake may appear on the face of the proceedings (y) In an old Madras case (z) this clause was referred to where a foreign Court had exercised jurisdiction contrary to the principles of International Law but such a case would now fall under clause (a)

Clause (d) —The expression *natural justice* in this clause refers rather to the form of procedure than to the merits of the particular case The mere fact that a foreign judgment is wrong in law does not make it one opposed to natural justice There must be something in the procedure anterior to the judgment which is repugnant to natural justice (a) Thus a foreign judgment obtained without notice of the suit to the defendant is contrary to natural justice and a suit on such judgment is not maintainable in a British Indian Court (b) So also a judgment based on a third review after two applications for review had been refused (c) or a judgment against a minor defendant for whom no guardian ad litem had been appointed (d) But notice served on an agent empowered to sue and defend suits in the foreign Court is sufficient (e) As to sufficiency of notice if the foreign Court has held service of the notice to be sufficient it must be taken to be correct in the absence of evidence to the contrary (f)

Clause (e) —All judgments whether domestic or foreign are void if obtained by fraud In the case of domestic judgments the fraud must be extrinsic to the matter tried but apparently this rule does not apply to foreign judgments (j)

Clause (f) —Presumably a foreign judgment for a gambling debt would not be enforced in British India

Limitation —Where as in the case of a suit on a contract limitation merely bars the remedy but does not extinguish the right the judgment of a foreign Court is not open to the objection that the suit was barred by the law of limitation applicable in the country where the contract was made (h)

Where the Court of a foreign country holds applying its own law that a suit is not barred by the law of limitation it cannot be said that it has refused to recognize the law of British India because the suit was barred according to the law of British India (i)

## 14 [S 13 Expln VI] The Court shall presume, upon the production of any document purporting to be a certified copy of a foreign judgment that such judgment was pronounced by a

Presumption as to foreign judgments

- (w) *Malammad v Chinhamani* (19 9) Mad 503  
 (x) *Pa a Shenoi v Hallog a* (1918) 41 Mad 0 4 1 C 03  
 (y) *Godai v C ay* (18 0) L R 6 Q B 139  
 (z) *H. de v Po B* (1841) 4 Wal 3 9  
 (a) *I. She v Hall g a* (1914) 41 Mad 0 45 I C 07  
 (b) *Lo don I k v H rm ay* (19 1) 8 B H C 00 *Lo don B k v i d* (1881) 5 B m 3 *Lo A a B k v B jay* (1885) 9 P m 316 *El ty v M elji* (188) 11 B m 41 *B gori m v Hala b a san* (1880) 13 Mad 496

- (c) *Hari S gh v M A mmed* (19 7) 8 Lah 51 10 I C 6 3 (a7) A L 00  
 (d) *Hari v gh v Muhammad sup a*  
 ( ) *J oa Mahamat* (19 4) 47 M d 877 8 I C 4 ( 5) A M 155  
 (f) *4 Mad 8 7 8 I C 4 ( ) A M 155 mp a*  
 (g) *V a ri D v K indo Lal* (1822) 6 Cal 891 910  
 (h) *Wall i ba v Fonn m* (18 0) Mad 400 See also Limitation Act 1904 s 4  
 (i) *Ca ga Prash i v e k Lal* (19 4) 46 All 119 9 I C 33 (a4) A A 161

Court of competent jurisdiction, unless the contrary appears on the record, but such presumption may be displaced by proving want of jurisdiction

See s 13 cl (a) and the undermentioned case (j)

## PLACE OF SUING

**15 [S 15]** Every suit shall be instituted in the Court of the lowest grade competent to try it

Court in which suits to be instituted

**Place of suing**—This heading governs sections 15 to 25. Place means place in British India and the heading indicates that the Courts referred to in these sections are in British India and the immovable property referred to is also in British India. As said by the Lahore High Court these sections regulate the venue in British India and apply only to those places where the Code is in force. They deal with matters of domestic concern and prescribe rules for the assumption of territorial jurisdiction by British Indian Courts in matters within their cognizance and do not govern claims against persons or things wholly outside their jurisdiction. (l)

**Scope and object of the section**—The object of the section in requiring a suitor to bring his suit in the Court of the lowest grade competent to try it is that Courts of higher grades shall not be overcrowded with suits. This section is a rule of *procedure not of jurisdiction* and whilst it lays down that a suit shall be instituted in the Court of the lowest grade it does not oust the jurisdiction of the Courts of higher grades which they possess under the Acts constituting them (i). Although therefore as a *matter of procedure* a suit below a certain value ought to be instituted in the Court of the Munsif the Subordinate Judge has still *jurisdiction* to try it (m). But also as a *matter of procedure* he ought not to entertain the suit but should return the plaint to the plaintiff to be presented to the Munsif as provided by O 7 r 10 [Code of 1882 s 57] (n). This is explained more fully below.

**Jurisdiction**—The word *competent* used in this section has reference to the jurisdiction of a Court. Jurisdiction means the extent of the authority of a Court to administer justice not only with reference to the subject matter of the suit but also to the local and pecuniary limits of its jurisdiction. Thus a Presidency Small Cause Court has no jurisdiction to try suits in which the amount or value of the subject matter exceeds Rs 2 000. This is said to be the jurisdiction of a Court as regards its *pecuniary* limits. Nor can it try suits for specific performance of contracts or for an injunction or for a dissolution of partnership. This is said to be the jurisdiction of a Court as regards the *subject matter* of a suit. Nor can it try a suit on a cause of action that has arisen beyond the local limits of the original civil jurisdiction of the High Court. This is said to be the local limits of its jurisdiction.

The jurisdiction of a Court may again be *original* or *appellate*. In the exercise of its *original* jurisdiction a Court entertains original suits. In the exercise of its *appellate* jurisdiction it entertains appeals. The High Courts of Allahabad Patna and Lahore have no *original* jurisdiction.

**Court of lowest grade competent to try a suit**—There are in British India a large number of Courts. The High Courts of Calcutta Madras Bombay Allahabad

(j) *I Am Poud v Sri Tam* (19) 2 All L J 88 10 I C 186 ( ) A A 510  
(l) *Bh. booy v I* 11 r n (19 9) 9 Lah 45  
109 F C S (-3) 4 L 9

(i) *V. dh. Lal v M. Ka* (18) 1 All 30  
(m) *Matra M d I H* (1 20) 1 (1 1 5)  
*Krish. asom v Aa ka ba* (14 11) 14  
M d 133  
( ) *V d : Lal Ma Jar* (18 4) All 30

Patna Lahore and Rangoon have been established each by a Royal Charter Other Courts in India have been constituted by Acts of the Governor General of India in Council and they are of various grades with different pecuniary limits of jurisdiction

In each of the three presidency towns there is a High Court and a Small Cause Court High Courts are empowered in the exercise of their ordinary original civil jurisdiction to try suits of any value except suits falling within the jurisdiction of Presidency Small Cause Courts of which the value does not exceed Rs 100 (o) The pecuniary jurisdiction of Presidency Small Cause Courts is confined to suits of which the value does not exceed Rs 2 000 (p) Thus both a High Court and a Presidency Small Cause Court are competent to try a suit say for Rs 500 for damages for breach of contract but of these two Courts it is the Small Cause Court which is the Court of the lowest grade competent to try the suit The suit therefore shall be instituted in the Small Cause Court as required by the present section This does not mean that the High Court has no jurisdiction to entertain the suit It has jurisdiction to try the suit but in order that the High Court may not be overcrowded with suits the Legislature has established Small Cause Courts and the present section requires that suits which a Small Cause Court is competent to try shall be brought in that Court There are however certain suits which a Small Cause Court is not competent to try such as suits for the recovery or partition of immovable property or for the foreclosure or redemption of a mortgage of immovable property or suits for injunction or for specific performance (q) These suits must be brought in the High Court though the value of the suit may be under Rs 100

Outside the presidency towns there are in each province a number of Courts of different grades established by a Civil Courts Act for each province The Civil Courts in the mofussil of Bombay Madras and Calcutta are divided into three classes as shown in the following table —

| Bombay Presidency<br>Act 14 of 1869                | Madras Presidency<br>Act 3 of 1871 | Bengal N W P and Assam<br>Act 12 of 1867 |
|--|------------------------------------|--|
| 1 District Courts                                  | District Courts                    | District Courts                          |
| 2 Courts of Subordinate Judges of the first class  | Subordinate Judges Courts          | Subordinate Judges Courts                |
| 3 Courts of Subordinate Judges of the second class | District Munsifs Courts            | Munsifs Courts                           |

The jurisdiction of District Judges and Subordinate Judges except Subordinate Judges of the second class in the Bombay Presidency extends to all original suits whatever may be the value of the suit But a District Court is a Court of superior grade to a Subordinate Judge's Court for a District Court is the principal Court of original civil jurisdiction in the district and it is also the Court of appeal from decrees and orders in certain suits passed by other Courts in the district including Courts of Subordinate Judges The jurisdiction of a Subordinate Judge of the second class in the Bombay Presidency extends to all original suits of which the value does not exceed Rs 5 000 The jurisdiction of a District Munsif in the Madras Presidency extends to all original suits (not otherwise exempted from his cognizance) of which the value does not exceed Rs 2 000 The jurisdiction of a Munsif in Bengal North Western Provinces and Assam extends to all original suits of which the value does not exceed Rs 1 000

(o) See Cl 1 of the Letters Patent Appellate Act 1852 (q) Presidency Small Cause Courts Act 1882  
(p) Presidency Small Cause Courts Act 1882 s 18 s 19

Both a Subordinate Judge and a Munsif have jurisdiction to try a suit say to recover Rs 500 for rent. But of the two Courts it is the Munsif's Court that is the Court of the lowest grade competent to try the suit. The suit therefore shall be instituted in the Munsif's Court as required by the present section.

As to Civil Courts in the Central Provinces see Act 16 of 1880 in Oudh Act 13 of 1879 in Jhansi Act 18 of 1867. As to Provincial Small Cause Courts see Act 9 of 1887.

Where a suit which ought to have been instituted in a Court of lower grade is instituted in a Court of higher grade—Suppose that a suit which under the provisions of this section ought to have been instituted in a Munsif's Court is brought in the Court of a Subordinate Judge and the Subordinate Judge instead of returning the plaint under O 7 r 10 tries the suit notwithstanding objection taken by the defendant and that a decree is passed against the defendant. Is the decree a nullity? No for the Subordinate Judge has jurisdiction to try the suit. It is a case of irregularity not affecting the jurisdiction of the Court within the meaning of s 99 below (r). As to cases where a suit is by reason of over valuation brought in a Court of higher grade see notes below. Over valuation and under valuation.

Where a suit which ought to have been instituted in a Court of higher grade is instituted in a Court of lower grade—In such a case the Court of lower grade ought to return the plaint to the plaintiff to be presented to the Court of higher grade [O 7 r 10]. If this is not done and the suit is heard by the Court of lower grade the decree is one passed without jurisdiction. This is a case of want of jurisdiction as distinguished from a mere irregularity within the meaning of s 99 below (s). As to cases where a suit is by reason of under valuation brought in a Court of lower grade see notes below. Over valuation and under valuation.

Principles regulating pecuniary jurisdiction—It is the plaintiff's valuation in his plaint which fixes the jurisdiction of the Court and not the amount which may be found and decreed by the Court (f). But jurisdiction may be destroyed if the plaint is so amended as to exceed the pecuniary limits of the Court in which the suit is instituted (u).

Over valuation and under valuation—Although it is the value put by the plaintiff on his suit that *prima facie* determines jurisdiction it does not follow that a plaintiff is at liberty to assign any arbitrary value to the suit and thus be free to choose the Court in which he should bring the suit (v). Cases do occur in which a plaintiff over values his suit or he under values it. The over valuation or under valuation may be erroneous or it may be done intentionally by the plaintiff for the purpose of bringing the suit in a Court different from that in which it would lie if it were properly valued. If the over valuation or under valuation is patent on the face of the plaint it is the duty of the Court to which the plaint is presented to return it to the plaintiff to be presented to the proper Court under O 7 r 10. If it is not patent on the face of the plaint but objection is taken by the defendant that it is over valued or under valued the Court may require the plaintiff to show that the suit has been properly valued if there are *prima facie* grounds for believing that the suit has not been properly valued (w) but not otherwise (x).

(r) See *A. d. Lal v. Mo. Jar. Hu.* (1884) All. 30 and *Y. tra. Mo. d. l. v. H. r.* (1890) 17 C. l. 15. b. th. ca. of over valuation. It is the value of the suit or reference to the Suits Valuation Act 1884.  
(s) See *M. d. l. v. H. r.* (1890) 17 Cal. 160. a. ca. of over valuation but it is the value of the suit or reference to the Suits Valuation Act 1884.  
(t) *Lal. A. m. B. d. j.* (1883) 8 Bom. 31. *M. d. l. v. H. r.* (1883) 8 Bom. 31.

All. 30. *Mad. D. v. R. n. j.* 1. 1. All. 6.  
(v) *C. d. v. J. o. b.* (1886) 9 M. d. j. 1. 1. *Y. tra. Mo. d. l. v. H. r.* (1890) 17 C. l. 15. b. th. ca. of over valuation. It is the value of the suit or reference to the Suits Valuation Act 1884.  
(w) *App. F. v. S. o. d. l.* (1884) 17 C. l. 15. b. th. ca. of over valuation. It is the value of the suit or reference to the Suits Valuation Act 1884.  
(x) *K. d. P. v. S. o. d. l.* (1884) 17 C. l. 15. b. th. ca. of over valuation. It is the value of the suit or reference to the Suits Valuation Act 1884.

Suppose that a suit has been over valued or under valued so that it is brought in a Court whose grade is higher or lower than that of the Court which would have been competent to try it if the suit were properly valued. Is the decree liable to be set aside or reversed by the appellate Court? No not unless (1) the objection as to jurisdiction by reason of over valuation or under valuation was taken by the defendant in the Court of first instance at or before the hearing at which issues were framed or (2) the over valuation or under valuation is found by the appellate Court to have prejudicially affected the disposal of the suit on the merits (y) and it matters not whether the over valuation or under valuation was erroneous or intentional (z) See Suits Valuation Act 1887 s 11

The High Court of Calcutta has held that where a suit is under valued with the result that the appeal from the decree in the suit is heard and decided by a District Court instead of by a High Court the decree of the District Court is one passed by a Court without jurisdiction and therefore a nullity. This happens in cases where a suit of which the true value exceeds Rs 5000 is valued at less than Rs 5000 & brings a suit against B for possession of immovable property in the Court of a Subordinate Judge. The real value of the suit exceeds Rs 5000 but the suit is valued at Rs 2100 only. A decree is passed in the suit for A. B files an appeal in the District Court but the appeal is dismissed. According to the Calcutta decisions the decree of the District Court is a nullity as being one passed without jurisdiction. The reason given is that the true value of the suit being more than Rs 5000 the proper forum of appeal if the suit had been properly valued would have been the High Court and not the District Court and the result of the under valuation was to oust the jurisdiction of the High Court as the Court of Appeal (a)

Where the subject matter of a suit does not admit of being satisfactorily valued.—In some suits the subject matter is not capable of being estimated at a money value e.g. suits for restitution of conjugal rights suits to remove a harnavan (b) suits to direct registration of a document under the Registration Act 1908 s 77 (c) etc. The court fee in such suits is Rs 10 as provided by the Court Fees Act 1870 Sch II art 17 cl vi. There is a distinction however between valuation for the purpose of jurisdiction and valuation for the purpose of ascertaining court fee (d). The subject now under consideration is valuation for purposes of jurisdiction.

In cases where the subject matter is not capable of being estimated at a money value it is provided by s 9 of the Suits Valuation Act 1887 that the value of the suit for purposes of jurisdiction is what the High Court may specify by rules made under that section. Where no rules are made the High Courts of Allahabad and Calcutta have said that the safest and the most convenient course is to treat the valuation made by the plaintiff as prima facie the true valuation but subject to correction by the Court if the defective valuation has been due to an improper motive and the Court must decide what should be considered to be the proper value (e). The cases in which the above rule was laid down were suits for restitution of conjugal rights. In a recent case however the High Court of Madras said that though the rule adopted by the High Courts of Allahabad and Calcutta might be appropriate in suits for restitution of conjugal rights it was not so in suits which affected property and that the best rule in such cases was to value the suit according to the value of the property liable to be affected

- (j) *Sri D v T I* (1883) 1 All 3830  
*It m v Secret y f State* (1901) 4 M J  
 4 J 4nt v *Fra uco* (1910) 3  
 10m 4 I L 90  
 (i) *Ham d a v C pnt* (1883) 4 Cal 661  
*Krish mi v K akas ba* (1901) 14  
 M d 183  
 (a) *I Jlaksh v Jot ja* (1911) 35 Cal  
 633 660-668 1 I L 464

- (b) *Cow n v Ambur v Irist* 1 Amb r  
 (188) 4 M d 116  
 (c) *S a m th v Ang n* (190) 10 Mad L  
 J 84 R m 4 y v S i Aty r  
 (1904) 31 M d 83  
 (d) *D y am v Gordandas* (190) 31 Bom 3  
 (e) *Z Hu a Kha v Ah rshid J* (1906)  
 4 M d 83 *Jah Mahomed v Mahar*  
*Baba* (190) 31 Cal 3

thereby (f) Thus a suit to compel registration of an instrument whether the instrument be registrable compulsorily (e.g. an instrument of gift) or voluntarily (e.g. a will) is valued in Madras according to the value of the property that would be affected by the suit (g) and a suit to set aside an instrument according to the value of the plaintiff's interest in the instrument (h) The Madras High Court has also held that though the court fee on a suit for the removal of a *karnavan* is only Rs. 10 it does not follow that a District Munsif has jurisdiction to try such a suit where the value of the *tarwad* property exceeds the pecuniary limits of the jurisdiction of the Munsif's Court (i) and that a Munsif has no jurisdiction to entertain a suit to set aside an adoption if the value of the property which would be left to the adopted son if the adoption were set aside exceeds the pecuniary jurisdiction of that Court (j) The High Courts of Allahabad and Calcutta would probably not agree. In fact the High Court of Allahabad has held that the value for the purposes of jurisdiction of a suit to set aside an adoption is not the value of the property which may possibly change hands if the adoption be set aside but the value put upon his plaint by the plaintiff (k) But whichever view be correct it is certain since the enactment of the Suits Valuation Act (s. 11) that when once a suit of this class is decided on its merits by the lower Court the decision will not be reversed in appeal on the ground of want of jurisdiction unless the cognizance of the suit by that Court has prejudicially affected its disposal on the merits.

**16** [S 16] Subject to the pecuniary or other limitations prescribed by any law, suits—

Suta to b Institute  
where subject matter  
situate

- (a) for the recovery of immovable property with or without rent or profits,
- (b) for the partition of immovable property,
- (c) for foreclosure, sale or redemption in the case of a mortgage of or charge upon immovable property,
- (d) for the determination of any other right to or interest in immovable property,
- (e) for compensation for wrong to immovable property,
- (f) for the recovery of movable property actually under distraint or attachment

shall be instituted in the Court within the local limits of whose jurisdiction the property is situate

Provided that a suit to obtain relief respecting or compensation for wrong to, immovable property held by or on behalf of the defendant may, where the relief sought can be

|  |   |
|--|---|
| (f) <i>R mu 4 y r v S i a a 4 i j</i> (1908) 31<br>M d 8 j   | (i) <i>K r i a v P a m</i> (1908) 11 Mad<br>34                |
| (g) <i>P i h m a B h g a</i> (1890) 13 Mad<br>6 (d ed of gift) <i>i m i A y v S i</i><br><i>A y a</i> (1908) 31 Mad 89 | (j) <i>K i a L u i a</i> (1908) 6 Mad<br>19                   |
| (h) <i>K a a n v K o r p a</i> (1891) 14 Mad 160   | (k) <i>S h o D e i P a m T u l i F m</i> (1903) 15<br>All 3 a |

entirely obtained through his personal obedience, be instituted either in the Court within the local limits of whose jurisdiction the property is situate, or in the Court within the local limits of whose jurisdiction the defendant actually and voluntarily resides, or carries on business, or personally works for gain

*Explanation*—In this section “property” means property situate in British India

*Alterations in the section*—The words with or without rent or profits in cl (a) are new The word sale in cl (c) has been newly added

*Subject to the pecuniary or other limitations prescribed by law*—The pecuniary limitations have been referred to in the notes on sec 15 Instances of other limitations are suits under sec. 92 or suits in Bombay against Government or an officer of Government in his official capacity (i) which can only be filed in a High Court or a District Court

*Chartered High Courts*—This section does not apply to Chartered High Courts in the exercise of their original civil jurisdiction (see s 170) The High Courts of Calcutta Madras Bombay Allahabad Patna Lahore and Rangoon are Chartered High Courts each having been established by a royal charter The nature and extent of the jurisdiction of these Courts is defined by the charter for each of these Courts The High Courts of Allahabad Patna and Lahore have no original civil jurisdiction The original civil jurisdiction of the High Courts of Calcutta Madras and Bombay is defined by clause 12 of the Charter which empowers them to try suits for land or other immovable property if such land or property be situated wholly within the local limits of the ordinary original civil jurisdiction or in case leave of the Court shall have been first obtained in part within such limits There have been many conflicting decisions as to the meaning of the expression suits for land or other immovable property in the Letters Patent but the more specific and detailed provisions of this section leave no scope for uncertainty

*Scope of the section*—As already stated this is one of a group of sections which refer to Courts in British India and to immovable property situate in British India This is specially expressed in the Explanation lest the proviso be construed as giving a municipal Court jurisdiction in respect of immovable property out of British India for British Indian Courts have no such jurisdiction (m) It specifies the Court in which suits relating to immovable property and suits for the recovery of movable property actually under distraint or attachment are to be instituted Section 19 indicates the Courts in which suits for compensation for wrong done to the person or to movable property are to be instituted. Section 20 is a general section

*Clause (a) suits for recovery of immovable property*—A suit for the recovery of immovable property situate in Bombay must be instituted in a Court in Bombay having jurisdiction to entertain the suit The Small Cause Court in Bombay has no jurisdiction to try such suit (n) The suit must therefore be brought in the High Court of Bombay Hence it is that the section commences with the words subject to the pecuniary or other limitations prescribed by any law The insertion of the words with or without rent or profits is intended to remove any difficulty there may be where the defendant does not reside within the local limits of the Courts within whose jurisdiction the property is situate

(i) B m C l C urts Act 1860 sec 3  
(i) A r t a j v C j a (1909) 33 Bom. 373  
\* I C 499

(n) See Preliminary Small Cause Courts Act  
1881 s 19

**Clause (b) suit for partition of immovable property**—For cases where the property is in the jurisdiction of different Court see sec 17 post If part of the property is outside British India the Court will deal with the property in British India while declining jurisdiction as to the rest (o) The Lahore High Court has recently held that a British Court can in a partition suit deal with property situate in a Native State (p) But this is incorrect

**Clause (c) suit for foreclosure sale or redemption**—A mortgages certain immovable property to B to secure payment of money lent to him by B Here A is the mortgagor and B is the mortgagee If A does not repay the loan on the due date B may institute a suit against A for sale of the mortgaged property so that the mortgage debt may be paid out of the sale proceeds of the property or he may sue for foreclosure of the mortgage The decree in a foreclosure suit provides that if the mortgagor fails to pay the amount that may be found due to the mortgagee within a time specified by the Court (generally six months) the mortgagor shall be absolutely debarred of all right to redeem the property (q) If A offers payment of the mortgage debt to B but B disputes the amount and refuses to reconvey A may sue B for redemption of the mortgage and the Court will pass a decree ordering an account to be taken of what will be due to B and directing that upon A paying to B the amount so due B shall reconvey the property to A (r) Suits for foreclosure sale or redemption must be instituted in the Court within the local limits of whose jurisdiction the mortgaged property is situate

A Court cannot declare a charge on property wholly outside its jurisdiction and if it did a purchaser under such a decree would be in no better position than a purchaser under a money decree (s)

**Clause (d) suits for the determination of any other right to or interest in immovable property**—There is no definition of immovable property in the Code Immovable property is defined in the General Clauses Act 1897 s. 3 cl (25) as including land benefits to arise out of land and things attached to the earth or permanently fastened to anything attached to the earth Trees standing on land are immovable property (t) But once the trees are severed from the land they become movable property Growing crops are movable property (see s. 13) Land includes water and a right of fishery in an enclosed water is immovable property (u) Benefits to arise out of land include incorporeal hereditaments such as a right of ferry (v) also pensions and allowances charged upon land and rents Thus a *hal* is immovable property (w) and so is the life interest of a widow in the rents and profits of her husband's estate (x) Immovable property as stated above includes benefits to arise out of land Rent that has already accrued due is movable property for it is a benefit which has arisen out of land but rent that is to accrue due is immovable property for it is a benefit to arise out of land Hence a suit for arrears of rent is governed not by the provisions of this section but by those of s. 20 and it may be instituted in any one of the Courts specified in that section although in such suit the plaintiff's title to the property of which the rent is claimed may incidentally come in question (y) But a suit for a declaration of the plaintiff's right to rent where such right is denied comes under cl (d) of the present section and must be instituted in the Court within the local limits of whose

- (o) *Punchan v Shub Chander* (1893) 14 C 1 835 (a case under clause 1 of the Letters Patent)  
 (p) *I. I. Jahan v. Ran Jan* (1903) 1 C 51 (3) A L 1  
 (q) Transfer of Property Act 1908 ss 86 87 now O 34 r 3  
 (r) Transfer of Property Act ss 9 93 now O 34 rr 7-8  
 (s) *C. D. Lall v. J. G. Nath* (1906) 8 All 117  
 (t) *S. I. v. I. M. M.* (1912) 19 Bom 0  
 (u) *H. pu v. Dh. ndi* (1899) 16 Bom 353

- Umed Khan v. D. lat Farn* (1883) 5 All 564  
 (u) *S. b. Hoidal v. G. p. S. d. r.* (1897) 4 Cal 449  
 (v) *Kr. Anu v. Ak. la. d.* (1897) 13 M. d. 4  
 (w) *v. r. md. v. Bh. Lal* (1894) Cal 449  
 (x) *v. th. v. D. At. ba. j.* (1894) 3 B. m. 1  
 (y) *Ch. nta. a. v. M. ad. v. ra.* (1899) 6 B. H. 6  
 (A. C. 9 12 go Lal v. W. d. o. (1901) 6 Cal. 05 A. m. ja. v. M. a. nd. a. (1903) C. W. v. S. i. 7 I. C. 53 (2) A. C. 619



jurisdiction the property is situate ( ) So also a suit for rent and ejectment under sec 66 of the Bengal Tenancy Act (a) A suit to recover a share of the *sale proceeds* of land which *have already been realted* is a suit for money governed by the provisions of s. 20 (b) But a suit by a vendor of land for the recovery of *unpaid purchase money* against the buyer who *refuses to complete the purchase* is a suit for the determination of any right to or interest in immovable property within the meaning of cl. (d) (c) A suit by a mortgagee to recover the mortgage debt from the mortgagor *personally* is a suit for debt governed by the provisions of s. 20 but if in addition to the claim against the mortgagor personally the mortgagee seeks to recover the mortgage debt by *sale* of the mortgaged property the suit will come under cl. (c) of the present section (d) A suit for maintenance is governed by the provisions of s. 20 but if in addition to the claim for maintenance the plaintiff claims that she is entitled to a *charge on immovable property* in the hands of the defendant the case is one within cl. (d) of this section (e) A suit for dissolution of partnership with the usual ancillary reliefs is not a suit within cl. (d) merely because part of the partnership assets consists of a factory (f)

*Income and mesne profits of land situate outside British India*—A suit will lie in a Court of British India to establish a right to a share in income derived from grants of land situated outside British India but received by the defendant within the local limits of a British Indian Court (g) Similarly a suit to recover mesne profits of land situate outside British India of which the defendant was in wrongful possession but of which he subsequently delivered possession to the plaintiff may be instituted in a Court in British India (h) Both these cases fall under s. 20 below

Clause (e) wrong to immovable property—This refers to torts affecting immovable property such as trespass (i) nuisance infringement of easements etc

Clause (f) movable property actually under distraint or attachment.—Movable property under attachment constitutes an exception to the general rule that movables follow the person (j) The exception is probably founded on the fact that when such property is under attachment its locality is fixed. The Code follows this rule for the sake of convenience of judicial administration (k) The clause applies to Courts in British India but when movables are under attachment by a foreign Court and the defendant is resident in British India and is able to get the attachment removed it has been held that he can be ordered in execution of a personal decree to recover the property (l)

*Proviso to the section*—The last paragraph of the section provides that suits to obtain relief respecting or compensation for wrong to immovable property may be instituted *at the plaintiff's option* either in the Court within the local limits of whose jurisdiction the property is situate or in the Court within the local limits of whose jurisdiction the defendant actually and voluntarily resides or carries on business or personally works for gain provided—

- (1) the property is held by or on behalf of the defendant
- (2) the relief sought can be *entirely* obtained through the personal obedience of the defendant (m) and
- (3) the property is situate in *and not beyond* British India (n)

- (1) *A. Har v. I. J. K.* (1899) 3 Mo. 1  
(2) *A. J. v. M. A.* (1903) 7 C. W. 54.  
(3) *T. I. C. v. J. A.* (1903) 6 Mo. 344  
(4) *I. J. v. K. A.* (1903) 6 Mo. 344  
(5) *M. I. v. K. A.* (1903) 9 Mo. 344  
(6) *S. I. v. K. A.* (1903) 1 Mo. 344  
(7) *S. I. v. K. A.* (1903) 1 Mo. 344  
(8) *S. I. v. K. A.* (1903) 1 Mo. 344  
(9) *S. I. v. K. A.* (1903) 1 Mo. 344  
(10) *S. I. v. K. A.* (1903) 1 Mo. 344  
(11) *S. I. v. K. A.* (1903) 1 Mo. 344  
(12) *S. I. v. K. A.* (1903) 1 Mo. 344  
(13) *S. I. v. K. A.* (1903) 1 Mo. 344  
(14) *S. I. v. K. A.* (1903) 1 Mo. 344  
(15) *S. I. v. K. A.* (1903) 1 Mo. 344  
(16) *S. I. v. K. A.* (1903) 1 Mo. 344  
(17) *S. I. v. K. A.* (1903) 1 Mo. 344  
(18) *S. I. v. K. A.* (1903) 1 Mo. 344  
(19) *S. I. v. K. A.* (1903) 1 Mo. 344  
(20) *S. I. v. K. A.* (1903) 1 Mo. 344

- (A) *Madhoo v. Pama* (1903) 46 Bom. 103  
(B) *C. I. v. S. I.* (1903) 46 Bom. 103  
(C) *C. I. v. S. I.* (1903) 46 Bom. 103  
(D) *C. I. v. S. I.* (1903) 46 Bom. 103  
(E) *C. I. v. S. I.* (1903) 46 Bom. 103  
(F) *C. I. v. S. I.* (1903) 46 Bom. 103  
(G) *C. I. v. S. I.* (1903) 46 Bom. 103  
(H) *C. I. v. S. I.* (1903) 46 Bom. 103  
(I) *C. I. v. S. I.* (1903) 46 Bom. 103  
(J) *C. I. v. S. I.* (1903) 46 Bom. 103  
(K) *C. I. v. S. I.* (1903) 46 Bom. 103  
(L) *C. I. v. S. I.* (1903) 46 Bom. 103  
(M) *C. I. v. S. I.* (1903) 46 Bom. 103  
(N) *C. I. v. S. I.* (1903) 46 Bom. 103  
(O) *C. I. v. S. I.* (1903) 46 Bom. 103  
(P) *C. I. v. S. I.* (1903) 46 Bom. 103  
(Q) *C. I. v. S. I.* (1903) 46 Bom. 103  
(R) *C. I. v. S. I.* (1903) 46 Bom. 103  
(S) *C. I. v. S. I.* (1903) 46 Bom. 103  
(T) *C. I. v. S. I.* (1903) 46 Bom. 103  
(U) *C. I. v. S. I.* (1903) 46 Bom. 103  
(V) *C. I. v. S. I.* (1903) 46 Bom. 103  
(W) *C. I. v. S. I.* (1903) 46 Bom. 103  
(X) *C. I. v. S. I.* (1903) 46 Bom. 103  
(Y) *C. I. v. S. I.* (1903) 46 Bom. 103  
(Z) *C. I. v. S. I.* (1903) 46 Bom. 103



Suits for immovable property situate within jurisdiction of different courts

in any Court within the local limits of whose jurisdiction any portion of the property is situate

Provided that, in respect of the value of the subject matter of the suit, the entire claim is cognizable by such Court

Scope and object of the section.—The provisions of this section are intended for the benefit of suitors the object being to avoid multiplicity of suits (a) A sues B in a Court in district Y on a mortgage of two properties one situate in district X and the other in district Y. The Court in district Y has jurisdiction under this section to order the sale not only of the property in district X but also of the property in district Y and to sell in execution of its decree the property in district Y (b) A is not obliged to bring two suits one in the Court of district X and the other in the Court of district Y. He may bring only one suit in either Court and it matters not if the properties are several one in each district or one property extending over two or more districts (c) The same rule applies to suits for partition (d) and to suits for the recovery of immovable property (e) A can sue in any Court in which any part of the immovable property is situate and he has the right to select his own forum (f) though this right may be controlled by the Court of appeal or the High Court secs. 20 and 23 below. But no partition can be made of property situate outside British India (g)

A bona fide compromise will not divest the Court of jurisdiction once jurisdiction has properly vested in it. *A* sues *B* in a Court in district *X* to recover possession of two properties one situate in district *X* and the other in district *Y*. The suit is compromised as regards the property situate in district *X*. This does not take away the jurisdiction of the Court in district *X* to proceed with the suit as regards the property situate in district *Y* unless it be shown that the compromise was a mere contrivance to defeat the policy of the rule of procedure as to local jurisdiction (*b*).

May be instituted—Cases are conflicting as to whether plaintiff suing in respect of a part of a property in one district only is barred from suing as to the other part or the rest of the property in another district in the jurisdiction of another Court. But the better opinion is that there is no bar and that the section is permissive (1)

Immovable property within the jurisdiction of different Courts — As already stated the immovable property to which this section refers must be situate in British India. Courts in British India have no jurisdiction over property situate outside British India (5). The Court will deal with property in British India if the suit is for partition while declining jurisdiction as to the rest (4). So also if part of the property is in

- (a) *H. laud.* v. *Lal Bahadur* (1894) 16 All.  
30  
(b) *M. eryk* Steel (184 ) 14 Cal 661 (*cy*)  
*M. han* D ydaks (184 ) 19 Cal 15  
7 Eco cy v. *Sahib Ahadr* (194 ) 1 Cal  
632  
(c) *Sa group Chander* v. *imerru u a* (188 ) 8  
103  
(d) *Khat* v. *Iemad* (1887) 1 Mad 330  
(e) *A b J* I m Ali (1908) 30 All 560  
(f) *I t j r i d i l* I I t e t a h (190)  
19 Mad 47 Z muru v. *Fat A d* (190 )  
3 Cal 145 30  
(g) *T macharya* v. *Ananacharya* (1894) 19 Bom.  
614

- (A) *F h t j* Jan 1 (1949) 1 Mad 340 A bra  
J n v I H l (1904) 30 All 563  
(f) *Y bba R* Kima l i (186 ) 3 M  
H C R 3 5 (d l d u n l e t t Act of  
14 J n l e l ave of a s per l Court was  
re j u d i V h l S g h v S o r i ( 1884 )  
P l 18 Hara v aye G a patro  
(1883) B m a t o tra J amoan v  
B l a m a s s o d a e ( 1 6 ) W R 145  
(j) *F r u h a G j a a* (1909) 33 P n i 3 3 -  
1 C 432  
(k) *P n A a n a n v S i d C h a d e* (198 ) 14 Cal  
838 *B l a l a v l c l i* (1934)  
R o m o

a Scheduled District outside the local limits of the jurisdiction of the Court and outside the local extent of the Code (1)

**Execution**—When the Court has power to pass a decree as to immovable property in a different jurisdiction it has also power to execute it. See note under sec 38 Jurisdiction of Court executing a decree

**Courts**—Courts in this section mean Courts to which the Code applies (m)

**Chartered High Courts** This section does not apply to Chartered High Courts in the exercise of their original civil jurisdiction (secs 120) See notes to s 16 Chartered High Courts.

**18 [S 16A]** (1) Where it is alleged to be uncertain within the local limits of the jurisdiction of which of two or more Courts any immovable property is situated, any one of those Courts may, if satisfied that there is

Place of institution of suit where local limits of jurisdiction of Courts are uncertain

ground for the alleged uncertainty, record a statement to that effect and thereupon proceed to entertain and dispose of any suit relating to that property, and its decree in the suit shall have the same effect as if the property were situate within the local limits of its jurisdiction

Provided that the suit is one with respect to which the Court is competent as regards the nature and value of the suit to exercise jurisdiction

(2) Where a statement has not been recorded under sub section (1), and an objection is taken before an appellate or revisional Court that a decree or order in a suit relating to such property was made by a Court not having jurisdiction where the property is situate, the appellate or revisional Court shall not allow the objection unless in its opinion there was, at the time of the institution of the suit, no reasonable ground for uncertainty as to the Court having jurisdiction with respect thereto and there has been a consequent failure of justice

**Uncertainty of local limits of jurisdiction** The uncertainty which the Legislature had in view was the alteration of boundaries by fluvial action (n) The absence of a notification of the boundaries of a district was held to create a reasonable uncertainty (o)

And there has been a consequent failure of justice—These words are new They have been added in order still further to restrict the taking of technical objections as to jurisdiction *Alla Ditta v Abdul Qalir* (p) is an instance of an objection to jurisdiction being disallowed although no statement was recorded as required by sub sec (1)

|  |                        |   |
|--|------------------------|---|
| (1) <i>Srinivas v. Mahalingam</i> (1913) 40 I.A. 114 M.L.J. 114 C. 1 | (10th M.F. 114)        | (o) <i>Asst. Commr. v. Dar</i> (1913) 4 |
| (2) <i>Srinivas v. Mahalingam</i> (1913) 40 I.A. 114 M.L.J. 114 C. 1 | (p) (1901) 11 I.L.J. 5 |   |

**19 [S 18]** Where a suit is for compensation for wrong done to the person or to movable property, if the wrong was done within the local limits of the jurisdiction of one Court and the defendant resides, or carries on business, or personally works for gain, within the local limits of the jurisdiction of another Court, the suit may be instituted at the option of the plaintiff in either of the said Courts

Suits for compensation for wrongs to person or movables

#### Illustrations

(a) A residing in Delhi beats B in Calcutta. B may sue A either in Calcutta or in Delhi.

(b) A residing in Delhi publishes in Calcutta statements defamatory of B. B may sue A either in Calcutta or in Delhi.

**Scope of section**—Section 16 refers to suits for immovable property which have to be filed in the local jurisdiction. Section 20 refers to personal actions such as actions in tort or contract where jurisdiction depends upon the residence of the defendant or the accrual of the cause of action. Section 20 overlaps this section which gives an option where the cause of action accrues in the jurisdiction of one Court and the defendant resides in the jurisdiction of another Court. The section is limited to torts in British India and to defendants residing in British India (q). It excludes suits for an injunction and suits in respect of torts committed outside British India. Such suits fall where the defendant is resident in British India not under this section but under section 20.

**Wrong**—Wrong means a tort or actionable wrong i.e. an act which is legally wrongful as prejudicially affecting a legal right of the plaintiff (r). But it must be a tort affecting the plaintiff's person or his reputation as in the illustrations or his movable property for tort affecting immovable property such as trespass or nuisance or infringement of easements fall under section 16 (e).

The plaintiff may sue either where the defendant resides or the wrong was committed (s). A wrong may however consist of a series of acts and it is sometimes not easy to specify the place where it was committed. Thus in a case from Burma (t) the defendant at Lapon wrongfully obtained a magistrate's order for the seizure of plaintiff's boat at Langoon and it was held that the Rangoon Court had jurisdiction as the wrong was done at Rangoon.

**Suits against Government**—The word *resides* refers only to natural persons. The words *carries on business* refer to commercial business. The section therefore does not apply to suits against the Secretary of State for damages for a tort where the tort is committed outside the jurisdiction. Such suits can only lie in the Court of the place where the tort is committed (u).

**20 [S 17]** Subject to the limitations aforesaid, every suit shall be instituted in a Court within the local limits of whose jurisdiction—

Other provisions relating to the institution of suits in different courts

(q) See *Gore v. Nair* (1916) 33 M. J. 433, 434, 31 L. C. 391.

(r) *Temple v. Ima* (1900) 20 Bom. L. R. 11, 49.

(s) *Hareli Shah v. Poo da Khan* (1906) 31 C.W.

N. 114981 C.R. (1906) A.C. 89.

(t) *Ma Ma v. Shw. Kha* (1911) 31 L. B. R. 166.

(u) *Gore v. Nair* (1916) 33 M. J. 433, 434, 31 L. C. 391.

- (a) the defendant, or each of the defendants where there are more than one, at the time of the commencement of the suit, actually and voluntarily resides, or carries on business, or personally works for gain, or
- (b) any of the defendants, where there are more than one, at the time of the commencement of the suit, actually and voluntarily resides, or carries on business, or personally works for gain, provided that in such case either the leave of the Court is given, or the defendants who do not reside, or carry on business, or personally work for gain, as aforesaid, acquiesce in such institution, or
- (c) the cause of action, wholly or in part, arises

*Explanation I*—Where a person has a permanent dwelling at one place and also a temporary residence at another place, he shall be deemed to reside at both places in respect of any cause of action arising at the place where he has such temporary residence

*Explanation II*—A corporation shall be deemed to carry on business at its sole or principal office in British India, or, in respect of any cause of action arising at any place where it has also a subordinate office, at such place

#### Illustrations

(a) A is a tradesman in Calcutta. B carries on business in Delhi. B by his agent in Calcutta buys goods of A and requests A to deliver them to the East India Railway Company. A delivers the goods accordingly in Calcutta. A may sue B for the price of the goods either in Calcutta where the cause of action has arisen or in Delhi where B carries on business.

(b) A resides at Simla. B at Calcutta and C at Delhi. A, B and C being together at Benares, B and C make a joint promissory note payable on demand and deliver it to A. A may sue B and C at Benares where the cause of action arose. He may also sue them at Calcutta where B resides or at Delhi where C resides but in each of these cases if the non resident defendant objects the suit cannot proceed without the leave of the Court.

Alterations in the section—The words 'every suit' have been substituted for the words 'all other suits' in the Code of 1882. The words 'wholly or in part' in cl (c) are new. Explanation III to s 17 of the Code of 1882 which related to causes of action in cases of contracts has been omitted in view of the addition of the words 'wholly or in part' in cl (c). See notes below. Cause of action in suits on contracts.

Subject to the limitations aforesaid—The limitations are the pecuniary and other limitations referred to in s 16. See note under the same heading below.

that section. The former section was a residuary section referring to all other suits and as such was held to be subject to s 19 (v). The present section overlaps section 19 and is subject to section 16 and by implication to section 15.

**Chartered High Courts**—This section does not apply to Chartered High Courts in the exercise of their original civil jurisdiction (see s 120).

**Scope of the section**—This is a general section embracing all personal actions. At common law actions are either personal or real. Personal actions are also called transitory because they may occur anywhere such as actions for tort to person or to movable property or suits on contract. Real actions are actions against the res or property and are called local because they must be brought in the forum rei sitæ, that is the place where the immovable property is situate. An action may also be a mixed action being partly real and partly personal. Torts to immovable property such as trespass and nuisance are mixed actions and are referred to in s 16 (c). Otherwise s 16 deals with real and local actions while secs 19 and 20 deal with personal or transitory actions.

The limitations mentioned in this section exclude the real and mixed actions of s 16 and confine the section to personal actions. The plaintiff has the option of suing either (1) where the cause of action has accrued or (2) in the forum of the defendant, i.e. where the defendant resides or carries on business or personally works for gain (w). This alternative is shown in the illustrations which are taken from two old cases, the first from *Winter v. Way* (x) and the second from *De Souza v. Coles* (y).

**Actually and voluntarily resides**—As to personal actions, residence will give jurisdiction even when the cause of action has arisen outside British India. Thus a partner was entitled to sue in the Court of Bulsar for the dissolution of a partnership commenced and carried on in foreign territory because the defendant partner at the time of the institution of the suit resided in Bulsar (z). And a suit for arrears of rent of lands in a Native State may be filed in a British Indian Court in the jurisdiction of which the defendant resides for rent that has already accrued due constitutes a personal claim (a). On the other hand if the cause of action has arisen in the jurisdiction a British Indian Court may entertain a suit against a non resident foreigner. See note below. Suit against a non resident foreigner.

The word actually excludes domicile or constructive residence while on the other hand compulsory residence does not confer jurisdiction. Under the Code of 1859 a man was held to reside at a place where he was lawfully confined but the word voluntarily renders these cases obsolete.

The word resides is construed according to the supposed intention of the Legislature (b) and even in this Code it is used sometimes in a more restrictive and sometimes in a more extended sense (see s 136 O 3 r 2 and O 20 r 1). However there appears to be no distinction between the meaning of the word resides in secs 16, 19 and 20 and of the word dwells in cl 12 of the Letters Patent (c). Therefore cases decided on the latter word may be considered authorities on the construction of the former.

**Dwells** within the meaning of clause 12 of Letters Patent.—The dwelling or residence must be of a more or less permanent character. It must be of such a nature as to show that the High Court in which a defendant is sued is his natural forum (d).

(c) *F. I. r. Pal v. Deo Lal Nath* (1903) 30 Cal 43.

(w) *Porter v. C. I. V. S.* (1896) 19 M 14.

(x) (1867) 1 Mad H C 200.

(y) (1868) 3 M J H C 344 347.

(z) *I. M. S. v. I. M. S.* (1911) 45 B M 1-2.

(a) *B. J. v. J.* (1891) 19 All 40.

(b) *F. M. A. v. A. A.* (1891) 6 Bom 100.

*G. A. v. G. A.* (1890) 14 Bom 54.

(c) *M. A. v. L. A.* (1891) 3 F M 200. *G. A. v. G. A.* (1890) 14 Bom 541 54.

(d) *G. A. v. G. A.* (1890) 14 Bom 541. *G. A. v. G. A.* (1891) 14 Bom 220. *G. A. v. G. A.* (1891) 14 Bom 224. *G. A. v. G. A.* (1891) 14 Bom 224. *G. A. v. G. A.* (1891) 14 Bom 224. *G. A. v. G. A.* (1891) 14 Bom 224.

Therefore when the defendant has a permanent dwelling at one place he cannot be said to dwell at a place where he has lodged for a temporary purpose only *e.g.* to defend a suit brought against him (e) or for a change while on leave (f)

Every person is deemed in law to have a dwelling or place of residence and so if he has no permanent place of residence he will be deemed to dwell where he is actually staying at the time. Thus where a defendant who was Political Agent at Kolhapur residing in a Government building there sold his furniture and other effects and left Kolhapur on a year's furlough and while en route to England stayed in Bombay for three days before sailing he was held to dwell in Bombay so as to give jurisdiction to the High Court in a suit instituted against him during his stay in Bombay (g). And in a Calcutta case a racing man who had come to Calcutta for a month for racing was held to dwell in Calcutta for he had no other residence at the time when the suit was instituted against him (h).

On the other hand a person may have more than one permanent place of residence at the same time. If so he will be deemed to dwell in any one of the places where he is actually staying for the time being and he may be sued in that place. In *Orde v Skinner* (i) the defendant who had a dwelling place at Mussoorie was held under the circumstances of the case to have another dwelling place at Bilaspur. Similarly where a defendant spent his time alternately in Calcutta and the mufassal he could be sued in Calcutta where he was residing at the time of institution of the suit (j). But a person who has been living and carrying on business in Bombay for twenty years cannot be said to be residing at Ahmedabad because he has a family house at Ahmedabad which he visits occasionally in such a case Ahmedabad cannot be said to be one of his places of residence (k). Where an Acharya (Hindu head priest) who had his permanent place of residence at Nathdwara where he had been installed on the gadi in 1890 came to Bombay for the first time in April 1889 at the invitation of his devotees and stayed in a house which he had purchased in 1888 for occasional residence and exchanged visits with his followers it was held in a suit brought against him in Bombay in May 1889 that he did not dwell in Bombay (l). Where a person who was domiciled and resided in Mysore left his house in charge of a servant and hired a house in Madras to which he brought his wife and family and apprenticed himself for a year to a Vali in Madras it was held in a suit brought against him in Madras some months after his residence there that inasmuch as he had taken up his abode in Madras meaning to remain there for several months and was actually living there when the suit was instituted he dwelled in Madras within the meaning of cl 12 of the Letters Patent (m).

**Carries on business** —The words also occur in cl 12 of the Letter Patent and the decisions under that clause apply equally to cases arising under ss 16, 19 and 20. The word business is used in a restricted sense (n) and is limited to commercial business. The expression carries on business is intended to relate to business in which a man may contract debts and is liable to be sued by persons having business transactions with him (o). A Hindu priest who receives offerings from his followers cannot be said to carry on business although the offerings are on such a large scale that he employs servants to collect and keep an account of them (p). A zemindari business has been held not to be

- (e) *Farridolli v K Id* (1864) 9 H 411  
 (f) *K ray v Walla s* (1863) 1 Bom H C 113 *Kussan S g v t rt* (18 0) 5 Mad H C 41  
 (g) *Fernandez v Wraj* (1901) 5 Bom 16  
 (h) *Morris v L m g a t n* (1903) Coryn 15  
 (i) *Mayhew v Tullock* (18 ) 4 N W P H C 1  
 (j) (1841) 3 All 91 7 I 4 196  
 (k) *Vala d ney v K H* (1864) Coryton 4  
 (l) *Ug r Chan v s rajnal* (1900) Bom L R 60 *Gurandita Mal v Ram D s* (1918) 1 R no 11 p 343 33 I C 6

- (i) *Goswami v Govardh ni l j* (1900) 14 Bom 541  
 (ii) *Sri vasa Venkat* (1911) 4 Mad 381 4 19 11 I C 447 in pp from J Mad 233  
 (n) *D r v r a v v Sree t ry of St te* (1887) 14 Cal 6 3 6 1 draj i ecr ts y fstat (19 ) 50 Mad 449 10 1 C 5 d ( ) A M 654  
 (o) *Goswami v Govardh ni l j* (1900) 14 P m 541  
 (p) *Goswami v Govardh ni l j* (1900) 14 Bom 541



the kind of business contemplated by this section (q) The phrase carries on business or personally works for gain is inapplicable to the Secretary of State for India for whatever income is obtained by Government is held for the benefit of the Indian Exchequer (r) A person may carry on business at a place where he has no office or regular establishment Thus a person residing in the mufassal who goes once or twice a week from the mufassal to a friend's house in Calcutta and does business there will be said to carry on business in Calcutta (s) The business need not be carried on personally (t) The phrase carries on business is used as distinct from the phrase personally works for gain It does not involve actual presence or personal effort and a man may carry on business in a place through an agent or through a manager or by his servants without having ever gone there It means having an interest in a business at that place a voice in what is done a share in the gain or loss and some control if not over the actual method of working at any rate upon the existence of the business (u) But it is necessary that the following three conditions should concur namely—

(1) The agent must be a *special agent* who attends *exclusively* to the business of the principal and carries it on in the name of the principal and not a *general agent* who does business for any one that pays him Thus a trader in the mufassal who habitually sends grain to Madras for sale by a firm of commission agents who have an independent business of selling goods for others on commission cannot be said to carry on business in Madras (v) So a firm in England carrying on business in the name of *A B & Co* which employs upon the usual terms a Bombay firm carrying on business in the name of *C D & Co* to act as the English firm's commission agents in Bombay does not carry on business in Bombay so as to render itself liable to be sued in Bombay (w)

(2) The person acting as agent must be an *agent in the strict sense of the term* The manager of a joint Hindu family is not an agent within the meaning of this condition (x)

(3) To constitute carrying on business at a certain place the *essential* part of the business must take place in that place Therefore a retail dealer who sells goods in the mufassal cannot be said to carry on business in Bombay merely because he has an agent in Bombay to import and purchase his stock for him He cannot be said to carry on business in Bombay unless his agent made sales there on his behalf (y) A Calcutta firm that employs an agent at Amritsar who has no power to receive money or to enter into contracts but only collects orders which are forwarded to and dealt with in Calcutta cannot be said to do business in Amritsar (z) Similarly a Life Assurance Company which carries on business in Bombay employs an agent at Madras who acts merely as a Lost Office forwarding proposals and sending moneys cannot be said to do business in Madras (a)

**Leave of the Court**—Leave of the Court is required when some of the defendants are within and others outside jurisdiction Thus a suit against the members of a firm one of whom resides within jurisdiction may be instituted with leave of the Court as regards the non resident defendants (b) and if the Court refuses leave the suit cannot proceed unless the non resident defendants acquiesce (c) Leave may be given even after institution of the suit (d)

- (q) *Yed n Chander v Poda* (197) 19 W R 311 *Anonymous a s* (18) 3 W R 3  
(r) *Dya Va a n v Secretary of State* (14) 14 C L 56 23 *Corrad v Lu v Secretary of State* (19) 60 Mad 442 10 I C 6  
(s) *A M 62*  
(t) *G chander v Coll* (1861) 2 Hyde 9  
(u) *M Dava v Han* (188) 4 Mad 99  
(v) *Kirpa Ram v Mafal Sen* (19 1) 19 All L J 606 C I C 93 (19) 1 A 36  
(w) *Chinnal v T Laka nat mm* 2 (1866) 6 M H 146

- (x) *Ka m j v Fo te* (19 1) 19 Bom II C 100  
(y) *4 nalas v Murriga* (1903) 6 Mad 544, 30 I A 70  
(z) *Fr m j Horn s j* (186) 1 T m H C 0  
(a) *Hera and v C m kh la* (1903) 3 I C 0 (1903) 1 A L 4  
(b) *Joh v Samb m rhy* (1908) 6 Mad L J 90 (20) 1 A M 347  
(c) *Ilav pp* 4 m L 1 (1916) 35 I C 74  
(d) *Maomed Ali v d d* (19) 146 Bom 2 64 I C 619 (19) 1 A J 25  
(e) *Va a n v Secretary of State* (1906) 30 Bom 60

**Acquiesce** —Section 20 of the Code of 1882 contained a provision that if a defendant who did not reside within the jurisdiction did not apply to the Court for a stay of proceedings he should be deemed to have acquiesced in the institution of the suit (e) but this clause has been omitted from the present Code and there is no express provision for such a presumption in the transfer sections 22 23 and 24 Nevertheless it is submitted that a defendant who appears and fails to apply for a transfer will be deemed to have acquiesced But when the defendant objected to jurisdiction the Calcutta High Court held that he could not be deemed to have acquiesced because he failed to apply for a transfer (f)

**Personally works for gain** —These words were inserted to give jurisdiction where a person lives outside the local limits of jurisdiction but comes within them to work for gain as in the case of a pleader who lives outside the jurisdiction of the High Court where he practises (g) The word works implies mental or physical effort and does not apply to the receipt of offerings by a Hindu priest (h) As already stated the phrase works for gain is not applicable to the Secretary of State or to Government (i)

**Cause of action** — Cause of action means every fact which it would be necessary for the plaintiff to prove in order to support his right to the judgment of the Court (j) It does not comprise every piece of evidence which is necessary to prove each fact but every fact which is necessary to be proved to entitle the plaintiff to a decree (k) Everything which if not proved would give the defendant a right to an immediate judgment must be part of the cause of action (l) It is in other words a bundle of essential facts which it is necessary for the plaintiff to prove before he can succeed in the suit (m) It has no relation whatever to the defence which may be set up by the defendant nor does it depend upon the character of the relief prayed for by the plaintiff It refers entirely to the grounds set forth in the plaint as the cause of action or in other words to the media upon which the plaintiff asks the Court to arrive at a conclusion in his favour (n) The cause of action must be antecedent to the institution of the suit (o) So when the plaintiff filed his suit for ejectment fifteen days before he was entitled to possession he failed for want of a cause of action (p)

**Cause of action in suits on contracts** —The corresponding section of the Code of 1882 merely referred to the place where the cause of action arose It was not clear whether this meant the whole cause of action or any part of the cause of action The section was therefore amended by section 7 of Act 7 of 1888 which added an Explanation as to the significance of the term when applied to contracts That Explanation was as follows —

**Explanation III** —In suits arising out of contract the cause of action arises within the meaning of this section at any of the following places namely —

- (1) The place where the contract was made
- (2) the place where the contract was to be performed or performance thereof completed

- (e) *Venkata v Krishnasami* (1883) 6 Mad 344  
*Pamappa v Ganpat* (1906) 0 Bom 81  
 (f) *Ratan Chand v Secretary of State* (1914) 18 C W N 1340 71 C 23  
 (g) *Pai Varain v Newton* (1830) 6 N W P 43  
 (h) *G 1911 v Goverdhanlalji* (1890) 14 Bom 541  
 (i) *Daya Varain v Secretary of State* (1887) 14 Cal 26 — 374  
 (j) *Cook v Gull* (1830) 8 C 1 10 *London Bombay Bank v Laddie* (1840) 5 Bom 4  
*Varayan v Secretary of State* (1906) 30 Bom 50  
 (k) *Read v Brown* (1888) 2 Q B D 1-5  
 131 *M R v Bholia Ram* (1893) 16 All

- 16 [F B] *Sul ma Bibi v Sulik Maham* mad (1876) 15 All 131 *Muhammad Z Karim v Muhammad Haff* (1917) 39 All 506 11 411 C 33  
 (l) *Read v Brown* (1888) 2 Q B D 1-5  
 (m) *Dhanyu haw v Ffride* (1830) 11 Bom 649  
*Mus v Ma Jai* (1900) 1 Bom 368  
*Kayoomath v Gobind* (1890) 2 Cal 451  
 (n) *Chand Ko v P. S. S. P. S. P. S. P. S.* 93 10 15 I A 156  
 (o) *Mahant Gobind v Rani Debi* (1919) 4 P T L J 32 323 52 I C 31  
 (p) *Gulzar S v Kalyan Chand* (1923) 1 All 399

- (3) the place where in performance of the contract any money to which the suit relates was expressly or impliedly payable

This Explanation made it clear that in suits on contracts cause of action meant the whole or any part of the cause of action but it was still not clear that it meant the same in other suits (q) In the present Code the words wholly or in part have been inserted after the word cause of action which makes it plain that all suits may be instituted where the cause of action arises wholly or in part (r) Explanation III has been omitted as no longer necessary but it is nevertheless a correct statement of what is still the law (s)

In a suit for damages for breach of contract the cause of action consists of the making of the contract and of its breach so that the suit may be filed either at the place where the contract was made or at the place where it should have been performed and the breach occurred (t) Thus if a contract is made in Poona to be performed in Poona the whole cause of action arises in Poona and the suit for breach can only be filed in the Poona Court But if the contract is made in Poona to be performed in Belgaum the suit for its breach can be filed either in the Poona or the Belgaum Court No leave of the Court is required in respect of a suit where part of the cause of action arises out of jurisdiction as in the case of High Court suits governed by clause 12 of the Letters Patent

The making of a contract is part of the cause of action and a suit on a contract can always be filed at the place where it was made (u) The determination of the place where it was made is part of the law of contract A contract by correspondence is made at the place where the letter of acceptance is posted (v) and if acceptance is by performance of a condition the suit may be instituted at the place where the condition is performed (w)

The performance of a contract is part of the cause of action and a suit in respect of breach can always be filed at the place where the contract should have been performed or its performance completed (x) The usual case is that of a contract for sale of goods and a suit on such a contract may be filed at the place where the goods were deliverable or the price payable (y) Thus if goods for delivery at Allahabad are sold according to sample and paid for in Bombay the buyer may sue in Allahabad if the goods prove not to be of sample quality (z) When a buyer at Hasganj ordered dyes from a seller at Delhi but after paying for and opening the parcel found it to contain only clay he was entitled to sue for damages at Hasganj (a) If not otherwise provided by the contract goods sold are deliverable at the place where they are sold or if not ready at the place of manufacture If they are sent by common carrier at seller's risk the contract is performed at the place where they are delivered to the buyer or if at buyer's risk at the place where they are delivered to the carrier (b) In the case of a contract for Bombay the place of performance is Bombay (c)

(q) See *Bank of India v. P. K. P. S.* (1903) 41 All 45

(r) See *Bank of India v. P. K. P. S.* (1903) 41 All 45

(s) See *Bank of India v. P. K. P. S.* (1903) 41 All 45

(t) See *Bank of India v. P. K. P. S.* (1903) 41 All 45

(u) See *Bank of India v. P. K. P. S.* (1903) 41 All 45

(v) See *Bank of India v. P. K. P. S.* (1903) 41 All 45

(w) See *Bank of India v. P. K. P. S.* (1903) 41 All 45

(x) See *Bank of India v. P. K. P. S.* (1903) 41 All 45

(y) See *Bank of India v. P. K. P. S.* (1903) 41 All 45

(z) See *Bank of India v. P. K. P. S.* (1903) 41 All 45

(a) See *Bank of India v. P. K. P. S.* (1903) 41 All 45

(b) See *Bank of India v. P. K. P. S.* (1903) 41 All 45

(c) See *Bank of India v. P. K. P. S.* (1903) 41 All 45

(d) See *Bank of India v. P. K. P. S.* (1903) 41 All 45

(e) See *Bank of India v. P. K. P. S.* (1903) 41 All 45

(f) See *Bank of India v. P. K. P. S.* (1903) 41 All 45

(g) See *Bank of India v. P. K. P. S.* (1903) 41 All 45

(h) See *Bank of India v. P. K. P. S.* (1903) 41 All 45

(i) See *Bank of India v. P. K. P. S.* (1903) 41 All 45

(j) See *Bank of India v. P. K. P. S.* (1903) 41 All 45

(k) See *Bank of India v. P. K. P. S.* (1903) 41 All 45

(l) See *Bank of India v. P. K. P. S.* (1903) 41 All 45

(m) See *Bank of India v. P. K. P. S.* (1903) 41 All 45

(n) See *Bank of India v. P. K. P. S.* (1903) 41 All 45

(o) See *Bank of India v. P. K. P. S.* (1903) 41 All 45

(p) See *Bank of India v. P. K. P. S.* (1903) 41 All 45

The place of performance is generally expressed in the contract and if not so expressed it may be inferred from the nature of the act. Thus a contract to repair a house must be performed where the house is situate and an agreement to register a mortgage must be performed at the place where the law requires it to be registered (d). If the place is neither expressed in the contract nor implied from the necessities of the case it will be determined by the Court according to the intention of the parties (e) or the provisions of sections 48 and 49 of the Contract Act. Thus in *Lleuhellin v Clunnial* (f) the Court said that looking to the ordinary course of business it was the intention of the parties that payment should be made at plaintiff's place of business. Similarly in *Sreenath Roy v Cally Das* (g) a suit for breach of an agreement to mortgage property outside Calcutta was held to lie in Calcutta as the plaintiff's place of business was in Calcutta and the defendant would have to repay the money there to redeem. Ordinarily in the case of goods purchased or money borrowed payment must be made at the residence of the seller or lender as the case may be (h). In a contract of service which did not fix the place of payment of salary the salary was held to be payable at the place where the service was rendered (i). When A sued B on a contract of service made at Hyderabad for service rendered at Hyderabad alleging that after service rendered B promised to pay in Madras the Court held that there was no consideration for the latter promise no contract to pay in Madras and therefore no breach of contract in Madras so as to enable A to sue in Madras (j).

If the contract is to be performed at the place where it is made the suit on the contract must be filed there and nowhere else. In *Dadabhai v Diogo* (k) A at Harwar sent money to his agent in Bombay with instructions to negotiate a contract for the purchase and shipment of goods from Bombay to Harwar. The agent entered into a contract with B and paid him the money but B failed to ship the goods. A sued B at Harwar but the Court there had no jurisdiction for the contract was made and the money paid in Bombay and the performance was also to be in Bombay by the shipment of goods from there.

**Contract of agency**—In suits for an agent's account the cause of action arises at the place where the contract of agency was made or the place where accounts are to be rendered and payment is to be made by the agent (l). In *Lal Singh v Adir Balah* (m) a Sialkot firm sent hides for sale to their commission agent at Calcutta and were entitled to sue at Sialkot for the sale proceeds as the accounts were to be rendered there and the money was payable there. In *Motilal v Surajmal* (n) a Bombay merchant A ordered goods from time to time from B who acted as his pucca adatia at Phulgaon. A sued B in Bombay for the amount due to him on the account. Tyabji J held (1) that as instructions were sent by A to B from Bombay and (2) that as accounts were rendered by B to A at Bombay and (3) that as demand was made for payment of the amount due from Bombay that payment of the money was intended to be made in Bombay and that a material part of the cause of action arose in Bombay. This case was dissented from in *Tika Ram v Daulat Ram* (o) where the Allahabad High Court held that a commission agent doing an independent business of his own is liable to account at his own place of business. This is in

(d) *Sami v Copal* (1873) 7 Mad H C 16

(e) *De Nijha v Forde* (189) 11 Bom 449  
*Muhammad v Muhammad* (1916) F R 231 I C 638

(f) (188) 4 All 43

(g) (1879) 5 Cal 8

(h) *Ba gals Mal v Ganga Pr m* (193) 1 I C 431 (—3) A A 16

(i) *B g Moammed v Karraj* (1900) — Bom L R 514

(j) *Se hager Fou v Vaukab takur Ju g* (190 )

30 Mad 439 See also *Kamiseti v Katha* (1904) Mad 35

(k) (1894) 14 Bom 43

(l) See *Famdius v Dhanpat* (1975) 8 Lah 103  
88 I C 90 ( ) A L 337

(m) (19 ) 3 Lah L J 479 65 I C 44 (— ) A L 36

(n) (1906) 30 Bom 157 a case under cl. 1 of the Letters Patent

(o) (1904) 48 All 466 20 L C 691 (— ) A L 530

accordance with the decisions of the Punjab (p) and Lahore (q) Courts The mere sending of goods does not constitute part of the cause of action and does not give jurisdiction to the Court of the place from which the goods were sent (r)

Place where money expressly or impliedly payable—Part of the cause of action arises where money is expressly or impliedly payable under a contract In *Lal Singh v Kadir Baksh* (s) the case referred to in the last paragraph the suit could be instituted at Sialkot as it was an implied term of the contract that the agent should pay his principal there When the place of payment is not specified the Court will be guided by the intention of the parties (t) The amount due on a balance struck at foot of an account is payable at the place where the balance was struck although the transactions which were the subject of the account took place elsewhere (u) In *Luchmeo Ghund v Zoratur Mul* (r) an account was taken and balance struck on dissolution of a partnership business at Muttra and Privy Council held that although the partnership agreement had been entered into at Ruliam the suit for the balance was properly instituted at Muttra as that was the place where the balance was struck and the amount became due and payable On the other hand the mere fact that a cheque is sent in payment from a particular place will not alter the locality of the suit (w) If under a contract for the sale of goods the price is payable at the seller's place of business but the buyer failing to pay the seller sends his man to the buyer's residence and the buyer pays at his residence the buyer cannot in a suit for compensation for inferiority of the goods take advantage of that fact and sue in the Court of the place where he resides (x) The fact that the creditor is described in a promissory note made at Y as resident of A does not make A the place of payment so as to give jurisdiction to the Court at A No place of performance being fixed the question as stated above is one of intention to be gathered from the contract and the surrounding circumstances (y)

The debtor must find his creditor—Under the English law if a place is appointed for the performance of a contract it is the duty of the creditor to attend at the place named to receive payment but if no place is appointed the debtor is bound to find the creditor and tender him the money in other word there is an implied promise to pay inter alia where the creditor resides or carries on business Under the Indian law as enacted in s 49 of the Indian Contract Act 1872 where no place is fixed for the performance of a promise whether the promise is to deliver goods or to pay money (z) it is the duty of the debtor to apply to the creditor to appoint a reasonable place for the performance of the promise and to perform it at such place But what if the debtor does not apply to the creditor to appoint a place? In such a case it has been held in some cases (a) that the common rule applies and there is an implied promise to pay the creditor wherever he might be and in some (b) that there is no such duty and no implied promise arises The point arose in a recent case

- (p) *Al hammat St A v Karamat Ali* (1896) 1 R 6  
 (q) *Bhamboe v Lam v ra n* (19 8) 9 Lah 435 109 I C 4 (5) A L 297  
 (r) *Na Hal v Au lai* (19 4) 30 Bom L R 1301 11<sup>2</sup> I C 734 (9) A B 544  
*Pur CA d v Jodh R J* (19) 66 I C 501 (1) A A 449  
 (s) (19) 33 Lah L J 429 63 I C 44 (1) A L 36  
 (t) *Du jusha v Eford* (1887) 11 Bom 649  
*D rragh d Co v Pursh tam* (1893) 4 Mad 3  
*Sau l a Nath v R mau dar* (191) 10 C L J 2 J 151 C 84 G frumies  
*v Narayan* (1919) 49 I C 900  
*Isak m m d v J h mmad* (1916) 1 R 31 I C 638  
 (u) *Ha mraj v P m Bux* (1886) 1 Agra 115  
 (v) (1860) 8 M I A 21 (a case under Beng

- Reg of 1803)  
 (w) *Soh n Si gh v Riddick* (19) 6 I C 66 (1) A L 164  
 (x) *Dam d Shah v Ral a Mal* (19 0) Lah L J 555 64 I C 387  
 (y) *Raman v Gopalachari* (1908) 31 Mad 3  
 (z) *So r m v R D Tata d C* (1907) 54 I A 265 71 S Rang 451 457 10 I C 610 (17) A L 156 The dicta to the contrary in *Tika R m v D l t P m* (19 4) 46 All 466 at pp 467 468 are erroneous  
 (a) *Du jusha v Eford* (1887) 11 Bom 649  
*S S Afold v Surajmal* (1906) 30 Bom 167 171 Gotul D v Nathu (1908) 49 All 310 9 I C 49 (26) A A 477  
 (b) *Kad m l v Surajm I* (1807) 9 Bom L R 903 909 910, I m n v G palach r (1808) 31 Mad 223

before the Judicial Committee (c) and it was held that where no application has been made by the debtor to appoint a place for the performance of the promise the place of performance is to be determined with reference to the intention of the parties and that in so doing regard should be had to the fact that the obligation to pay the creditor involves the further obligation of finding the creditor so as to pay him. Their Lordships said: "Their Lordships do not think that in this state of the authorities it is possible to accede to the present contention that s. 49 of the Indian Contract Act gets rid of the inference that should justly be drawn from the terms of the contract itself or from the necessities of the case involving the obligation to pay the creditor the further obligation of finding the creditor so as to pay him. The Common Law rule however applies only when the creditor is within the realm. It cannot extend further than it does in England and a debtor in a Native State is not bound to find and pay a creditor in British India (d)."

**Negotiable Instruments**—The cause of action in a suit on a negotiable instrument arises wherever any one of the facts the proof of which is essential to plaintiff's case occurs. Thus a suit may be filed at the place where the bill was drawn or where it was accepted or dishonoured or where it was payable. A suit may be instituted at the place where a hundi was drawn (e). Where a promissory note was signed by the defendant at Secunderabad and delivered to the plaintiff at Madras the Madras Court had jurisdiction as delivery was necessary to complete the plaintiff's title (f). If the promissory note is drawn in the jurisdiction of the Court the suit may be filed there although the promisee is described in the note as resident of another place (g). But a promissory note is presumed to have been drawn at the place where it purports to have been executed (h). If a hundi was neither drawn nor payable in Bombay it cannot be sued on in the Bombay High Court although it was for the balance of an account of Bombay transactions (i). A hundi may be sued on at the place where it was dishonoured (j) or where it was payable (k). A suit on a promissory note executed at Vizianagaram and payable at Secunderabad or Madras is maintainable in the High Court of Madras (l). A promissory note not expressly payable at Delhi was delivered to the payee there and it was presumed to be payable there so as to give jurisdiction to the Delhi Court (m).

The endorsee of a hundi may sue his endorser at the place of endorsement (n) and so may the assignee of a promissory note (o). The Calcutta High Court has held that an endorsee may sue the drawer and acceptor at the place of endorsement. For when D drew a hundi at Benares on his firm at Bombay in favour of B P & Co a firm at Calcutta and the hundi was endorsed by B P & Co to P in Calcutta part of the cause of action was held to arise in Calcutta where the endorsement was made and P could sue in the Calcutta High Court after obtaining leave under clause 12 of the Charter (p). But the case is different when the drawer of a hundi raises money by negotiating his own hundi. A seller of goods drew hundis outside Madras on the buyer firm in Madras and negotiated them outside Madras. The Madras firm paid the endorsee and was entitled to sue the drawer in Madras to recover moneys overpaid as the amount

- (c) *Soni v R D T & Co* (197) 4 I A 26 5 Ranc 41 10 I C 610  
(27) A PC 156 distin. *ishling Pulappa v Vrbhadrapa* (190) 7 B M L R 893  
(d) *La silat v Ch I* (190) 3 I A 54 53 Cal 84 9 I C 60 ( ) A I C 10  
(e) *Ra purt b Preme k* (1920) 15 B M 93  
S I v H M a j (1900) 1 I 5 J  
I I v O P t i c e o u l I k (1916)  
34 I C 191 *La sa t I* I I I al  
(18) 1 A H 39  
(f) *W nter* I o d (186 ) 1 M H C 0  
(g) *Rama v Copal hary* (1908) 31 M L 3  
(h) *Mile* 18h Myle (190 ) 3 M d 19  
(i) *S war n* I j r a n j a l (1916) 40 Bom

- 433 I C 918  
(j) *M I ha d v g Chand* (1 ) 1 Bom  
3 I A r a n D *Kotu ni* (1903) P R  
13  
(k) *D o l r Du* *Fe a* B I (190)  
S i a t L J 538 31 A 96  
(l) *S r y M H* *H d o* (1901) 4 M d J  
( ) *M I a s a t v M h a m d* (1916) I I  
31 I C 63  
( ) *S j n e h d* *M l e* I (13) 9 E o n  
H C 0  
(o) *V u p a l l v M n e p a l l* (1916) 31 M I  
L J 816 3 I C 61  
(p) *P a r s o o n t h* *C a l a n d a r u* (190 ) 1 I  
451

of the hundi was in excess of what was due for the price of the goods (q) The over payment in Madras was part of the cause of action but the payment received by the drawer from his endorsee could not be treated as a payment towards the contract The negotiation by the drawer was only a provisional method of realizing the money from persons who were willing to accept the hundi for a small profit and take the trouble of getting paid The High Court of Calcutta has held that if P accepts and pays a hundi in Calcutta for the accommodation of D in Cawnpore and D fails to pay part of the cause of action arises in Calcutta (r)

**Partnership**—A suit for the dissolution of partnership and for accounts may be instituted either where the contract of partnership was entered into (s) or where the business of the partnership was carried on (t) and if the business was carried on in two places the suit may be filed at either place (u) If the partnership has been dissolved and the accounts taken and balance struck a suit for the balance will lie at the place where the balance was struck (t) The fact that a partnership owns immovable property does not make a suit for the dissolution of partnership and for accounts a suit for immovable property (w)

**Cause of action in other suits**—In an administration suit the undertaking to administer is part of the cause of action (x) The grant of letters of administration is part of the cause of action in a suit for a legacy (y) In a contract of bailment the payment of the bailee's charges is part of the performance of the contract (z) and part of the cause of action also accrues at the place where the goods bailed are stored (a) A suit for a breach of a contract of betrothal may be filed where the breach takes place (b) and in case of a contract to marry at the place where the marriage was to have been celebrated (c) A suit for damages for misrepresentation will lie at the place where the misrepresentation was made (d) or for wrongful arrest at the place of arrest (e) or for death caused by negligence at the place where the death took place (f) or for libel at the place of publication (g) The cause of action in a suit to set aside a forged will arises at the place where the will was published (h) or if plaintiff's interest in any property is prejudicially affected by the will the suit may be filed at the place where that property is situate (i) In a suit to set aside a deed of release executed in Calcutta of plaintiff's interest in property in Bombay it was said that the cause of action did not arise wholly in Calcutta but included the effect of the release on the Bombay property (j) In a contract of insurance of goods made in Rangoon and providing for payment at Rangoon the cause of action is at Pangoon and not at the place where the goods were destroyed or damaged (k) But in the case of a life insurance the cause of action accrues at the place where the death occurs (l) A suit for restitution of conjugal rights may be brought in the Court of the place where the husband resides or it may be brought in the Court

- (q) *Po mi Damoda* (19 4) 4 M 1 403  
 9 I C 800 (24) A M 464  
 (r) *Pancha dar v G ap t am* (12 0) 4 Cal  
 583 9 I C 539  
 (s) *D ga Das v Jas n* (191 ) 41 All  
 13 0 I C 155 J g n G d Jfal  
 (18 ) I R 6 Jaganad v I hna  
 Cha d (1904) 1 W R 100  
 (t) *Alia Duta v St ka Dar* (1916) P R  
 4 23 I C 953 A a ja S ga v  
 T lali Pam (1919) 17 All L J 1015  
 I C 6  
 ( ) *Thimma v Halalrush a* (19 0) 0 Mad  
 L J 99 9 I C 91 ( 6) A M 4 7  
 ( ) *Lu hnee Ch nd v Zorac r Muf* (1900)  
 8 M I A JI  
 (w) *D ga Da v Ja Var in* (1917) 41 All 513  
 50 I C 1 6  
 (x) *Sri a le ata* (1906) 9 M d 39 9  
 (y) *Re E Her Ma k y* (18 4) 2 P & B 3  
 ( ) *Hoseck M He t n* (1906) 1 R 0  
 (a) *Ca esk Prasad v Luns Har* (191 ) 1 All

- L J 13 41 I C 904  
 (b) *Bhag gh v I Pa ngh* (1916) P R 93  
 37 I C 114  
 (c) *Mah a Pr vad v b t f v j* (19 )  
 6 I C 81  
 (d) *Be g t cool co Fijin Cotto co* (18 0)  
 W I 13  
 (e) *I ddt Kaha on* (14 1) 6 Beng L R 141  
 (f) *Sham v ran v B B d C I Rly* (1919)  
 41 All 448 50 I C 130  
 (g) *C f rt I k t t* (18 9) 13 Pom 1 8  
 (h) *Shard I v D ga I r* (1843) A W N 1 3  
 (i) *Vut t t Pa gva v Vut lu J lla ma* (19 3)  
 43 M 1 L J 615 2 I C 9 0 (23) A M  
 109  
 (j) *Hady Iama I H t j e Mah t* (19 4)  
 13 Beng L I 91  
 (k) *J pter General I a rancer co v Abd I*  
*Azn* (19 3) 1 Rang 31 6 I C 4  
 ( ) A R  
 (l) *P j b Muf at H nd Famul J P luf Fu d*  
*v S da* (1919) 1 R 94 45 I C 900

of the place where the wife resides (m) A suit by a guardian for the custody of his ward removed by the defendant from Allahabad to Lahore may be brought in the Court at Lahore or it may be brought in the Court at Allahabad (n) A suit for damages for infringement of a trade mark may be brought in the Court of place where the defendant resides or in the Court of the place where the defendant publishes advertisements constituting infringement of the trade mark (o) A suit for damages for conversion may be brought in the Court of the place where the conversion originally took place (p)

Place of suing where decree sought to be set aside on ground of fraud —The question whether a suit can be instituted in one District for setting aside a decree passed by a Court in another District has been the subject of many decisions. The result of the actual decisions ignoring what are merely obiter dicta may be stated thus. A suit to set aside a decree obtained by fraud in Court X where nothing is done beyond transferring the decree for execution to Court Y can only be maintained in Court X that is the Court which passed the decree (q) Where however a decree passed by Court X is transferred for execution to Court Y and the decree holder makes an application to Court Y for execution of the decree (r) or property belonging to the judgment debtor is attached by Court Y (s) or the judgment debtor is arrested by Court Y in execution and released on giving security (t) the judgment debtor may institute a suit in Court Y for a declaration that the decree was obtained by fraud and for an injunction restraining the decree holder from executing the decree. Similarly if the judgment debtor's property is sold by Court Y in execution he may sue the decree holder in Court Y for a similar declaration and for setting aside the sale and for possession (u). In all these cases the cause of action arises in part within the jurisdiction of Court Y. But where the decree holder has done nothing beyond getting the decree transferred for execution to Court Y and has not made an application to Court Y for execution the judgment debtor as stated above cannot institute a suit in Court Y for setting aside the decree not even if the plaint includes a relief for injunction (v). A High Court will grant leave under its Charter and entertain a suit to set aside a decree of a Mofussil Court for fraud if part of the cause of action has arisen in its jurisdiction (w).

Suit against corporations Explanation II—Irrespective of the Companies Act the domicile of a trading company is fixed by the situation of its principal place of business (x) that is to say its chief office where the central management and control are actually to be found (y). In the case of a company registered under the Companies Act the controlling power is as a fact generally exercised at the registered office and that office is therefore not only for the purposes of the Act but for other purposes the principal place of business (z). This is not however necessarily the case (a) and the question whether that or some other place is the principal place of business of the company is in each case a pure question of fact to be determined upon a scrutiny of the

- (m) *L. Idajia v. Ba. Duraj* (1844) 18 Bom 316  
As to suits under the Indian Divorce Act  
1869 see *Yu. Serna v. Ele ora* (1913)  
38 Bom 1 at 149 O I C 43  
(n) *Sa. at (1a) v. For* (1850) 1 All 13  
(o) *He. tra. Lal v. Fa. cl* (191) 3  
All 446 O I C 98  
(p) *A. r. k. Ch. n. Gopik. r.* (187) C I 64  
(q) *Un. r. o. S. q. v. H. d. o. (180)* 3 All 418  
(r) *L. n. k. Bel. r. s. v. P. H. F. n. (1903)* 5 All  
43 *I. d. a. Pro. v. d. e. Co. Ltd. v. G. n. a.*  
(192) C W N 33 6 I C 318 (3)  
A C 4  
(s) *J. a. l. v. J. r. s. (191) 3 All 189*  
S I C 0 *J. a. v. S. i. p. v. E. D.*  
v. o. i. d. (o) (19 6) Lal 61 94 I C  
37 (6) A L D 43 v. F. r. m.  
I. c. Mal (19) 3 Lu k 14 106 I C  
41 (4) A U B. C. o. tr. De. D. J. I

- M. v. H. I. (1914) 38 All 64 41 C 97*  
*Jawal. Singh v. E. D. S. o. n. d. Co.*  
(19 6) 7 Lah 61 94 I C 377 (6) A L  
7  
(t) *I. P. Lal. I. an. Gok. I. (1a) d. (191) 39*  
All 60 41 I C 3  
(v) *F. e. r. v. r. I. o. s. A. K. u. a. (1901) 5 C*  
W 50  
(w) *S. 6 All 564 t. p. 56 41 C 98*  
(x) *V. t. ce. Das v. v. n. do. Lal. (190) 30*  
Cal 99  
(y) *J. r. s. Scott. h. Arcude. I. I. u. r. a. e. Co.*  
(1846) 1 Q B D 41  
(z) *Ibid. De. E. s. Con. v. d. d. M. e. Ltd. v.*  
*House* [1906] A C 44  
(a) *H. t. s. v. C. d. sh. I. r. p. e. r. I. I. r. e. Co.*  
(187) 3 O B D 35  
(b) *K. v. t. n. L. i. o. L. i. a. s. Co. v. B. a. l. e. r. (1863) 2*  
H & C 9



course of business and trading (b) But a Company may have subordinate or branch offices in fifty different jurisdictions and it may be sued in any one of such jurisdictions in respect of a cause of action arising there (c)

**Suit against non resident foreigners**—The Court has no jurisdiction in a suit against a non resident foreigner on a cause of action which arose wholly without British territory (d) As already stated the Court has jurisdiction to entertain a suit against a foreigner resident within the limits of its jurisdiction in respect of a cause of action that has accrued abroad (e) A foreigner is not exempt from the jurisdiction of British Indian Courts (f) If a foreigner resides or himself carries on business or personally works for gain in British India it is clear that he is amenable to the jurisdiction of British Indian Courts But what if a foreigner does not reside or does not himself carry on business or personally work for gain in British India and

(1) the cause of action arises within the local limits of a British Indian Court or

(2) the cause of action arises without British India but the foreigner carries on business through his agent within the local limits of a British Indian Court?

As to case (1) it is settled that a non resident foreigner who is a subject of a protected Native State may be sued in the Court of British India if the cause of action arises within the jurisdiction of such Court (g) Thus if A a subject of the Native State of Sangli and residing at Sangli borrows money from B at Belgaum B may sue A for recovery of the money in the Belgaum Court for the cause of action arises at Belgaum

As to case (2) the High Court of Bombay in one case held that where no part of the cause of action arose in Bombay it had no jurisdiction to entertain a suit against a foreigner who did not reside in Bombay but carried on business through an agent in Bombay (h) But that decision was disapproved in the later case of *Girdhar v Kassar* (i) The point arose in a later case before the Privy Council but it was left open (j) The Madras High Court has held that the expression carrying on business in cl 12 of the Letters Patent includes carrying on business through an agent in British India by foreigners living outside jurisdiction (k)

**21 [New]** No objection as to the place of suing shall be allowed by any appellate or revisional Court unless such objection was taken in the Court of first instance at the earliest possible opportunity and in all cases where issues are settled at or before such settlement, and unless there has been a consequent failure of justice

Objection to jurisdiction

(b) *De Beers Co Ltd v M s Ltd v Howe* (1906) A C 45 Hbbury vol v p 15 art 6

(c) *R k of Bengal v Sarat Chandra* (1919) 4 Pat. L J 141 43 I C 943

(d) *Bh. Doo v Jam v Ram* (1935) 9 Lah 455 109 I C 3 (N) 4 L J

(e) *Imadi v Imadi* (1911) 45 Bom 1 63 I C 99 Bhujbal v Nambeju (189) 19 All 40

(f) *Smul v I Jan Textile Co* (197) 49 All 662 101 I C 63 (A) A A 413

*R m Iary v Pralhadras* (1906) 20 Bom 133 *Crdh v Kassar* (189) 17 Bom 66

*Tadepall v Vrob Sayed* (1906) J Mad 63 *In m las v Murugas*

(1903) 6 Mad 544 30 I A 300 *Rambhai Shanku* (1901) B m 53 *Srin raga*

*v Se I sa* (1911) 34 I A 10 34 Mad 11 I C 44

(h) *R sary v Kassar* (1893) 1 Bom 0

(i) (1893) 1 Bom 66 [a case under the Pre sidentcy Small Cause Courts Act 188

191]

(j) *Annamalai v M ruga* (1903) 6 Mad 544 30 I A 300 [a case under s 17 of the Code of 185 corresponding with s 20 of the present Code]

(k) *Janoo v Latch* (193) 45 Mad L J 471 74 I C 35 (24) A M 158 *disent*

*18 from 1 Bom 30 and 11 wing 17 Bom 68*

(4) *Place of suit*—This phrase may refer to territorial jurisdiction in its wider sense as where the suit is not cognizable by a British Indian Court being for instance a suit for partition of land outside British India or in its narrower sense of the local venue in British India for suits cognizable by British Indian Courts. The words are used in this section in this latter sense with reference to the local venue for which rules have

(e) (14, 4) 10 C 1 8 8 8  
(p) *Mysell* 3 H of J h e (18J3) 1 Q B 149  
(q) See *Jase* 4 t *Fra* *Curo* (1910) 3  
B m 3 I e 9 0 0 F 3 L k h m  
K *tway* (1910) 33 C 1 6 x 660-6  
1 I C 464 *Facappa* e *Shidappa*  
(1910) 45 I 4 \* 43 Rom 0 50 I C  
- 2

been enacted in the preceding sections 15 to 20 (r) These sections it will be observed occur under the heading Place of suing

**Waiver of objection to jurisdiction**—It is a fundamental rule that a judgment of a Court without jurisdiction is a nullity (s) Where by reason of any limitation imposed upon the authority of a Court a Court is *without jurisdiction* to entertain any particular action or matter neither the acquiescence nor the express consent of the parties can confer jurisdiction upon the Court nor can consent give a Court jurisdiction if a condition which goes to the jurisdiction has not been performed or fulfilled Where a limited Court takes upon itself to exercise a jurisdiction it does not possess its decision amounts to nothing (t) The general rule therefore is that consent cannot give jurisdiction and want of jurisdiction cannot be waived There is an apparent conflict in the reported cases on this subject owing to the failure to keep clearly in view the distinction between want of jurisdiction and irregularity in the exercise of jurisdiction, or to use the phrase of Mookerjee J irregularity in the assumption of jurisdiction (u) The leading case on the subject is *Ledgard v Bull* (v) decided by the Privy Council in 1886 The suit was for damages and an injunction for infringement of a patent Under the Patents and Designs Act such a suit can only be brought in a District Court but it was brought in the Court of a Subordinate Judge who had no jurisdiction to entertain it The suit was eventually transferred from the Subordinate Judge's Court to the District Court and there heard and decided The defendant contended that an order for transfer of a suit from one Court to another under s 24 could not be made unless the suit had been brought in a Court having jurisdiction but this contention was overruled The same view was taken by the High Court on appeal The Judicial Committee held that the suit having been instituted in a Court which had no jurisdiction no order of transfer could be made but that the District Court being competent to entertain and try the suit if it were competently brought the defendant could waive the objection to the irregularities of its institution but that he had not done so and the decree of the District Court could not therefore stand and it ought to have been set aside by the High Court Lord Watson in delivering the judgment of the Board said—

The District Judge was perfectly *competent to entertain* and try the suit if it were competently brought and their Lordships do not doubt that in such a case a defendant may be barred by his own conduct from objecting to irregularities in the institution of the suit [But] when the Judge has *no inherent jurisdiction* over the subject matter of a suit the parties cannot by their mutual consent convert it into a proper judicial process although they may constitute the Judge their arbiter and be bound by his decision on the merits when the case is submitted to him But there are numerous authorities which establish that when in a case which the Judge is competent to try the parties without objection join issue and go to trial upon the merits the defendant cannot subsequently dispute his jurisdiction upon the grounds that there were irregularities in the initial procedure which if objected to at the time would have led to the dismissal of the suit

The principles laid down in *Ledgard v Bull* were reiterated by their Lordships of the Privy Council in *Meenakshi Naidu v Subramania Sastry* (w) That was a case in which the High Court of Madras had entertained an appeal from an adjudication from which no appeal was provided for by any enactment Their Lordships held that the decree of

(s) 117 *hoo* 1 *n* *Narasim* (1941) 9 Lab 45

(t) 117 *hoo* 1 *n* *Narasim* (1941) 9 Lab 45

(u) 117 *hoo* 1 *n* *Narasim* (1941) 9 Lab 45

(v) 117 *hoo* 1 *n* *Narasim* (1941) 9 Lab 45

(w) 117 *hoo* 1 *n* *Narasim* (1941) 9 Lab 45

(s) (18) 13 I A 131 9 All 191 See also

1 *hoo* 1 *n* *Narasim* (1941) 9 Lab 45

(u) (1947) 14 I A 160 11 All 11 5 J anchored

*Dakore Temple C* at (19) 1

Bo L R 8 8 6 87 I C 313 ( )

A 1 C 155

the High Court was a nullity. In the course of the judgment their Lordships said: In the present case there was an inherent incompetency in the High Court to deal with the question brought before it and no consent could have conferred upon the High Court that jurisdiction which it never possessed.

These two cases illustrate the distinction between want of jurisdiction and irregular exercise or assumption of jurisdiction. Irregular exercise or assumption may be waived as it was in the case of *Ledgard v Bull*. But when the Court is not competent to entertain or try the suit there is a want of inherent jurisdiction which cannot be waived. But here again there are certain exceptions. If the Court has no jurisdiction owing to some privilege attaching to a party the party may waive that privilege. Thus a defendant may waive his status as an agriculturist. Another exception is in the case of pecuniary jurisdiction enacted in section 11 of the Suits Valuation Act 7 of 1887. A third exception is this section as to the place of suing or the local venue of suits within the cognizance of British Indian Courts.

**Objection as to place of suing**—The words 'place of suing' occur in the heading to sections 15 to 20, a group of sections which refer to the local venue of suits cognizable by British Indian Courts in British India and in places to which the Code applies. Sections 15 to 20 lay down rules as to place of suing and there is no doubt that in this section the expression is used with reference to those rules. Those rules regulate the venue in places in British India where the Code applies. They deal with matters of domestic concern and prescribe rules for the assumption of territorial jurisdiction by British Indian Courts in matters within their cognizance. Section 21 is therefore limited in the same way and has no application to cases not cognizable by British Indian Courts (x). The decision of Privy Council in *Setrucherla v Maharaja of Jeypur* (y) makes this clear. The suit was instituted in the Court of the Subordinate Judge of Vizagapatam on a mortgage of property which was partly situate in Vizagapatam and partly in a Scheduled District to which the Code did not apply. The defendant did not object to the jurisdiction of the Court and a decree was passed for the sale of the whole of the property. On appeal the defendant objected for the first time to the jurisdiction of the trial Court. The High Court overruled the objection in view of the provisions of section 21. The Privy Council however upheld the objection on the ground that sec. 21 only applied when the right place of suing was one subject to the Code. Their Lordships said: This is not an objection to the place of suing; it is an objection going to the nullity of the order on the ground of want of jurisdiction. Another instance is the case of *Manjappa v Rajagopala* (z) where a Court in the Madras Presidency passed a decree in a suit which was in the cognizance of a foreign Court in Mysore and the High Court held that the defect of jurisdiction could not be cured by section 21. Again when a Subordinate Judge passed a decree on a mortgage of lands in the Santhal Parganas in a suit which the Legislature had withdrawn from the cognizance of the civil Courts as they were under settlement there was no question of the application of section 21 and the Court of execution was entitled to treat the decree as a nullity and to refuse to execute it (a).

On the other hand when the suit is one within the cognizance of British Indian Courts and the want of jurisdiction is only as to local venue under sections 15 to 20 the defect may be waived under this section. Thus if the defendant resides in the jurisdiction of Court A and he is sued in Court J on the allegation that he resides in it, jurisdiction he cannot raise this objection for the first time in appeal (b) nor can he in a

(x) *Blamboo v Ram Naray* (1908) 9 Lah. 455 109 I C 8 (4) A L 79

(y) (1919) 46 I A 151 4 Mad 313 51 I C 14

(z) (1916) M W N 373 45 I C 3  
(a) *G. Chand v Pr f lla A ar* (1906) 3 C 1 165 89 I C 65 ( ) A C 90 (F B)  
(b) *F. M. Ram v Av Jan Lal* (1914) 1 I C 513

subsequent suit set aside the decree as a nullity (c) If a suit on a mortgage of land in the jurisdiction of Court B is instituted in Court A contrary to the provisions of section 16 and the defendant does not object the decree is not a nullity (d) So also when the territorial jurisdiction of the Court is altered by a notification during the pendency of the suit (e)

“Objection as to place of suing when to be taken —The general rule is that an objection to jurisdiction may be taken at any stage of the proceedings provided there are materials on the record to sustain it (f) It may be taken for the first time in appeal or in second appeal (g) or in revision (h) or after remand in second appeal (i) or in appeal to the Privy Council provided the objection is patent on the face of the proceedings (j) This section which is framed on the analogy of section 11 of the Suits Valuation Act is an exception to this general rule

Under this section the objection must be taken at the earliest opportunity in the Court of first instance and in cases where issues are settled at or before settlement of issues. Even then the Court of Appeal or Revision will not allow the objection unless there has been a failure of justice. If the objection is raised for the first time in appeal or revision it is excluded by the terms of the section (k) In the original suit however the objection may be raised at any time before final judgment (l)

Section 21 and execution proceedings —The waiver extends to execution proceedings and the judgment debtor cannot object to the validity of the decree in execution proceedings. In *Zamindar of Ettiyapuram v Chidambaram* (m) Wallis C.J. said “The effect of the section in my opinion is that objections which the appellate or revisional Court is thereby precluded from allowing must be considered cured for all purposes unless taken before the passing of the decree of the original Court. The ordinary way of questioning a decree passed without jurisdiction is on appeal or revision and if this is forbidden a Court of first instance cannot in execution do that which the appellate or revisional Court is precluded from doing. But it is different where after the passing of a preliminary mortgage decree the Court which passed it ceases to have territorial jurisdiction over any of the mortgaged properties. In such a case failure on the part of the mortgagor to object to the passing of the final decree precludes him from disputing the validity of the decree but not from objecting to the jurisdiction of the Court to order a sale (n)

When a Court executing a decree transferred to it attached and sold properties after territorial jurisdiction had been withdrawn from it the Madras High Court held that the judgment debtor's failure to object estopped him from questioning the validity of the sale but that there was no estoppel against a subsequent purchaser of the same property at a sale held in execution of a decree passed against the same judgment debtor in another suit for the estoppel of the judgment debtor did not operate against such purchaser (o). The same Court has also held

|  |  |
|--|--|
| (c) 4 <i>Amir v Sambasani</i> (1914) 3 M d 1 J 349 31 C 463                      | (d) 4 <i>Chidambaram v Zamindar of Ettiyapuram</i> (1914) 3 M d 1 J 349 31 C 463 |
| (e) 4 <i>Chidambaram v Zamindar of Ettiyapuram</i> (1914) 3 M d 1 J 349 31 C 463 | (f) 4 <i>Chidambaram v Zamindar of Ettiyapuram</i> (1914) 3 M d 1 J 349 31 C 463 |
| (g) 4 <i>Chidambaram v Zamindar of Ettiyapuram</i> (1914) 3 M d 1 J 349 31 C 463 | (h) 4 <i>Chidambaram v Zamindar of Ettiyapuram</i> (1914) 3 M d 1 J 349 31 C 463 |
| (i) 4 <i>Chidambaram v Zamindar of Ettiyapuram</i> (1914) 3 M d 1 J 349 31 C 463 | (j) 4 <i>Chidambaram v Zamindar of Ettiyapuram</i> (1914) 3 M d 1 J 349 31 C 463 |
| (k) 4 <i>Chidambaram v Zamindar of Ettiyapuram</i> (1914) 3 M d 1 J 349 31 C 463 | (l) 4 <i>Chidambaram v Zamindar of Ettiyapuram</i> (1914) 3 M d 1 J 349 31 C 463 |
| (m) 4 <i>Chidambaram v Zamindar of Ettiyapuram</i> (1914) 3 M d 1 J 349 31 C 463 | (n) 4 <i>Chidambaram v Zamindar of Ettiyapuram</i> (1914) 3 M d 1 J 349 31 C 463 |
| (o) 4 <i>Chidambaram v Zamindar of Ettiyapuram</i> (1914) 3 M d 1 J 349 31 C 463 |  |

that if a Court continues to execute a decree against immovable property after territorial jurisdiction has been withdrawn from it the judgment debtor's failure to object will preclude him from raising the point in appeal (p)

**Section 21 and new suit**—It has been held in Madras (q) and Lahore (r) that if the defendant does not object to jurisdiction and a decree is passed against him he cannot in a subsequent suit set aside the decree for want of jurisdiction. In a Calcutta case (s) a landlord filed a suit for rent and ejectment under sec 66 of the Bengal Tenancy Act and obtained a decree in execution of which the tenure was sold and purchased by himself. The land was situate in the jurisdiction of another Court but the defendant had raised no objection. When the landlord went to take possession the tenant defendant filed a suit for a declaration that the decree had been made and the sale held without jurisdiction. It was contended for the landlord that the sale were validated by section 21 but this contention was overruled. Mookerjee J said that section 21 is an exception to the well established rule that where a Court has no inherent jurisdiction over the subject matter of the suit its decree is a nullity even though the parties may have consented to jurisdiction of the Court. This exception cannot obviously be so interpreted as to have a wider application than what is justified by its terms. It is impossible for us to hold that section 21 debars the defendant from questioning the validity of the execution sale which is the root of the title of the plaintiff. In the view taken by the learned judge the decree was validated by section 21 but the execution sale was a nullity. It is submitted however that the view taken by the Madras High Court is correct that when once the objection to jurisdiction is waived under section 21 it is waived for all purposes.

Unless there has been a consequent failure of justice.—Even though the objection has been raised at the earliest opportunity and wrongly disallowed the judgment will not be disturbed unless the trial in the wrong Court has led to a failure of justice (t). In order to ascertain whether there has been a failure of justice the appellate Court must go into the merits of the case and form an opinion upon the justice or otherwise of the decision of the first Court (u).

**Remand**—There is no question of territorial jurisdiction when a suit is remanded by a Court of Appeal for jurisdiction then depends entirely upon the order of remand (v).

## 22 [s 22] Where a suit may be instituted in any one

of two or more Courts and is instituted in one of such Courts, any defendant after notice to the other parties, may at the earliest possible opportunity and in all

Power to transfer suit which may be instituted more than one Court

cases where issues are settled at or before such settlement apply to have the suit transferred to another Court and the Court to which such application is made after considering

- (p) *M v Krama v Ananth rayana* (194) 46 Mad L J 50 9 I C 806 (4) A M 457 *Pa a v asuan* (194) 47 Mad L J 13 8 I C 33 (4) A M 63 *Par gopala Turup U* (194) 49 Mad 46 9 I C 1 (6) A M 41
- (q) *I m t s I m t (121) 3 M d L J 343 3 I C 483* *Chokli I ga v I ek yudha* (194) 4 M d L J 44 1 I C 1 ( ) A M 117
- (r) *P r holari D s Radh A s hem* (194) 11

- L I L J 306 (2) A L 44
- ( ) *K v J Ma t (12) (W N 4* 1 (3) A C 619 *See P* ) *Cent I B I of I n t (1) 6) A B m* 1 R 8 2 8 3 9 I C 341 (6) A L 44
- (t) *Elar v J L M v J (1916) 1 1 93* 3 I C 114
- ( ) *La h m I J (1 1) 19 A L L J* 30 6 I C 311
- (v) *Chaw v A (1 3) 44 Mad L J 34* 1 I C 314 (3) A M 351

the objections of the other parties (if any), shall determine in which of the several Courts having jurisdiction the suit shall proceed

**Transfer where plaintiff has a choice of Courts**—The power of transfer given by this section is not a general power as in section 24. It is limited to cases in sections 16 and 20 where plaintiff has the option to sue in more Courts than one (w) Prima facie plaintiff as arbiter litis has the right to select his own forum (x) That right is controlled by the power of transfer but it is a right that ought not lightly to be interfered with (y)

**Grounds of transfer**—See note to section 24 under the same heading

**Notice**—The provisions of this section as to notice and time of application are mandatory (z) Notice must be before application and to co defendants as well as to the plaintiff

**Stay of suit**—Section 20 of the Code of 1882 provided for stay of proceedings in order to compel the plaintiff to take his case to another Court. This has been omitted as sufficient provision has been made by the power of transfer in sections 22 to 24. But the Court has an inherent jurisdiction to stay any suit which is an abuse of its process. Whether the institution of the suit in a particular Court is an abuse of the process of that Court is a question of fact. In a suit filed in the Bombay High Court the fact that both the parties and the witnesses of the defendants were residents of Wardha in the Central Provinces was held not to justify an order for the stay of the suit (a). The High Court has also power to stay a suit in another Court. See note under O 39, r 1

**23 [Ss 22, 23, 24]** (1) Where the several Courts having jurisdiction are subordinate to the same Appellate Court, an application under section 22 shall be made to the Appellate Court

To 1st Court application  
114

(2) Where such Courts are subordinate to different Appellate Courts but to the same High Court, the application shall be made to the said High Court

(3) Where such Courts are subordinate to different High Courts the application shall be made to the High Court within the local limits of whose jurisdiction the Court in which the suit is brought is situate

**Chartered High Courts**—Sections 22 and 23 do not apply to Chartered High Courts in the exercise of their ordinary original civil jurisdiction (b)

**Subordinate Courts**—Subordination of Court is regulated by sec 3. A Court of a subordinate Judge is subordinate to the District Court no matter what the forum of appeal may be in the particular case for the transfer of which application is made (c)

- (12) *Ira Ch Jr v Dho e Krist* (1913) 1 All L J 896 41 C 318 *Nato J*  
*F J era g co v J Han* (12 3) 11 C 64 (3) A L 3  
(12) *Khat J Bibi v Taruk* (1883) 9 Cal J 50  
(12) *Chatt J v Kailash* (1909) 10 Cal L J 105 31 C 33  
(12) *G lab (A J v Sher v gh* (1917) I R 11 31 C 616 *Sh e D it v Mot I m*  
(12) *La J J 93 89 I C 31 ( )*

- A L 3  
(a) *Geffert v Ju kha d* (1883) 13 Bom 18  
*Hind stan Assurn ce Ltd v Jai Mulr j*  
(1914) 7 Mad L J 84 71 C 45  
*Sh e Kanha ya* (1919) 1 P 167 54  
1 C 93  
(b) *M A d a Ch dra v Lal Mohan* (1909) 60 Cal 949 94 ( ) A C 38  
(c) *Um t i v A Leom* (1901) 10 Cal L J 108 31 C 632

**Different High Courts**—If suits between the same parties are instituted in Courts subordinate to different High Courts either High Court can transfer the suit from the Court which is subordinate to it (d) A Judge on the Original Side of the High Court is not a Court subordinate to the High Court and a Bench of the High Court cannot entertain an application for the transfer of a suit from him to another Court (e)

**24 [S 25]** (1) On the application of any of the parties and after notice to the parties and after hearing such of them as desire to be heard, or of its own motion without such notice, the High Court or the District Court may at any stage—

General power of transfer and withdrawal

- (a) transfer any suit, appeal or other proceeding pending before it for trial or disposal to any Court subordinate to it and competent to try or dispose of the same, or
- (b) withdraw any suit, appeal or other proceeding pending in any Court subordinate to it, and
  - (i) try or dispose of the same, or
  - (ii) transfer the same for trial or disposal to any Court subordinate to it and competent to try or dispose of the same, or
  - (iii) retransfer the same for trial or disposal to the Court from which it was withdrawn

(2) Where any suit or proceeding has been transferred or withdrawn under sub section (1), the Court which thereafter tries such suit may, subject to any special directions in the case of an order of transfer, either re try it or proceed from the point at which it was transferred or withdrawn

(3) For the purposes of this section, Courts of Additional and Assistant Judges shall be deemed to be subordinate to the District Court

(4) The Court trying any suit transferred or withdrawn under this section from a Court of Small Causes shall for the purposes of such suit, be deemed to be a Court of Small Causes

**Alterations in the section**—These have been noted in their appropriate place in the commentary below

**Chartered High Courts**—This section applies to Chartered High Courts in the exercise of their ordinary original civil jurisdiction (f)

(d) *Benl t Sa Jarod* *Makud: D* (1908) 45 Cal L J 1 100 I C 331 ( ) A C  
 3 Cal 541 *all 172h* *Chot L t*  
 (197) 133 m 6 9 30 100 I C 1 4  
 ( ) A B 9  
 (e) *By t M lo al v St th Ma* (19 ) 1 (f) *M A dra C t nd* *Lal Moh* (1909)  
 56 Cal 941 954 ( ) A C 3 2



**Form**—For form of notice of application see App II form no

**Jurisdiction**—An order for the transfer of a suit from one Court to another cannot be made under this section unless the suit has been in the first instance brought in a Court that has jurisdiction to try it. But if after the transfer is made the parties without objection join issue and go to trial upon the merits the order of transfer cannot subsequently be impeached (g). The same rule applies to appeals (h). See note Waiver of objection to jurisdiction under sec 21. Conversely a suit cannot be transferred to a Court which has not jurisdiction to try it (i). Thus a High Court cannot transfer to a District Court an insolvency petition presented to it under the Presidency towns Insolvency Act (j). Nor can a District Court transfer a suit from one subordinate Court to another subordinate Court which has been newly created and empowered to try subsequently instituted suits (l). See notes to s 21.

**General power of transfer**—This section gives a general power of transfer of all suits, appeals and other proceedings and is not limited like section 22 to suits in which the plaintiff has the option of suing in more than one Court. It may be exercised at any stage of the proceeding and even *ex motu* without an application.

**Grounds of transfer**—As stated in the notes on section 22 the plaintiff as *arbitrarius litis* or *dominus litis* has the right to choose his own forum or rather any forum the law allows him. This right is subject to control under sections 22 to 24. The burden lies on the applicant to make out a strong case for a transfer. A mere balance of convenience in favour of proceedings in another Court is not a sufficient ground (k) though it is a relevant consideration (m). As a general rule the Court should not interfere unless the expenses and difficulties of the trial would be so great as to lead to injustice or the suit has been filed in a particular Court for the purpose of working injustice (n). What the Court has to consider is whether the applicant has made out a case to justify it in closing the doors of the Court in which the suit is brought to the plaintiff and leaving him to seek his remedy in another jurisdiction (o). Where in a suit for partition instituted in the Court of 24 Pargannas the parties were residents of Calcutta and the major portion of the immovable property was also situate in Calcutta the suit was transferred to the original side of the High Court of Calcutta in the ground principally of convenience (p). In a suit to set aside certain deeds of gift executed by a deceased person who claimed the plaintiff claimed to be on the ground that the deceased was not of a sound mind and that the deeds were procured by undue influence the High Court of Allahabad ordered the suit to be transferred to the Court of the place where the deeds were executed on the ground that the witnesses were residents of that place and that the defence must turn upon local evidence (q). Another ground of transfer is a pecuniary or other personal interest in the presiding Judge (r) or a reasonable apprehension of the litigant that he will not get a fair trial (s).

(g) *Ledyard v B H* (1857) 9 All 131 131 A 134 *Ferry Lal v Komal Kishore* (1907) 6 C 1 30

(h) *R m Nara v Jarmes* (1890) 10 Cal 39

(i) *J mat v Ch lan* (1907) 5 Pat L J 98 571 C

(j) *Sri v ad v Official Assignee* (1911) 39 M d 4 2 11 C 7

(k) *Patil v J v A Japerumal* (1913) M W 2 101 453 C 13

(l) *F Norton v Settlement* (1907) 1 Ch. 407 409 *Mahomed v Mid Chand* (1919) 41 All 101 101 C 364

(m) *T la Ram v H rjan Das* (1883) 5 All 60 516a B v *Maqbul* (1916) 14 All L J 4 31 C 613 *Fayazullah v Nwar*

(19) 144 All 86 11 8 ( ) 1 A

( ) *Re Norton v Settlement* (1907) 1 Ch 471 *Hind v N v Co* M d 101 (1914) 2 M 1 L J 61 1 C 45

(o) *Tula Ram v Harjivan Das* (1893) 5 All 60 61

(p) *Jotendro Nath v F J Arad* (1900) 16 Cal 71

(q) *Inayat Ali v Nwar* (1900) 44 All 96 1 C 1 101 A A 6

(r) *Loburi v Atam R vaj and Trad g Co* (1884) 10 Cal 615

(s) *Sher Si g v Thakur Das* (1903) 1 11 84 *Shad Shah v Afjha* (1913) 1 C 62 ( ) 3 A L 64

**Notice**—No notice is necessary if the Court acts *suo motu*. If an application is made notice must be given by the Court and not by the party as in sec 22. The provision as to notice is imperative and an order for transfer made without notice will be set aside (t) and so will an *ex parte* decree made by a Court to which the suit has been transferred without notice to the defendant (u). On the other hand the Madras High Court treats the matter of notice as one of practice and procedure and holds that notice may be waived (t) and that want of notice is an irregularity which does not invalidate the order of transfer (w).

**At any stage**—These words and the substitution of the word pending for instituted settle a doubt as to whether a suit could be transferred or withdrawn after the hearing had commenced. The High Courts of Bombay Madras and Allahabad held that a suit could be transferred or withdrawn at any stage even after the hearing had commenced and even in the course of execution proceedings (x). On the other hand the Calcutta High Court held that there was no power to interfere after the hearing had commenced and no power to transfer an execution proceeding (y). It is now clear that the former view is correct.

**Pending before it**—Under the corresponding section of the Code of 1882 it was held that a District Judge had no power to transfer to a subordinate Court a suit pending before him (z). Clause (a) confers this power on District Courts and High Courts.

**District Court**—District Court in this section means a Court of unlimited pecuniary jurisdiction. An order of transfer under this section cannot therefore be made by an Assistant Judge whose pecuniary jurisdiction is limited (a).

**Clause (a) Court subordinate to it**—A decree for dissolution of marriage under the Indian Divorce Act 4 of 1869 made by the District Judge of Nagpur is subject to confirmation by the High Court of Bombay but after the Bombay High Court has confirmed the decree an application for alimony must be made to the Court at Nagpur. The Bombay High Court cannot entertain it nor can it transfer the application to the Nagpur Court for that Court is not subordinate to it (b). A senior Subordinate Judge in the Punjab cannot transfer a case from his Court to that of a junior Subordinate Judge for the latter is not subordinate to him (c).

**Clause (a) Suit**—The High Court of Allahabad has held that the word suit in this clause includes proceedings in execution (d). This is no doubt correct for an execution proceeding is a proceeding in a suit and would therefore not be included in the expression other proceeding which must therefore have the same meaning as all proceedings in any Court of civil justice in section 141. See note on that section. The words dispose of have been added evidently with reference to miscellaneous proceedings.

**Clause (b) Other proceedings**—The words other proceedings include an insolvency petition (e) but not a proceeding under s 476 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (f). The Madras High Court has held that a District Court has

(t) *Fatema v. Imdad Ali* (19 0) 18 All. L.J. 351 58 I.C. 560

(u) *Ganga am v. Gujar Mal* (19 ) 84 I.C. 33 (3) A.L. 414

(v) *Sa K ma v. Ikoran* (1890) 13 Mad. 11

(w) *Bellary Pr vs C v Venkata* (1911) 1 Mad. L.J. 80 8 I.C. 7

(x) *In re Balaji* (1881) 5 Bom. 690 *Varma v. Al. Redji* (1895) Bom. 78 *M. I. Talwar v. Muta v.* (1893) 6 Mad. 37 *Jain v. M. v. T. v. T. v. T.* (1903) 6 Mad. 9 *Bandi v. Laksh* (1904) 7 All. 34

(y) *Kul. Motun G. I. Maho ed* (18 8) 15

(z) *Sakh am v. Gang* (1859) 13 F.m. 64

(a) *Hoy Uma G. v. v.* (1910) 34 Bom. 411 61 C. 518

(b) *Walla v. Walore* (1916) 40 Bom. 109 31 I.C. 531

(c) *F. v. L. v. J. Lat* (19 0) 1 Lah. 154 1 C. 3

(d) *M. Hammed v. T. v. T. v. T.* (19 ) 47 All. 5 8 I.C. 46 ( ) 44 d.

(e) *A. v. v. A. v. v.* (1893) 22 Bom. 6

(f) *P. v. v. P. v. v.* (19 ) 42 All. 460 101 I.C. 4 ( ) 44 463

power under this clause to withdraw to its own file proceedings in execution transmitted by it to a Subordinate Court (g)

**Competent Court**—Under cl b (ii) the transfer of a suit must be to a Court competent to try or dispose of it. The High Court therefore has no power to transfer a Small Cause suit pending before a Subordinate Judge to the Court of a District Munsif where the Small Cause jurisdiction of the Munsif is less than the value of the Small Cause suit (h). Nor has the High Court power to transfer an insolvency petition made under the Provincial Insolvency Act 1920 and pending before a Subordinate Judge to the Judge of the High Court exercising insolvency jurisdiction (i).

**Re transfer**—Clause (b) (iii) gives power to re transfer a suit to the Court from which it was withdrawn. There was no such power in the Code of 1882 and the cases in footnote (j) are obsolete.

**Sub section (4) Court of Small Causes**—The High Courts of Allahabad (l), Madras (l) and Patna (m) and latterly also the High Courts of Bombay (n) and Calcutta (o) are agreed that the expression Court of Small Causes in sub sec (4) includes a Court vested with the powers of a Court of Small Causes. The High Courts of Bombay (p) and Calcutta (q) at one time held that it was restricted to a Court established under Act 9 of 1887 but those decisions are no longer law.

The provisions of sub section (4) do not constitute the Court to which the suit is transferred a Small Cause Court (r). It is however deemed to be a Small Cause Court for the purposes of the suit (s) with the result that its procedure in the trial of the suit is governed by the provisions of Act 9 of 1887 (t) and no appeal lies if there is no appeal under that Act (u). The procedure will be that of a Small Cause Court even though the District Judge transferring the suit directs it to be tried as a regular suit for he has no jurisdiction to give such a direction (v). The decree will not operate as res judicata in a suit which the Small Cause Court had no jurisdiction to entertain (w). The same principles apply where on the retirement or transfer of a Subordinate Judge having Small Cause Court powers the suit is transferred by order of the District Judge to another Judge not invested with Small Cause Court jurisdiction and no appeal will lie from a decree passed by the latter Judge (x).

**Transfer of suit from Presidency Small Cause Court to High Court**—See notes to cl 13 of the Letters Patent.

**Power of Court to stay suit pending before it**—See notes to s 22 under the same head.

**Power of High Court to stay suit pending in another Court**—See note to O 70 r 1 under the same head.

- (g) *Ellipala v Subahma Jams* (1916) 39 Mad 44 2 I C 119  
(A) *Mirge v Nkta* (19 9) 38 Mad L J 619 (19) A M 513  
(i) *Gould v Sadamite* (19 9) 5 Mad 5 (19) A M 1031 See also *In the Matter of Omer Khan d Bros* (19 6) 4 Mang 554  
(j) *Im v Alak* (1907) 2 All 304 Van d n v Kenney (1907) 4 All 36  
(l) *Mangal v P Chait* (1891) 13 All 3 4 S Kha v J gh oth D s (191) 39 All 14 3 IC 809 *Patel v S gh v Mus m mot R ta* (1914) 40 All 46 IC 93 See also *Mys Jha v H a Lal* (1914) All LJ 880 8 IC 2 (4) A A 761  
(m) *S K a v v Adam adha* (1915) 38 M d 5 1 IC 1  
(n) *Lal v D s v Ke hwar Lal* (1917) 1 Pat 64 6 IC 241 (3) A I 49  
(o) *N y v Bhagubhai* (1907) 31 Bom 314 [191]  
(p) *Bal Lal Chandra v Sukri A a* (1919) 4 Cal.

- 594 Madhvi I v Behari Lal (1918) 7 C I I J 461 44 IC 831  
(p) *Rancho d s v Gresh* (1899) 3 Bom 38  
(q) *Dil v Lam Na ain* (1904) 31 Cal 1057  
(r) *Ar h v Ehan M vram* (1894) 18 Bom 61  
(s) *Saarama v Palmanabi* (1915) 38 Mad 17 IC 4  
(t) *Chh s J Lal v Lakshmi Chandra* (1916) 38 All 4 34 IC 113 See also *Ugrah Singh v Motihari Co Ltd* (1919) 41 Cal L J 15 43 IC 04  
(u) *S K a v Jagah th Das* (191) 39 All 11 37 IC 409  
(v) *S K a v v J dm a la supra*  
(w) *D I r Lal v Ha a Lal* (1914) 1 All LJ 83 61 IC 66  
(x) *Kaula v v Dada Muhammad* (1893) All 8 P m Charan v Kishor Lal (1913) 40 All 810 115 IC 1 (9) A A 40

**25 [Ss 20 21]** (1) Where any party to a suit, appeal or other proceeding pending in a High Court presided over by a single Judge objects to its being heard by him and the Judge is satisfied that there are reasonable grounds for the objection, he shall make a report to the Governor General in Council, who may, by notification in the *Gazette of India*, transfer such suit, appeal or proceeding to any other High Court

Power of Governor General in Council to transfer suit

(2) The law applicable to any suit, appeal or proceeding so transferred shall be the law which the Court in which the suit appeal or proceeding was originally instituted ought to have applied to such case

The object of this section is to empower the Governor General in Council to transfer cases from one High Court to another under certain circumstances. The section proceeds on the analogy of s 527 of the Code of Criminal Procedure 1898

## INSTITUTION OF SUITS

**26 [S 4b]** Every suit shall be instituted by the presentation of a plaint or in such other manner as may be prescribed

Institution of suits

**Suit**—A proceeding that does not commence with a plaint is not a suit (y) The essential provisions as to procedure in suits is enacted in sections 26 to 35 A Details have been relegated to the rules of procedure in the first Schedule For institution of suits see O 4 r 1

**Changes introduced by the section**—The words or in such other manner as may be prescribed are new No other manner of instituting suits has hitherto been prescribed

## SUMMONS AND DISCOVERY

**27 [S 64]** Where a suit has been duly instituted, a summons may be issued to the defendant to appear and answer the claim and may be served in manner prescribed

Summons to defendant

Issue and service of summons—See O 5 below

**28 [S 85]** (1) A summons may be sent for service in another province to such Court and in such manner as may be prescribed by rules in force in that province

Service of summons where defendant resides in another province

(2) The Court to which such summons is sent shall, upon receipt thereof, proceed as if it had been issued by such Court and shall then return the summons to the Court of issue together with the record (if any) of its proceedings with regard thereto

See note to Order 3

**29** [S 650A] Summonses issued by any Civil or Revenue Court situate beyond the limits of British India may be sent to the Courts in British India and served as if they had been issued by such Courts

8 rvice of foreign sum  
monses

Provided that the Courts issuing such summonses have been established or continued by the authority of the Governor General in Council, or that the Governor General in Council has, by notification in the *Gazette of India*, declared the provisions of this section to apply to such Courts

By notification—For notifications issued under this section see General Statutory Rules and Orders Vol I pp 642 655 and Vol IV pp 682 684

**30** [New] Subject to such conditions and limitations as may be prescribed the Court may, at any time, either of its own motion or on the application of any party —

Power to order discovery  
and the like

- (a) make such orders as may be necessary or reasonable in all matters relating to the delivery and answering of interrogatories, the admission of documents and facts, and the discovery inspection production, impounding and return of documents or other material objects producible as evidence
- (b) issue summonses to persons whose attendance is required either to give evidence or to produce documents or such other objects as aforesaid,
- (c) order any fact to be proved by affidavit

Delivery and answering of interrogatories—See O 11 below  
Admission of documents and facts—See O 12 below  
Discovery and inspection—See O 11 below  
Production impounding and return of documents—See O 13 below  
Summonses to persons to give evidence—See O 14 below  
Proof of facts by affidavits—See O 19 below

**31 [Aen]** The provisions in sections 27, 28 and 29 shall apply to summonses to give evidence or to produce documents or other material objects

Summons to witness

**32 [Nen]** The Court may compel the attendance of any person to whom a summons has been issued under section 30 and for that purpose may—

Penalty for default

- (a) issue a warrant for his arrest
- (b) attach and sell his property,
- (c) impose a fine upon him not exceeding five hundred rupees,
- (d) order him to furnish security for his appearance and in default commit him to the civil prison

See O 16 rr 10 13 r 17 and r 21

To whom a summons has been issued —This section applies only if a summons has been issued. It does not apply where a person is merely ordered to produce a document (z)

## JUDGMENT AND DECREE

**33 [S 198]** The Court, after the case has been heard, shall pronounce judgment, and on such judgment a decree shall follow

Judgment and decree

See O 20 r 1

On such judgment a decree shall follow —Under this section it is imperative that a decree shall follow the judgment and as it is the duty of the Court to comply with the provisions of the law the Court's failure to prepare a decree should not deprive a party of his right of appeal. The appeal should not be dismissed and the appellant should be allowed time to move the lower Court to prepare a decree (a)

## INTEREST

**34 [S 209]** (1) Where and in so far as a decree is for the payment of money the Court may, on the decree order interest at such rate as

Interest

the Court deems reasonable to be paid on the principal sum adjudged, from the date of the suit to the date of the decree in addition to any interest adjudged on such principal sum for any period prior to the institution of the suit, with further interest at such rate as the Court deems reasonable on the

(z) K. 51 C. L. J. 50 r 31 C. 31 II (1900) | (a) M. 66 P. 16 v. K. C. 49 (1919) 1 1

aggregate sum so adjudged, from the date of the decree to the date of payment, or to such earlier date as the Court thinks fit

(2) Where such a decree is silent with respect to the payment of further interest on such aggregate sum as aforesaid from the date of the decree to the date of payment or other earlier date, the Court shall be deemed to have refused such interest and a separate suit therefore shall not lie

Scope of the section—This section applies only where the decree is for the payment of money. It does not apply where the decree is for the enforcement of a mortgage or charge. See notes below under the head Interest in suits for enforcement of mortgage. There is no analogy between interest awarded under this section and mesne profits (b)

The three divisions of interest—Interest that may be awarded to a plaintiff in a suit for money may be divided into three heads according to the period for which it is allowed namely—

- (1) interest accrued *due prior to the institution of the suit* on the principal sum adjudged (as distinguished from the principal sum claimed)
- (2) additional interest on the principal sum adjudged *from the date of the suit to the date of the decree* at such rate as the Court deems reasonable
- (3) further interest on the aggregate sum adjudged i.e. the principal sum plus interest *from the date of the decree (i) to the date of payment or (ii) to such earlier date as the Court thinks fit* at such rate as the Court deems reasonable

Interest up to date of suit is a matter of substantive law and the section does not refer to payment of interest under the first head (c). It applies only to the second and third heads

I Interest prior to date of suit—Interest antecedent to suit is not a matter of procedure but a brief note on the subject will not be out of place. The law on the subject may be considered under the following two heads

- (1) where there is a stipulation for the payment of interest at a fixed rate
- (2) where there is no stipulation at all for the payment of interest

1 If there is a stipulation for the rate of interest the Court must allow that rate<sup>a</sup> up to the date of the suit however high it may be [Lauzy Laws Repel Act 29 of 1855 s 2] subject to the two following exceptions (1) if the rate is penal the Court may award interest at such rate as it deems reasonable [Indian Contract Act 1872 s 74] and (2) even if the rate is not penal the Court may reduce it if the interest is excessive and the transaction was substantially unfair [Lauzy Laws Act 10 of 1918 s 3].

2 If there is no express stipulation for payment of interest the plaintiff is not entitled to interest except in the following cases—

- (i) Mercantile usage—Where it is allowed by mercantile usage (d)

(b) *Dura Rao v. Dehendra* (1906) 33 Cal 123.

(c) *C. Wilson v. G. A. H.* (1909) 3 Cal L J 33.

(d) *Doolbhai v. Lamdall* (1893) 5 M L A 102.

136 (Bombay) *Jayramlal v. Jha v. Jha* (1909) M L A 63 (Calcutta).

*J. J. J. v. K. K. K.* (1906) 3 M L A 68 (Calcutta).

*J. J. J. v. K. K. K.* (1906) 3 M L A 68 (Calcutta).

(ii) *Statutory right to interest*—Interest is payable where a right to it or an authority for its allowance or payment is conferred by statute. Section 80 of the Negotiable Instruments Act 26 of 1881 provides that when no rate of interest is specified in a promissory note or bill of exchange the Court shall notwithstanding any agreement relating to interest between the parties award interest at the rate of 6 per cent per annum from the date on which the amount claimed became due and payable. Similarly the Interest Act 32 of 1839 enacts that where there is no stipulation to pay interest but the amount claimed is a sum certain (as distinguished from unascertained damages) and is payable at a certain time by virtue of some written instrument the Court (e) may allow interest at a rate not exceeding the current rate of interest from the date on which the amount became payable. If no time is fixed for the payment of the amount the Court may award interest at the rate aforesaid from the time the creditor demands payment in writing intimating to the debtor that interest will be claimed from the date of such demand up to the date of payment. The provisions of the Interest Act 32 of 1839 are in the main a reproduction of the provisions of Lord Enderden's Act [3 and 4 Wm 4 c 42 s 48]. The House of Lord in *London Chatham and Dover Railway Company v South Eastern Railway Co* (f) the modern leading case on interest held that the sum certain within the meaning of that Act must be a certain sum which is one absolutely and in all events due and not a mere provisional payment to be made by one party to the other.

(iii) *Implied agreement*—Where an agreement to pay interest can be implied from the course of dealing between the parties (g)

In the *London Chatham and Dover Railway Company's case* the House of Lords held that interest cannot be given by way of damages for detention of a debt.

II Interest from date of suit to date of decree—The rate of interest from the date of the suit to the date of the decree is in the discretion of the Court (h) and this discretion is not excluded even if a fixed rate is mentioned in the contract as payable up to realisation (i). But though the rate of interest for the aforesaid period is discretionary the Court should in the exercise of that discretion award interest at the contract rate unless it would be inequitable to do so (j). The Court may under this head award interest in a suit for money although interest is not specifically asked for in the plaint (k) [see O 7 r 7].

It is well established that no interest can be allowed on damages for any period prior to the suit (l) but there is a conflict of decisions whether interest can be allowed under this section on damages from the date of the suit it being held in some cases that it can be allowed (m) and in some that it cannot be allowed (n).

Where the High Court has refused to exercise its discretionary power to allow interest from date of suit the Judicial Committee as a rule will not interfere (o).

III Interest from date of decree to date of payment—The rate of interest from the date of the decree to the date of payment is also in the discretion of the Court. The plaintiff getting security of a decree has his interest reduced in

(e) This does not apply to an executing Court.  
*Hogarth Shippi g Co Ltd v Mitsui Bussan Kaisha Ltd* (19 6) 53 Cal 35 98 I C 34 (6) A C 1119

(f) [1893] A C 4 v s e Halsbury Vol 1 p 373

(g) *Williams v Gifford* [1901] Ch 543 F s Duncan [1901] 1 Ch 30

(h) *Panna L v Vichand* (19 ) 6 C W N 737 67 I C 43 ( ) 41 C 46 [I C]

(i) *Mogana v Dhond* 1 (1886) 1 Cal 509 ( ) *Malha v bbi* (1879) 3 Fom

Ume Ch de F i sa (1 91) 14 Cal 164 300 I I 4 01 Th d clon

to the contrary in *Fama's nd a Dew* (1 83) 1 Mad 4 5, is no lon r law

(j) *Order v el ne* (1 90) 3 All 21 106 10

I A 198

(k) *P v H* 1 (1 1) Lah c 61 I C 845 See 1 o f h Chajmal Da

*Bryhula Lal* (1 9 ) 21 A 193

(l) *Fr v C m* ner of t do is (18 0) Bom H C 4 C 83 I I

*H sh Ch mter* (1845) 11 Cal 1

(m) *Pa mol I Muz* m (19 4) 33 Cal L J 8485 60 I C m ( ) 4 C 63

*Tanad ga v C L H* (19 6) 51 M 1 L J 43 D 1 C 6 1 ( ) 4 M 10 1

(n) *Curdson* 6 h (19 0) 3 Cal L J 33 3 4 60 I C 83

(o) *So endra M ha v H n Prasad* (19 6) 5 1 t 135 5 I A 415 91 I C 1033 ( ) 4 PC 49



aggregate sum  
date of p

i  
f  
of  
in

T  
tiff in  
it is al

(1)

( )

(3) fu  
H

r

Interest up t  
refer to payment of  
third head

I Interest prior  
of procedure but a l r  
subject may be con al

(1) where there

( ) where there

{ 1 If there is a stipul  
up to the date of the suit  
1800 s 2] subject to the tw  
may award interest at al l r  
18 s 4] and (2) ex nif t  
is excessive and the trans ti  
1918 s 3].

{ 2 If there is no exire  
entitled to interest except in t<sup>1</sup> f

(i) Mercantile usage—W] r 1

- 
- ( ) *Dunlop v. Newland* (1841) 10 Cl. & F. 181  
(c) *Creswell v. Gane* (1841) 10 Cl. & F. 181  
2) 1803 601 6, 244  
(d) *Dool v. Ramsall* (1840) 5 W. R. 14

(u) *Statutory right to interest*—Interest is payable where a right to it or an authority for it allowance or payment is conferred by statute. Section 80 of the Negotiable Instruments Act 26 of 1881 provides that when no rate of interest is specified in a promissory note or bill of exchange the Court shall notwithstanding any agreement relating to interest between the parties award interest at the rate of 6 per cent per annum from the date on which the amount claimed became due and payable. Similarly the Interest Act 32 of 1839 enacts that where there is no stipulation to pay interest but the amount claimed is a sum certain (as distinguished from unascertained damages) and is payable at a certain time by virtue of some written instrument the Court (e) may allow interest at a rate not exceeding the current rate of interest from the date on which the amount became payable. If no time is fixed for the payment of the amount the Court may award interest at the rate aforesaid from the time the creditor demands payment in writing intimating to the debtor that interest will be claimed from the date of such demand up to the date of payment. The provisions of the Interest Act 32 of 1839 are in the main a reproduction of the provision of Lord Tenterden's Act [3 and 4 Wm 4 c 42 s 49]. The House of Lord in *London Chatham and Dover Railway Co v South Eastern Railway Co* (f) the modern leading case on interest held that the sum certain within the meaning of that Act must be a certain sum which is one absolutely and in all events due and not a mere provisional payment to be made by one party to the other.

(uu) *Implied agreement*—Where an agreement to pay interest can be implied from the course of dealing between the parties (g).

In the *London Chatham and Dor v Railway Co* in any case the House of Lords held that interest cannot be given by way of damages for detention of a debt.

II Interest from date of suit to date of decree—The rate of interest from the date of the suit to the date of the decree is in the discretion of the Court (h) and this discretion is not excluded even if a fixed rate is mentioned in the contract as payable up to realization (i). But though the rate of interest for the aforesaid period is discretionary the Court should in the exercise of that discretion award interest at the contract rate unless it would be inequitable to do so (j). The Court may under this head award interest in a suit for money although interest is not specifically asked for in the plaint (k) [see O 7 r 7].

It is well established that no interest can be allowed on damages for any period prior to the suit (l) but there is a conflict of decisions whether interest can be allowed under this section on damages from the date of the suit it being held in some cases that it can be allowed (m) and in some that it cannot be allowed (n).

Where the High Court has refused to exercise its discretionary power to allow interest from date of suit the Judicial Committee as a rule will not interfere (o).

III Interest from date of decree to date of payment—The rate of interest from the date of the decree to the date of payment is also in the discretion of the Court. The plaintiff getting security of a decree has his interest reduced in

- (e) This does not apply to an executory Court.  
Hogarth Sh pp Ag Co Ltd v Mit v  
Bussan Kai Fa Ltd (19 6) 53 Cal 3  
98 I C 38 (28) A C 1119  
(f) [1893] A C 49 See H history Vol 1 pp  
37 39  
(g) Willott v Cordine [1901] Ch 543 Po  
Du can (1905) 1 Ch 0  
(h) Pa na Lal v Nihal Chandra (19 3) 6 C W  
N 737 87 I C 43 ( ) A I C 46 [1 C]  
(i) Mag v an v Dhoudil Toy (1906) 1 Cal  
569 C realha v A bi (1879) 3 Bom  
50 Cmes C nider v Fatma (191) 19  
Cal 164 180 1 I A 01 The decision  
to the contrary in *Pama handra v Dero*  
(1 91) Mad 455 is no longer law  
(j) *Orde v Sina ner* (1880) 3 All 91 106 10

- I A 198  
(l) *P p Pama Harp l* (19 1) - Lah 6 64 I  
446 See also *Lala Chhajmal Das v*  
*Brybhulan Lal* (189 1) I A 199  
(m) *Fri n v C misioner of t m ms* (19 0)  
Bom H C A C 5 J I ca v  
*H rish Ch der* (1885) 11 Cal 1 2  
(n) *I l M E m* (19 4) 39 Cal L J  
84 45 80 I C 8 ( ) A C 63  
*Jamal ga v G khdas* (19 6) 51 Mad  
L J 43 9 I C 6 1 ( ) A M 10 1  
(o) *C endro* G A (19 0) 3 Cal L J  
31 J 4 601 C - 3  
(p) *So endra Moha v Harv Prasad* (19 6) 5  
1 t 135 5 I A 41 911 C. 1033 ( )  
A P C 0

aggregate sum so adjudged, from the date of the decree to the date of payment, or to such earlier date as the Court thinks fit

(2) Where such a decree is silent with respect to the payment of further interest on such aggregate sum as aforesaid from the date of the decree to the date of payment or other earlier date, the Court shall be deemed to have refused such interest and a separate suit therefore shall not lie

**Scope of the section**—This section applies only where the decree is for the payment of money. It does not apply where the decree is for the enforcement of a mortgage or charge. See notes below under the head Interest in suits for enforcement of mortgage. There is no analogy between interest awarded under this section and mesne profits (b)

**The three divisions of interest**—Interest that may be awarded to a plaintiff in a suit for money may be divided into three heads according to the *period* for which it is allowed namely—

- (1) interest accrued due *prior to the institution of the suit* on the principal sum adjudged (as distinguished from the principal sum claimed)
- (2) additional interest on the principal sum adjudged from the *date of the suit* to the *date of the decree* at such rate as the Court deems reasonable
- (3) further interest on the aggregate sum adjudged *i.e.* the principal sum *plus* interest from the *date of the decree* (i) to the *date of payment* or (ii) to such earlier date as the Court thinks fit at such rate as the Court deems reasonable

Interest up to date of suit is a matter of substantive law and the section does not refer to payment of interest under the first head (c). It applies only to the second and third heads.

**1 Interest prior to date of suit**—Interest antecedent to suit is not a matter of procedure but a brief note on the subject will not be out of place. The law on the subject may be considered under the following two heads:

- (1) where there is a stipulation for the payment of interest at a fixed rate
- (2) where there is no stipulation at all for the payment of interest

**1** If there is a stipulation for the rate of interest the Court must allow that rate up to the date of the suit however high it may be [Usury Laws Repeal Act 28 of 1854 s. 2] subject to the two following exceptions: (1) if the rate is penal the Court may award interest at such rate as it deems reasonable [Indian Contract Act 1872 s. 74] and (2) even if the rate is not penal the Court may reduce it if the interest is excessive and the transaction was substantially unfair [Usurious Loans Act 10 of 1914 s. 3].

**2** If there is no express stipulation for payment of interest the plaintiff is not entitled to interest except in the following cases—

- (i) *Mercantile usage*—Where it is allowed by mercantile usage (d)

(b) *Dura ka ahi v. Debendra* (1906) 33 Cal. 13.

(c) *Crundwell v. Ganeh* (1970) 37 Cal. L. J.

203 60 I.C. 44

(d) *Doolabhai v. F. Mulla* (1850) M.I.A. 109

136 (Bombay) *Jayram v. J. J.*

*And* (1920) 31 I.A. 63 (Calcutta)

*J. J. v. K. K.* (1916) 31 I.A. 60 (Calcutta)

(u) *Statutory right to interest*—Interest is payable where a right to it or an authority for its allowance or payment is conferred by statute. Section 90 of the Negotiable Instruments Act 1881 provides that when no rate of interest is specified in a promissory note or bill of exchange the Court shall notwithstanding any agreement relating to interest between the parties award interest at the rate of 6 per cent per annum from the date on which the amount claimed became due and payable. Similarly the Interest Act 3 of 1933 enacts that where there is no stipulation to pay interest but the amount claimed is a sum certain (as distinguished from unascertained damages) and is payable at a certain time by virtue of some written instrument the Court (e) may allow interest at a rate not exceeding the current rate of interest from the date on which the amount became payable. If no time is fixed for the payment of the amount the Court may award interest at the rate aforesaid from the time the creditor demands payment or writing intimating to the debtor that interest will be claimed from the date of such demand up to the date of payment. The provisions of the Interest Act 32 of 1930 are in the main a reproduction of the provisions of Lord Tenterden's Act [3 and 4 Wm 4 c 42 s 43]. The House of Lords in *London Chatham and Dover Railway Co v South Eastern Railway Co* (f) the modern leading case on interest held that the sum certain within the meaning of that Act must be a certain sum which is one absolutely and in all events due and not a mere provisional payment to be made by one party to the other.

(vi) *Implied agreement*—Where an agreement to pay interest can be implied from the course of dealing between the parties (g).

In the *London Chatham and Dover Railway Company's case* the House of Lords held that interest cannot be given by way of damages for detention of a debt.

II Interest from date of suit to date of decree—The rate of interest from the date of the suit to the date of the decree is in the discretion of the Court (h) and this discretion is not excluded even if a fixed rate is mentioned in the contract as payable up to realization (i). But though the rate of interest for the aforesaid period is discretionary the Court should in the exercise of that discretion award interest at the contract rate unless it would be inequitable to do so (j). The Court may under this head award interest in a suit for money although interest is not specifically asked for in the plaint (k) [see O 7 r 7].

It is well established that no interest can be allowed on damages for any period prior to the suit (l) but there is a conflict of decisions whether interest can be allowed under this section on damages from the date of the suit (m) being held in some cases that it can be allowed (n) and in some that it cannot be allowed (o).

Where the High Court has refused to exercise its discretionary power to allow interest from date of suit the Judicial Committee as a rule will not interfere (p).

III Interest from date of decree to date of payment—The rate of interest from the date of the decree to the date of payment is also in the discretion of the Court. The plaintiff getting security of a decree has his interest reduced in

- (1) This does not apply to an executing Court.  
*Bowth Sapping Co Ltd v Mit of Bussan & Co Ltd* (19 6) 53 Cal 735 94 L C 24 (26) 4 C 1119  
 (2) [1893] A C 443 see Halsbury Vol 1 pp 37-9  
 (3) *Wilmet v Garine* [1901] Ch 418 70 Duncanson 111 Ch 4  
 (4) *Panna Lal v Jhal Chaudhary* (19 3) 6 C W 737 67 I C 423 (2) A I C 46 (P C)  
 (5) *Mog v v Dhootal* 1 (1886) 1 Cal 563  
*Carroll v Hurst* (1879) 3 Pom 4  
*Times Chandu v Fata* (1891) 19 Cal 164 180 1 I A 201 The decision to the contrary in *Ramachandru v Devis* (1 2 Mad 445 is so good law  
 (6) *Ode r Skinner* (1830) 3 All 91 106 107

- I A 196  
 (7) *P. P. Karm v Haral* (11 1) Lah 6 64 I C 216 see also *Fala Chhajm I Das v Brjdhulan Jal* (190 1 A 192)  
 (8) *Fra v v Co m m n* f c tona (18 0) 107 H C 4 C 63 I C 1 r r  
*Horrak Chande* (1 55) 11 Cal 1 r r  
 (9) *Pamul v v Mularam* (19 4) 22 C I L J 24 63 I C 1114 (12 6) 1 M J 15 43 9 I C 2 (6) 15 10  
 (10) *Gre v n* 3 1 60 I C 23  
 (11) *So reudra Mohan v J M Prasad* (19 6) 5 Lat 135 5 I A 414 91 I C 1123 (1 A PL 0

aggregate sum so adjudged, from the date of the decree to the date of payment, or to such earlier date as the Court thinks fit

(2) Where such a decree is silent with respect to the payment of further interest on such aggregate sum as aforesaid from the date of the decree to the date of payment or other earlier date, the Court shall be deemed to have refused such interest and a separate suit therefore shall not lie

**Scope of the section**—This section applies only where the decree is for the payment of money. It does not apply where the decree is for the enforcement of a mortgage or charge. See notes below under the head Interest in suits for enforcement of mortgage. There is no analogy between interest awarded under this section and mesne profits (b).

**The three divisions of interest**—Interest that may be awarded to a plaintiff in a suit for money may be divided into three heads according to the period for which it is allowed namely—

- (1) interest accrued due prior to the institution of the suit on the principal sum adjudged (as distinguished from the principal sum claimed)
- (2) additional interest on the principal sum adjudged from the date of the suit to the date of the decree at such rate as the Court deems reasonable
- (3) further interest on the aggregate sum adjudged i.e. the principal sum plus interest from the date of the decree (i) to the date of payment or (ii) to such earlier date as the Court thinks fit at such rate as the Court deems reasonable

Interest up to date of suit is a matter of substantive law and the section does not refer to payment of interest under the first head (c). It applies only to the second and third heads.

**I Interest prior to date of suit**—Interest antecedent to suit is not a matter of procedure but a brief note on the subject will not be out of place. The law on the subject may be considered under the following two heads

- (1) where there is a stipulation for the payment of interest at a fixed rate
- (2) where there is no stipulation at all for the payment of interest

1 If there is a stipulation for the rate of interest the Court must allow that rate up to the date of the suit however high it may be [Lauzy Laws & Legal Act 23 of 1860 s. 2] subject to the two following exceptions (1) if the rate is penal the Court may award interest at such rate as it deems reasonable [Indian Contract Act 157 s. 4] and (2) even if the rate is not penal the Court may reduce it if the interest is excessive and the transaction was substantially unfair [Lauzy Laws & Legal Act 10 of 1915 s. 3].

2 If there is no express stipulation for payment of interest the plaintiff is not entitled to interest except in the following cases—

- (i) *Mercantile usage*—Where it is allowed by mercantile usage (d)

(b) *Dua tooth v. Dehendra* (1906) 33 Cal. 1-3  
 (c) *Cronson v. Cronson* (1900) 3 Cal. L. J.  
 601-2  
 (d) *Dool-blass v. Lamell* (1860) 31 I. A. 109

16 (Bombay) *J. Jyomohun v. J. J. A. and (1906) 31 I. A. 63 (Calcutta)*  
*J. Jyomohun v. K. Jyomohun* (1906) 31 I. A. 60 (Calcutta)

of *damdupat* ceases to operate from the date of the suit (b). But this is entirely in the discretion of the Court (c). It has been held by the High Court of Madras that the rule of *damdupat* does not apply where interest is claimed under a mortgage governed by the Transfer of Property Act 1882 (d). A different view has been taken by the High Court of Bombay (e) and Calcutta (f). The rule of *damdupat* does not apply where the mortgagee has been placed in possession and is accountable for the rents and profits received by him as against the interest due (g). See *Mulla's Hindu Law* Chapter 28.

## COSTS

35 [Ss 218 221 Jud Act, 1890, s 5 R S C, O 45, r 1]

(1) Subject to such conditions and limitations as may be prescribed, and to the provisions of any law for the time being in force, the costs of and incident to all suits shall be in the discretion of the Court, and the Court shall have full power to determine by whom or out of what property and to what extent such costs are to be paid, and to give all necessary directions for the purposes aforesaid. The fact that the Court has no jurisdiction to try the suit shall be no bar to the exercise of such powers.

(2) Where the Court directs that any costs shall not follow the event, the Court shall state its reasons in writing.

(3) The Court may give interest on costs at any rate not exceeding six per cent per annum, and such interest shall be added to the costs and shall be recoverable as such.

Subject to such conditions and limitations as may be prescribed.—Prescribed means by rules contained in or made under the Act see sec 2 (16) and (18). The following rules contain express provision as to costs—O 11 r 3 (costs of interrogatories) O 2 r 2 (proof of documents) O 21 r 72 (3) (application to set aside a sale) O 23 r 1 (3) (withdrawal of suit) O 24 r 4 (costs on payment into Court) O 3 rr 4 & 5 (next friends and guardians) O 33 rr 10 11 & 16 (pauper suits) O 34 r 3 (interpleader suits) O 34 (mortgage suits). But nothing in the rules as to pauper suits limits the discretion of the Court under sec 35 to apportion costs (h).

The provisions of any law. The discretion to award costs is limited by certain enactments e.g. the Presidency Small Cause Courts Act 18 of 1882 sec 22 (1) the Land Acquisition Act 1 of 1894 sec 27 (g).

(b) *Dionist v. Pany* (1893) 18 B. 86. *Halsall v. Esdaile* (1913) 40 T. 4 64 3 T. r. 3 6 18 1 (1909) 17 C. 1—[interlocutory]

(c) *Halsall v. Esdaile* (1913) 40 T. 4 64 3 T. r. 3 6 18 1 (1909) 17 C. 1—[interlocutory] *11 B. 49 87 T. 1 (1909) 4 B. 36* (interest allowed at 6 per cent only) *11 B. 49 87 T. 1 (1909) 4 B. 36* (interest allowed at 6 per cent only)

(d) *M. P. v. L. P.* (1903) 6 Mad. 86. The judgment was reversed upon the assumption that the rule of *damdupat* was in force in

the town of Madras  
(1) *Jeeva v. M. ordus* (1911) 3 Bom. 192  
81 C. 619

(f) *K. J. v. L. v. Varanda* (1913) 4 Cal. 6 6  
31 L. C. 6

(g) *Sind v. Javva* (1900) 4 Bom. 114

(h) *Jalpa v. Iray* (1884) 8 Bom. 114

(i) *M. M. v. A. B. v. Z. f. f.* (1909) 6 Cal. 434

116 L. C. 36 (1914) C. 560

j) *A. v. C. v. Coll. v. Valsett v. Damodardas*

(1909) 3 B. 114 114 L. C. 3 (1909) A. B. 63

the generality of cases (1) Where the rate of interest charged and decreed was 24 per cent the Lahore High Court refused to allow interest after decree (q) If the Court awards interest from the date of the decree but no rate is specified the decree holder will be entitled to interest at the Court rate which is usually 6 per cent (r) But if no such interest is awarded by the decree it will be deemed to have been refused (s) see sub sec (2) In a case decided by the Privy Council in 1878 it was held that when the decree is silent about future interest it cannot be recovered in execution proceedings but the decree holder may by suit recover damages for the detention of the decretal amount (t) That was a case under the Code of 1859 & 193 of that Code which relates to interest did not contain any such provision as is contained in sub sec (2) of the present section The provision was first introduced by Act 7 of 1888 The Privy Council ruling was followed in a recent Calcutta case but the decision it is admitted is in that respect incorrect (u)

**Illustration of the above rules**—A lends Rs 1000 to B to be repaid with interest at the rate of 18 per cent per annum In a suit by A to recover the amount of the loan with interest at the rate aforesaid it is contended on behalf of B that the rate of interest is penal (Contract Act s 74) The Court find that the rate of interest is not penal nor is the transaction substantially unfair Hence—

- (1) as regards interest [on Rs 1000] from the date of the loan to the date of the suit the Court must allow it at the contract rate that is at the rate of 18 per cent per annum Usury Laws Peepal Act s 2
- (2) as regards interest [on Rs 1000] from the date of the suit to the date of the decree the Court may allow it at the contract rate that is at the rate of 18 per cent per annum or it may in its discretion allow it at a lower rate or may disallow it altogether
- (3) as regards interest from the date of the decree to the date of payment on the aggregate sum adjudged [i.e. Rs 1000 plus the interest adjudged under the above two heads] the Court may allow interest at such rate as it deems reasonable This rate is usually 6 per cent & to interest on costs see s 30 cl (3)

**Interest in mortgage suits**—The law on this subject is now codified in O 34 r 11

**Rule of damdupat**—This is a rule of Hindu law according to which interest exceeding the amount of the principal sum cannot be recovered at any one time This rule is in force in the Bombay Presidency (v) including Sind (w) and in Berar (x) and in the presidency town of Calcutta (y) but it is not recognized outside that town (z) It is also not recognized in the Madras Presidency (a) The meaning of the rule is that interest must not exceed the principal and a Hindu lends Rs 500 to another Hindu and the loan is not repaid till the interest amounts to Rs 500 the lender is not entitled to recover more than Rs 500 for principal and Rs 100 for interest But the Court may under this section award further interest to the lender from the date of the suit though the aggregate interest may hereby exceed Rs 600 The reason is that the rule

(r) *Times Chander v Fatma* (1921) 18 Cal. 164  
140 171 A 201

(q) *P. J. v. J. v. J. v. J.* (1925) 109 I. C. 416 (1) 4  
A. L. 811

(s) *T. v. Lal v. P. v. P.* (1913) 7 B. L. P. App  
30

(t) *Ambs v. S. v. S.* (1913) 4 B. L. J. 687  
I. C. 266 (74) A. M. 10 [decree all nt  
t. Int rest on ext. sec. 2 (3)]

(u) *At. v. v. v. v. v.* (1914) 10 N. L. R. 91  
3 Cal. 60 3 I. A. 4

(v) *N. v. A. K. v. A.* (1916) 3 C. L. J. 94  
I. C. 92 (1) A. L. 4

(w) *U. v. A. v. S. v. J.* (1913) 11 B. M. R.  
(u) *A. v. v. v. v. v.* (1914) 10 N. L. R. 91

(x) *I. v. v. v. v. v.* (1914) 10 N. L. R. 91  
61 I. A. 14

(y) *N. v. v. v. v. v.* (1914) 10 N. L. R. 91  
3 I. A. 1

(z) *H. v. v. v. v. v.* (1883) 1 C. L. R.  
90  
(1) 4 J. I. v. v. v. v. v. (1913) 6 B. M. R. C. 400

through the Court (a) But though the discretion conferred upon the Courts by this section is wide it is a judicial discretion and must be exercised on fixed principles Where there are no materials before the Court on which it can exercise its discretion it is not justified in depriving a successful party of his costs (b) The following are the leading rules on the subject —

1 *Costs shall follow the event*—The general rule is that costs shall follow the event unless the Court for good reason otherwise orders This means that the successful party is entitled to costs unless he is guilty of misconduct or there is some other good cause for not awarding costs to him (c) The Court may not only consider the conduct of the party in the actual litigation but the matters which led up to the litigation (d) A refusal to go to arbitration is no ground for refusing costs (e) nor is the fact that the plaintiff brought his action without previous notice to the defendant (f) When an offer of compromise is made which the Court considers proper for acceptance but it refused the Court as a general rule relieves the party making the offer from payment of costs incurred after the date of the offer but an offer which the Court considers insufficient is no bar to a plaintiff's right to costs (g) In an account suit costs generally follow the result of the account unless the defendant has falsely denied his liability to account (h) But if the right to claim partition is wrongly disputed the disputing party will be made liable for costs unnecessarily incurred (i) An assignee of a decree made respondent without his consent but who actively supports the decree under appeal will be made liable for costs of the appeal but not of the lower Court (j) A successful party is not to be deprived of his costs merely because the suit proceeds *ex parte* (k) It has been held to be a good reason for depriving a successful respondent of his costs that the appeal was filed on the strength of a decision which was overruled after the filing of the appeal (l)

It is provided by R S C O 40 r 1 that where any action cause matter or issue is tried with a jury the costs shall follow the event unless the judge by whom such action cause matter or issue is tried or the Court shall for good cause otherwise order It has been held by the House of Lords that the expression the costs shall follow the event means that the party who on the whole succeeds in the action gets the general costs of the action but where the action involves separate issues whether arising under different causes of action or under one cause of action the word event should be read distributively and the costs of any particular issue should go to the party who succeeds upon it An issue in this sense need not go to the whole cause of action but includes any issue which has a direct and definite event in defeating the claim to judgment in whole or in part A sued B for 1641 for the price of 31 bags of goat's hair sold to B B by his defence pleaded (1) that the goods were not according to sample and were

- (c) *Ganga Das v. Murren Brouer* (19 8) 10  
Lah L J 401 1091 C 4 6 (9) A L 200  
(b) *C. I. S. v. C. I. S. v. C. I. S.*  
N. V. S. C. (1903) 11 B 7 6 (C 4)  
(c) *Chhaibai v. Morol* (1891) 15 Bom 4 4  
K pp. cam v. Za. d f Kal i (1901)  
M d 341 C ope B h t t g a  
(1880) 15 Ch D 01 I d e s h a M a n  
o p (1 8 ) 13 I A 0 31 (s c e s i l  
plaintiff) M o h r v I o m a t h (18 8)  
d ( 1 4 9 4 B h b r s v v a l c r o o i  
(1880) 1 Cal 18 d 1 1 4 13 (s u c c e s s  
ful d t n d n t) F t r F u g i r l 133  
1 Q B 64 H s i v W e s t L d  
F r i n s n l y c o ( 1 9 ) 14 App Cas  
n 3  
(d) *E. Lock v. Pa. ey Fida D. t. c. Cou. c. l.*  
(1900) 1 Q B 3 360 aff'd (1900)  
Q B 616 *Sukumari v. G. p. Moh a*  
(1916) 43 Cal 190 31 I C 66  
( ) *Bckett v. L. (14 4) Tim a Law I p 4*  
(f) *Good v. Huet* (1833) C 1 D 1  
Wittm n Oppr ( 1 4 ) ( 1 )  
60 v e f a i l l c o e t i t l r r k  
of North J l H a r t t e r f f  
(189 13 ( 1 4 )  
(g) *F. v. D. J. d. M. r. n. (15 6) L T*  
161  
(h) *H. v. K. h. a. (18 ) 14 ( 1 14 13*  
1 A 1 3 H y f e j u d S i o c  
(1916) 0 C W 38 3 I C 83  
(i) *S. v. A. at a K r p l (1910) 10*  
( 1 1 J J 003 3 I C 4  
(j) *F. J. H. (1 ) 01 m 16*  
(k) *L. p. d. I. v. v. a. (1004) J C W v*  
21 651 ( 1 1 ) 4 4 66  
(l) *F. m. v. v. a. k e 1 d a m (1912) 43*  
Mad L J 61 3 I C



**Costs as penalty**—Costs cannot be imposed as a penalty beyond the costs of suit (1). It is not according to law to give to a party by way of damages the costs as between attorney and client of the litigation in which the damages are recovered (2). The object of awarding cost is to indemnify a party against the expense of successfully vindicating his rights in Court (3). As to compensatory costs in cases of false or vexatious claims or defences see s. 303 below.

**Costs of and incident to suits**—This expression includes not only costs of suits but costs of applications in suits. If there has been an invalid reference to arbitration out of Court the Court cannot make an order for costs incurred before the arbitrator as they are not costs of the suit (4). As to costs of applications the Court may make an order directing either party to pay the costs of the other or it may make no order as to costs or it may reserve costs or make costs costs in the cause.

The general order for costs of the suit does not displace a specific order for costs made on an application (5). If the order is costs reserved those costs remain to be dealt at the hearing. If the order is "costs costs in the cause" the Bombay High Court at one time held that the Court had a discretion to deal with those costs in any manner it thought fit (6) in other words costs costs in the cause stood on the same footing as costs reserved except that in the case of costs costs in the cause if nothing was said about those costs in the final judgment they were taken to be included in the costs of the suit (7). But these decisions are no longer law and it has now been held that where the costs of an application are made costs in the cause the party to whom the costs of the suit are awarded is entitled as a matter of course to the costs of the application (8). If the order is costs to abide the result the Court has a discretion to apportion costs at the hearing but if the order is cost to follow the event or costs to abide and follow the result the Court has no discretion and the successful party is entitled to his costs (9).

**Costs to be in the discretion of the Court**—The section provides that the costs of suit and applications shall be in the discretion of the Court. Such discretion must be a judicial discretion to be exercised on legal principles not by chance, melior, nor by caprice nor in temper (10). In the exercise of this discretion the Court is not confined to the consideration of the conduct of the parties in the actual litigation itself but may also take into consideration matters which led up to and were the occasion of that litigation (11). The discretion conferred upon the Court by this section is very wide (12). Thus the Court may order the costs to be paid by the parties in definite proportion or it may order one party to pay to the other a fixed sum in lieu of taxed costs (13). Similarly it may disallow costs to a successful plaintiff as where the rate of interest claimed by the plaintiff and allowed to him under the Usury Laws 1862 Act (14) is usurious (15) or it may make a successful plaintiff pay the whole costs of the other side (16). It may also allow the expenses of witnesses though not summoned

- (1) *Wallcott v. Fisher* (1883) 1 C.D. 411.  
(2) *Wells v. Edwards* (1841) 14 C.D. 411.  
(3) *M. A. J. v. J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(4) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(5) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(6) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(7) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(8) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(9) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(10) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(11) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(12) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(13) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(14) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(15) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(16) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.

- (17) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(18) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(19) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(20) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(21) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(22) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(23) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(24) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(25) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(26) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(27) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(28) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(29) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(30) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(31) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(32) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(33) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(34) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(35) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(36) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(37) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(38) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(39) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(40) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(41) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(42) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(43) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(44) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(45) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(46) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(47) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(48) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(49) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(50) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(51) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(52) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(53) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(54) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(55) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(56) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(57) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(58) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(59) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(60) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(61) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(62) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(63) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(64) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(65) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(66) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(67) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(68) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(69) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(70) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(71) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(72) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(73) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(74) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(75) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(76) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(77) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(78) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(79) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(80) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(81) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(82) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(83) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(84) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(85) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(86) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(87) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(88) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(89) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(90) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(91) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(92) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(93) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(94) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(95) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(96) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(97) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(98) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(99) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.  
(100) *J. v. J.* (1870) 43 Cal. 441.





entitled to receive from the plaintiff half the costs incurred in the joint defence (b)

13 Where two plaintiffs join in one action claiming for separate and distinct causes of action and judgment is entered in favour of one plaintiff and against the other the successful plaintiff is entitled to recover from the defendant the whole of his general costs of the action and the defendant is entitled to recover from the unsuccessful plaintiff the costs occasioned by his joinder as plaintiff (c)

14 Where the decree of the lower Court is confirmed by the appellate Court the mere fact that the grounds upon which the confirmation proceeds are not the same as the ratio decidendi of the Court below is no ground for departing from the rule that the costs shall follow the event (d)

15 Where a third party with no sufficient reason appears and defends an action separately he must bear the costs of so doing even though the plaintiff is unsuccessful in the action (e)

16 *Costs in an administration suit*—See Williams on Executors 11th ed vol 2 p 1649 *et seq* Ingpen on Executors 2nd ed p 352 *et seq* Danniell's Chancery Practice 8th ed p 1075 and the undermentioned case (f)

17 *Costs in a partnership suit*—See Lindley on Partnership 9th ed pp 627

18 *Costs of mortgagee*—See Fisher on Mortgage 6th ed paras 1894 1897

19 *Costs of trustee*—See Lewin on Trusts 12th ed p 126 *et seq*

20 *Costs of proceedings in Probate Court*—See Ingpen on Executors 2nd ed pp 97 99

**Co defendants**—The Court may order one defendant to pay the costs of another defendant (g) In a suit against a partnership of several partners some of whom admitted and some of whom denied the partnership those who denied were ordered to pay the costs of those who admitted (h)

**Discretion not to be delegated**—The discretion given to the Court under this section cannot be delegated to the taxing officer (i)

**Costs against person not a party to suit**—An order for costs cannot be made against persons who are not parties to the suit (j) Persons interested on whose behalf a suit is brought under O 1 r 8 cannot be ordered to pay costs (k) As regards an action for costs against a third person on the ground that he was the mover of and had an interest in the suit it has been held by the Privy Council that such an action cannot be maintained in the absence of malice and want of probable cause (l)

**Out of what property**—The Court is not bound to order costs to be paid out of the estate Such an order is generally made in favour of trustee and in probate suits when the difficulty of construction is caused by the testator (m)

**Costs where relief is claimed against defendants in the alternative**—See note under the same head to O 1 r 3

- (b) *Beau v. Nt. v. Nt.* [1903] 1 K. B. 3  
(c) *Id. v. Nt. v. Nt.* [1903] 1 Q. B. 11  
(d) *Id. v. Nt. v. Nt.* [1903] 1 K. B. 11  
(e) *Id. v. Nt. v. Nt.* [1903] 1 K. B. 11  
(f) *Id. v. Nt. v. Nt.* [1903] 1 K. B. 11  
(g) *Id. v. Nt. v. Nt.* [1903] 1 K. B. 11  
(h) *Id. v. Nt. v. Nt.* [1903] 1 K. B. 11  
(i) *Id. v. Nt. v. Nt.* [1903] 1 K. B. 11  
(j) *Id. v. Nt. v. Nt.* [1903] 1 K. B. 11  
(k) *Id. v. Nt. v. Nt.* [1903] 1 K. B. 11  
(l) *Id. v. Nt. v. Nt.* [1903] 1 K. B. 11  
(m) *Id. v. Nt. v. Nt.* [1903] 1 K. B. 11

- (b) *Id. v. Nt. v. Nt.* [1903] 1 K. B. 3  
(c) *Id. v. Nt. v. Nt.* [1903] 1 Q. B. 11  
(d) *Id. v. Nt. v. Nt.* [1903] 1 K. B. 11  
(e) *Id. v. Nt. v. Nt.* [1903] 1 K. B. 11  
(f) *Id. v. Nt. v. Nt.* [1903] 1 K. B. 11  
(g) *Id. v. Nt. v. Nt.* [1903] 1 K. B. 11  
(h) *Id. v. Nt. v. Nt.* [1903] 1 K. B. 11  
(i) *Id. v. Nt. v. Nt.* [1903] 1 K. B. 11  
(j) *Id. v. Nt. v. Nt.* [1903] 1 K. B. 11  
(k) *Id. v. Nt. v. Nt.* [1903] 1 K. B. 11  
(l) *Id. v. Nt. v. Nt.* [1903] 1 K. B. 11  
(m) *Id. v. Nt. v. Nt.* [1903] 1 K. B. 11



unless there is a question of principle involved (x) On the other hand it has been held by the High Court of Bombay that an appeal will lie for costs only whether the order as to costs involves a question of principle or not (y) The ground of the Bombay decisions is that every decree being appealable any part of it is appealable though it be the part relating to costs whether there is a matter of principle involved or not But even according to the Bombay decisions though an appeal may lie for costs only the appellate Court will not as a rule vary or set aside the order of the lower Court as to costs unless there is a principle involved and the principle has been violated

Does a *second* appeal lie on a matter of costs only? It has been held that it does provided there is a question of law or principle involved ( ) see s 100 cl (a)

II *Appeal from a direction as to costs contained in an appealable order* — The law as to appeal from a decision as to costs contained in an order (as distinguished from a decree) is that if the order is itself appealable an appeal will lie from that part of the order which relates to costs (a). But no second appeal lies on a matter of costs awarded by an appealable order for no second appeal lies from any order passed in appeal under s 104 see s 104 (2).

III *Appeal from a direction as to costs contained in a non appealable order*—Since no appeal lies from a non appealable order no appeal can lie from a direction as to costs contained in such order. Thus if an order is made adjourning the hearing of a suit and one of the parties is directed to pay the costs occasioned by the application for adjournment he cannot appeal from the direction as to costs for an order adjourning the hearing of a suit is not an appealable order it not being included in s. 104 (1) below (b).

Letters Patent appeal—An order as to costs is not a judgment within the meaning of clause 10 of the Letters Patent and is not appealable as such (c)

Costs against Secretary of State—The Secretary of State is in an unsuccessful litigation liable to pay costs like any other unsuccessful party (d)

**Suit for contribution towards costs** — A defendant is not entitled as against a co defendant to contribution in respect of costs to which both are liable unless there be some equity existing between him and the co defendant (e)

**Review of taxation**—On a review of taxation the decision of the taxing master is not absolutely final even on a question of quantum. The Court has jurisdiction to interfere with the discretion of the taxing master if he has acted upon any wrong principle or applied any wrong consideration (f).

**35A** (1) If in any suit or other proceeding not being an appeal any party objects to the claim or defence on the ground that the claim or defence or any part of it is as against the plaintiff, false or vexatious to the knowledge of the party by whom it has been put forward and if thereafter as against the

Compe at ry con  
re pe t of f l or vex ti  
l ms or d f i c

[illegible]

(a)  $L H \quad 1 \quad f \quad h \quad f \quad f \quad (1) \quad 1 \quad (1) \quad 1$   
 $91 \quad 11 \quad 5 \quad 6 \quad 8 \quad 11 \quad 10 \quad 16 \quad 17 \quad 18$   
 $02 \quad 64 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 13 \quad ( ) \quad 4 \quad 4 \quad 10$

(b)  $I H u s \quad f \quad h \quad p \quad t \quad (1) \quad 1 \quad 8 \quad C \quad 1 \quad 91$

(c)  $M i a l \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1$   
 $(h e t t e r) \quad (1) \quad 0 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1$

(d)  $r \quad f \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1$   
 $1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1$

(e)  $M H \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1$   
 $1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1$

(f)  $f \quad a \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1$   
 $1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1$

objector, such claim or defence is disallowed, abandoned or withdrawn in whole or in part, the Court, if the objection has been taken at the earliest opportunity and if it is satisfied of the justice thereof, may, after recording its reasons for holding such claim or defence to be false or vexatious, make an order for the payment to the objector, by the party by whom such claim or defence has been put forward, of costs by way of compensation.

(2) No Court shall make any such order for the payment of an amount exceeding one thousand rupees or exceeding the limits of its pecuniary jurisdiction, whichever amount is less.

Provided that where the pecuniary limits of the jurisdiction of any Court exercising the jurisdiction of a Court of Small Causes under the Provincial Small Cause Courts Act 1887, and not being a Court constituted under that Act, are less than two hundred and fifty rupees the High Court may empower such Court to award as costs under this section any amount not exceeding two hundred and fifty rupees and not exceeding those limits by more than one hundred rupees.

Provided further that the High Court may limit the amount which any Court or class of Courts is empowered to award as costs under this section.

(3) No person against whom an order has been made under this section shall by reason thereof be exempted from any criminal liability in respect of any claim or defence made by him.

(4) The amount of any compensation awarded under this section in respect of a false or vexatious claim or defence shall be taken into account in any subsequent suit for damages or compensation in respect of such claim or defence.

This section was added into the Code by Act 9 of 1939. The section does not come into operation until the Local Government has, with the previous sanction of the Governor General in Council, by notification in the local Official Gazette directed that the Act shall come into force in the Province on such date as may be specified in the notification.

The section provides for payment of costs by way of compensation in cases of false or vexatious claims and defences. See notes to s. 30. Costs as penalty on p. 129 above.

An order awarding compensation under this section is appealable under section 104 (f). But an appellate Court cannot make an order when the original Court has refused to do so. See proviso to O. 41 r. 33.







**Execution of orders**—The term order is defined in s 2 cl 14 as the formal expression of any decision of a civil Court which is not a decree. An order under s 34 of the Guardians and Wards Act 8 of 1890 directing a guardian to pay a sum of money out of his ward's estate for the marriage expenses of a person dependent on his ward is not an order within the meaning of s 2 cl 14 and it cannot be enforced against the ward after he has attained majority and the guardian has been discharged (b). But an order made after the dismissal of a partition suit directing the plaintiff to deposit in Court a certain sum of money as remuneration for work done by the Commissioners of partition is an order within the meaning of s 2 cl 14 and it may be executed as a decree (c).

Merger of decree — As to merger of decree of the first Court in the decree of the Appellate Court see *Ajray v. Suami Nath (d)* where all the cases are reviewed. See also notes to O 9 r 13. Hearing of application after disposal of appeal.

37 [S 649 2nd para ] The expression " Court which passed a decree," or words to that effect, shall, in relation to the execution of decrees, unless there is anything repugnant in the subject or context, be deemed to include,—

- (a) where the decree to be executed has been passed in the exercise of appellate jurisdiction, the Court of first instance, and
- (b) where the Court of first instance has ceased to exist or to have jurisdiction to execute it, the Court which, if the suit wherein the decree was passed was instituted at the time of making the application for the execution of the decree would have jurisdiction to try such suit

Changes introduced in the section—This section differs from the corresponding section 649 of the Code of 1882 in that the expression the Court of first instance in clause (a) has been substituted for the expression the Court which passed the decree against which the appeal was preferred. As to the effect of the alteration see notes below.

Court which passed a decree —Section 35 indicates the Courts by which decrees may be executed. A decree may be executed either by the Court which passed it or by the Court to which it is sent for execution. It may also be executed by the Court to which it is transferred under s. 24 above (c). The present section explains the meaning of the expression "Court which passed a decree".

(b) *P. nitham* also collected in 1916 41 Mad  
41 41 1 1 341

(c)  $\text{Cha deu A me } \backslash \text{ K+em K maru (19)}$

(d) (191 ) 32 411 13 36 1 C 0

(e) See *M. A. Mural v. Tilam Chand* (1977) 4 All MR 461, 46 (SC).



Court X has jurisdiction to entertain the application for execution but the question whether it could itself order the sale of the property was not decided (j) In a later Madras case the opinion was expressed that Court X has no jurisdiction to entertain the application for execution (l) but this view was overruled by a Full Bench of the same High Court the Full Bench taking the same view as the Calcutta High Court Wallis C J observed that the power of sending the decree to another Court was sufficient to meet the case The learned C J construed sec 150 as conferring upon the Court of the transferred area jurisdiction to entertain the application for execution but was of opinion that the section could not be read as taking away from the Court which passed the decree the power which it had according to the unbroken current of authorities of entertaining the application (l) But a Court to which a decree is transferred for execution has no jurisdiction to order either the attachment or sale of immovable property if at the time of the order such Court had no territorial jurisdiction over the property (m)

C1 (b) Ceased to have jurisdiction to execute —A Court does not cease to have jurisdiction to execute its decree because it is abolished and re-established (n) or merely because its business is transferred by the District Judge under the Act constituting it to another Court (o) or because the area in which the judgment debtor resides is transferred from its jurisdiction to that of another Court (p) Where an order was made by the High Court of Calcutta rejecting a petition for leave to appeal to the Privy Council and directing the petitioner to pay the respondent's costs but the order was silent as to the Court by which it was to be executed it was held that the circumstance that the High Court on its appellate side does not in practice execute its own decrees and orders did not make that Court as regards the execution of the order a Court that had ceased to have jurisdiction to execute its decree (q) [O 45 r 1u] Nor does a Court which passed a decree cease to have jurisdiction to execute it because after the passing of the decree a party [e g Court of Wards] is added in execution who had been a party when the suit wherein the decree was passed was instituted would have deprived the Court of its jurisdiction (r) In a recent Madras case (s) the Court said with reference to cl (b) of the section In fact this portion of section 37 of the Civil Procedure Code clearly has reference to transfers of territorial jurisdiction from one Court to another In applying this section the nature of the cause which put an end to the jurisdiction of a Court is immaterial (t)

What decrees may be executed.—See note under the same heading s 36 on p 135 above

### COURTS BY WHICH DECREES MAY BE EXECUTED

38 [S 223 1st para] A decree may be executed either by the Court which passed it or by the Court to which it is sent for execution

Court by which decree may be executed

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| (j) <i>Pudra ga v Eyalanga</i> (1907) 30 Mad 53                           | (o) <i>9 I C 800 (6) A I 200</i>   |
| (k) <i>Subb ah Pa a tallan</i> (1914) 3 M d 46 41 I C 893                 | (p) <i>Kali dale v D o Vath</i> (1938) 3 Cal 315                             |
| (l) <i>Madan v M th s m</i> (1919) 4 Mad 81 83 833 83 84 53 I C 13 M d 10 | <i>Jogi mth Shro dan</i> (191) 6 Iat. 1 J 304 6 I C 44                       |
| <i>la ppa v I v</i> (193) 4 Mad L J 10 31 C 96 (4) A M 3                  | (q) <i>M th R uppa v P va Aar d n</i> (1923) 45 Mad L J 10 31 C 96 (4) A M 3 |
| <i>v tr h la v Je ip</i> (19) 50 Mad 84 103 I C 4 ( ) A M 6               | (r) <i>H rro E e had v Et pendro</i> (191) 6 Cal 401                         |
| (m) <i>Veerappa v J a</i> (190) 43 M d 13 31 C 1 J                        | (s) <i>B ndoo v Vats gao</i> (1914) 33 I m 66 I C 406                        |
| (n) <i>Rhod if t l v Ha d ar</i> (19 ) 4 Pat 688                          | (t) <i>Tankal m Vath v S ra v M d l</i> (1919) 4 M d 461 464 51 I C 10       |
|   | (u) <i>Ca dha v d d l</i> (1923) 1 Bom. 16                                   |

**Court which passed a decree**—See notes to s 37 on p 137 under the same heading

**Court to which it is sent for execution**—This would be under sections 39 and 40

**Jurisdiction of Court executing a decree**—The following are the leading rules relating to the jurisdiction of Courts executing decrees —

**PULE I**—No court can execute a decree in which the subject matter of the suit or of the application for execution is properly situate entirely outside the local limits of its jurisdiction—Territorial jurisdiction in other words is a condition precedent to a Court executing a decree (u)

**Exception I**—The Court which passed a decree for the enforcement of a mortgage of immovable property has power in execution of its decree to order the sale of such property though it may be situate beyond the local limits of its jurisdiction—A sues B in a Court in district X on a mortgage of two properties one situate in district X and the other in district Y A decree is passed for the sale of both the properties The Court in district X having jurisdiction to entertain the suit in respect of the property situate in district Y (s 17) has also jurisdiction to sell that property in execution of its decree though the property is situate beyond its jurisdiction It is not bound to send the decree for execution as regards the property in district Y to the Court of that district under s 39 (c) but it may do so (z) In the latter case the decree as respects the property in district Y may be executed by the Court of district Y (u) See also notes to s 17

**Exception II**—Where after the passing of a decree in a suit for the enforcement of a mortgage the whole of the immovable property included therein falls by transfer of jurisdiction within the local limits of the jurisdiction of another Court the application for execution of the decree according to the Calcutta rulings may be made either to the Court which passed the decree (though the property is no longer within its jurisdiction) or to the Court within the local limits of whose jurisdiction the immovable property falls by such transfer but where the application is made to the former Court it should not itself order the property to be sold but should transfer it to the latter Court for passing and executing the order for sale (x) See note to s 37 Court which passed the decree rule 5 p 137

**Exception III**—The salary of the public officer or of a servant of a Railway company or local authority may be attached by a Court though the disbursing officer may not be within the local limits of the Court's jurisdiction See O 21 r 48 and notes thereto

**RULE II**—Where a decree has been passed for the payment of money and the decree holder applies for attachment and sale of immovable property (belonging to the judgment debtor) which forms one estate of part whereof is situated within the local limits of the jurisdiction of the Court executing the decree and part beyond such limits the Court executing the decree has the power to attach and sell the whole estate including the portion situated beyond the local limits of its jurisdiction See O 21 r 3 and notes thereto

**RULE III**—Whether a Court to which a decree has been sent for execution under s 39 has jurisdiction to execute the decree if the amount of the decree exceeds the limits of the pecuniary jurisdiction of the Court? There is a conflict of decision as to whether the Court of execution is restricted to the pecuniary limits of its jurisdiction To put the question in a concrete form if a decree for Rs 7 000 is sent for execution to a Court whose

(u) *Pr m Cha d v Makhoda Dec* (1890) 17 Cal 639 03 B 99 D nl p d C v J ga noth (1912) 39 C l 104 111 C 41 *Ambika v Ma (Iga f Loan Offs* (19 3) 33 C W N 849  
(v) *Maseyk v Steel* (188 ) 14 Cal 661 *Kart B Nath Td Idhary* (1848) 1 Cal 667 *Gopi Mohun v D phak* (189 ) 19 C l 13 *T co v v S B C A dra* (1894) 21 C l

639 *Jager ath v D p R* (189 ) Cal 871  
(w) *Azur B ksh v S Itan S gh* (1918) 1 P no 43 p 1 48 I C 9 *J gennath v D p Ian* (189 ) 2 Cal 871  
(x) *L t hman v M l l* (1881) 6 C l 513 *Jahar v Kam v D bi* (1901) 3 Cal 38 *S Adnan v M thusam* (1919) 40 M d 815 I C 213



record is a nullity and it cannot be executed against his estate (n) As to whether a decree passed by a Court without jurisdiction can be executed see notes to s 21 section 21 and execution proceedings As to the powers of a Court to which a decree is transferred for execution see notes to s 42 and O 21 r 7

**Construction of decree by executing Court**—If the decree is free from ambiguity the Court of execution is bound to execute it whether it be right or wrong (o) But though a Court executing a decree cannot go behind the decree it is quite competent to construe the decree where the terms of the decree are ambiguous and to ascertain its precise meaning for unless this is done the decree cannot be executed The construction of a decree must be governed by the pleadings and the judgment (p) And the Court should if possible put such a construction upon the decree as would make it in accordance with law (q) When a particular construction has been put upon a decree in a former execution proceedings it is not open to the Court in a subsequent application to treat that construction as erroneous See note to s 11 Orders in execution proceedings on p 77 above

**39 [S 223, 2nd and 3rd paras]** (1) The Court which passed a decree may, on the application of the decree holder send it for execution to another Court,—

Transfer of decree

- (a) if the person against whom the decree is passed actually and voluntarily resides or carries on business, or personally works for gain, within the local limits of the jurisdiction of such other Court, or
- (b) if such person has not property within the local limits of the jurisdiction of the Court which passed the decree sufficient to satisfy such decree and has property within the local limits of the jurisdiction of such other Court, or
- (c) if the decree directs the sale or delivery of immovable property situate outside the local limits of the jurisdiction of the Court which passed it, or
- (d) if the Court which passed the decree considers for any other reason, which it shall record in writing, that the decree should be executed by such other Court

(n) *J. gl. Lal v. Lal* P m (1919) 4 Pat L.J. 40 OIC 59 R p Nara v. Ramayee (1918) 2 C.L.J. 19 Naradra v. Gopal (1911) 1 Cal L.J. 634 OIC 66 Ind d. Ali v. Jagan Lal (1901) 17 All 48 I dha J. 1 L.L.S. 16 (1901) 13 All 53 17 1 A 10 J. dh v. I mcha dra (1900) 6 R m 31 Lal v. th v. Lal (1900) 11 R m L.L. 10 0 4 I.C. 137 S bama v. I mcha otha (1913) 33 Mad 68 31 I.C. 198

(o) *Parth v. Pupa S. gh* (1899) 20 All 397 *Idu t v. T. Lh S. gh* (1901) 23 Cal

33 S.I. 4 7

(p) *Lam Kerp v. P. K. Kary* (1884) 6 All 269 5 All 11 A 37 K. I. K. K. v. Secretary of St. le (1885) 18 C. 1 13 183 15 I A 186 *Jagan v. S. J. t* (1891) 19 Cal 1 9 19 I A 16 *Ta. v. J. J. t* (1896) 18 All 314 *S. I. v. J. m. I. I* (1894) 18 R m 54

(q) *Im. I. v. L. h* 4 (1891) 19 All 1 4 R. t v. L. d. v. (1899) 1 All 361 I dha h. v. Collect v. J. p. r (1901) 23 All 220 62 S.I. 4 24

(2) The Court which passed a decree may of its own motion send it for execution to any subordinate Court of competent jurisdiction

Alterations in the section—The words of competent jurisdiction in sub s (2) are new

The Court which passed a decree—See notes to s 37 under the same head on p 137 above

Another Court—The Court to which the decree is sent for execution must be a Court in British India (r) Decrees cannot be sent to Courts not in British India except in the case for which section 45 makes special provision (s)

Jurisdiction of Court executing a decree—See notes under the same head to s 28 on p 140 above

Transfer of decree for execution—A decree passed by one Court may be sent for execution to another Court either on the application of the decree holder on one of the grounds stated in this section or by the Court which passed it of its own motion When a decree is sent by the Court which passed it for execution to another Court the Court sending the decree must send a copy of the decree and other documents mentioned in O 21 r 6 to the Court by which the decree is to be executed The latter Court must on receiving the copy of the decree and the other documents cause the same to be filed (O 21 r 7) An application for transfer of a decree is not an application for execution (t) The decree holder who has applied for execution to the Court which passed the decree need not make a fresh application to the transferee Court (u) When he has not applied to the Court which passed the decree he must apply to the transferee Court for execution (O 21 r 10) The Court executing a decree sent to it for execution has the same powers in executing such decree as if it had been passed by itself (s 42)

Clause (a)—This clause provides for transfer of the decree if the judgment-debtor is resident in the jurisdiction of another Court The power of the Court under this clause to transfer a decree is not confined to the case where execution is sought against the person of the judgment debtor The decree holder is not bound to state in the application for transfer the mode in which the decree is to be executed If he satisfies the Court that the judgment debtor resides in the jurisdiction of another Court he may ask for transferring the decree to that Court without stating anything more in his application (v) If the judgment debtor a garnishee is resident in another jurisdiction the decree must be transferred there to serve a prohibitory order upon him (u)

Clause (b)—If the judgment debtor's property is out of jurisdiction the Court which passed the decree cannot attach it but must transfer the decree to the Court within whose local limits the property may be (x)

Clause (c)—As stated in rule 1 under sec 38 territorial jurisdiction is a condition precedent to a Court executing a decree If the decree directs the sale of immovable property within the territorial limits of the jurisdiction of another Court it must be sent to that Court for execution There is an exception to this in the case of a decree for the

(r) *Doyle v. F. & P. (1927) 1 Dom. 30*  
 (s) *1 tin. L. 100 (190) 9 Cal 400 P. 100*  
*Leslie v. Fern. L. (191) 40 Ind. 1063*  
 4 1 C 34  
 (t) *K. L. T. L. T. L. S. (191) 34 All. 396*  
 14 1 C 1 - Sc. al. o. B. L. b. 7 r. v. v.  
*Nara. D. S. (19) 54 I. A. 19 54 Cal.*  
 00 101 1 C. 4 ( ) 1 A. I. C. 3 approv  
 ing (h. t. e. r. p. L. S. g. h. v. v. d. S. n.

(1916) 43 Cal. 903 38 I. C. 606  
 ( ) *K. B. D. v. Tarapur. a. (193) 2 Pat.*  
 909 4 I. C. 3 ( ) 4 A. I. 170  
 (v) *Dua. K. v. Imperial Bank. f. Ind. a.*  
 (19 1) 33 C. W. N. 620 ( ) 2 A. C. 20  
 (w) *B. G. D. v. Co. v. J. 27. n. a. (191)*  
 31 C. 1 104 11 I. C. 417  
 ( ) *Ba. K. of L. gal. v. Sarat (1919) 4 Pat. L. J.*  
 141 43 I. C. 943



enforcement of a mortgage see exception 1 to Rule 1 under sec 38 above As to such decrees the Court may either execute the decree itself or to send it for execution to the Court having local jurisdiction (y)

Clause (d) —In a Bombay case the Court expressed a doubt whether clause (d) of this section enabled a Subordinate Judge to transfer a decree for execution to a Small Cause Court where the property attached was within the local jurisdiction of the Subordinate Judge ( )

A decree may be executed simultaneously in more places than one — A Court passing a decree has the power to send its decree to more Courts than one for concurrent execution But this power should be sparingly exercised and when exercised it would be in many cases proper to impose terms on the decree holder that he should not proceed to a sale under all the attachments at once (a)

Appeal —An appeal lies from an order rejecting an application for the transfer of a decree The reason is that questions relating to the transfer of decrees are questions relating to execution within the meaning of s 47 (b) See s 2 (2)

Madras Village Munsif's Court Act I of 1899 —This Act is a complete code of procedure by itself and the provisions of the Civil Procedure Code cannot be imported into it except to the extent provided by the Amending Act 2 of 1920 (c)

Award —An award filed under s 11 of the Indian Arbitration Act 9 of 1899 is enforceable under s 16 of the Act as if it were a decree of the Court It may therefore be transferred for execution as a decree under this section to another Court (d) So also an award made under rules framed under s 13 of the Co operative Societies Act 2 of 1912 (e)

**40 [New]** Where a decree is sent for execution in another province, it shall be sent to such Court and executed in such manner as may be prescribed by rules in force in that province

Transfer of decree to Court in another province

Executed in such manner as may be prescribed by rules in force in that province —The manner of execution is that of the Court which executes the decree but as to whether execution of the decree is barred by limitation or not it is the law governing the Court which passed the decree that applies (f)

**41 [S 283 4th para]** The Court to which a decree is sent for execution shall certify to the Court which passed it the fact of such execution, or where the former Court fails to execute the same the circumstances attending such failure

Result of execution process to be certified

Certify —The Court of execution must certify the result of the execution to the Court which passed the decree and transferred it for execution When the certificate is sent the transferee Court ceases to have seizin of the execution proceeding until then

(1) *A. K. Nath v. T. D. Idara* (1923) 1 Cal 66

(2) *A. K. v. D. A. C.* (1894) 18 Bom 61

(3) *S. Rodier v. L. J. M. P.* (1919) 14 M. I. A. 48 *Arakha v. L. J. M. P.* (1924) 18 Cal 168 *Deb v. L. J. M. P.* (1910) 5 Rang 39 *104 I. C. 333* ( ) *A. K. v. D. A. C.* (1923) 33 Cal 670 ( ) *A. C. J.*

(b) *Patel v. J. M. P.* (1904) 18 Cal 66

(c) *S. I. A. v. M. P.* (1931) 46 Mad 31

(d) *S. I. A. v. M. P.* (1911) 43

(e) *Patel v. J. M. P.* (1904) 18 Cal 66

(f) *T. M. P. v. D. A. C.* (1900) 1 Cal 1

(g) *Patel v. J. M. P.* (1911) 43

the decree rests in the *trans fere* Court (g) The *Oudh* Court has held that though the *trans fere* Court ceases after certification to have jurisdiction further to execute the decree it has power to decide an objection taken before it in respect of anything done in the course of the execution proceedings taken by it (h) Mere notification of payments made on account of the decree to the Court which passed the decree does not amount to a certification under this section (i) In a *Bombay* case it was said that the section only means that the Court of execution should keep the Court which passed the decree informed of what has happened in the execution (j) This is incorrect for the certificate is a very important step it is a formality which has the effect of determining the jurisdiction of the *trans fere* Court and is only sent after complete failure to execute or after the Court has executed as far as it can (k)



entertain a fresh application in the Court which passed the decree (h) See note Certify under section 22 above

The Court is not bound to certify failure of execution if the decree holder wishes to make another attempt (r)

**43 [S 229]** Any decree passed by a Civil Court established in any part of British India to which the provisions relating to execution do not extend or by any Court established or continued by the authority of the Governor General in Council in the territories of any foreign Prince or State may, if it cannot be executed within the jurisdiction of the Court by which it was passed, be executed in manner herein provided within the jurisdiction of any Court in British India

Execution of decrees passed by British Court in places to which this part does not extend or in foreign territory

This section applies to British Courts in Scheduled Districts and to British Courts in foreign territory. Such Courts may transfer their decrees for execution to Courts in British India to which the Code applies. The Court of the Political Agent Sikkim is a Court referred to in the section and it may transfer its decrees for execution to the Subordinate Judge at Darjeeling (j). The application for execution of a transferred decree must show that the Court is one referred to in this section (l)

**44 [S 229 B]** The Governor General in Council may, by notification in the Gazette of India, declare that the decrees of any Civil or Revenue Courts situate in the territories of any Native Prince or State in alliance with His Majesty and not established or continued by the authority of the Governor General in Council, or any class of such decrees may be executed in British India as if they had been passed by the Courts of British India

Execution of decrees passed by Courts in Native States

By notification.—For notifications issued under this section see General Statutory Rules and Orders Vol I pp 622 623 and Vol IV pp 689 693 and 685

**Decree of Courts of Native States**—The section uses the words Native Prince or State which are more restrictive than the words foreign Prince or State in section 43 and therefore does not refer to foreign Courts outside India. But the section does not take Native State decree out of the category of foreign decrees (l). It empowers a Court in British India to execute a decree transferred from a notified Native State Court but the British Court is not precluded from refusing execution on the ground that the Native State Court had no jurisdiction to pass the decree (m) or that the decree was obtained by fraud (n). The judgment-debtor will have the same defences as if

(h) *Mithra v K d P* (1904) 3 C W N 101

(i) *Ith v C d P* (1913) 1 R M L 1 43

4 I C 149 (J) A B 306

(j) *Jam v M P Raja f S L m* (1913) 3 C 1

89 11 1 44

(k) *Jad b (Chandra) D a* (1901) 4 E. 100

(l) *R 134 18 W L 1 4*  
(m) *Hay v Pema* (1921) 1 Lom.

(n) *Govindarajan v Muga Sad* (1916) 39 Mad 24 46 I C 2  
*Jappa v Jerry* (1916) 40 Ind. 551 36 I C 365

(o) See 15 L m 16 supra

he were sued on the foreign judgment (o) The section was merely intended to alter the procedure for enforcing Native State decrees (p) and must be construed as subject to the same limitations as are contained in s 13

**Limitation for execution of Native State decree**—The period of limitation for execution of a decree of a Court of a Native State transferred for execution to a Court of British India is not the period prescribed by the law of that State but that prescribed by the law of British India that is three years from the date of the decree [Limitation Act 1908 Sch I art 182] (q)

**45 [S 229 A]** So much of the foregoing sections of this Part as empowers a Court to send a decree for execution to another Court shall be construed as empowering a Court in British India to send a decree for execution to any Court established or continued by the authority of the Governor General in Council in the territories of any foreign Prince or State to which the Governor General in Council has, by notification in the Gazette of India, declared this section to apply

**Court established or continued in Native States**—For a list of such Courts see General Statutory Rules and Orders Vol I pp 638 642 and Vol IV p 683

**Execution of British decrees in foreign territory**—This is the only section which refers to the execution in foreign territory of decrees of Courts in British India Such decrees can only be executed in foreign territory by British Courts established there and empowered by notification under this section It is only when the Court in foreign territory is a Court established and continued by the Governor General in Council in the extraterritorial jurisdiction that there is power to provide for the transfer to them of decrees of British Indian Courts for execution for both in Native States and in other foreign territory execution would be pursuant to the legislative authority or sovereign power of such State or territory (r)

The two previous sections dealt with the converse case of the execution by British Courts of decrees of—

- (a) British Courts in Scheduled Districts see 43
- (b) British Courts in foreign territory including Native States see 43
- (c) Foreign Courts in Native States see 41

All other decrees of foreign Courts see Courts outside India and Courts of Native States not notified under sec 44 must be enforced by suit But as regards foreign Courts in Native States a reciprocal arrangement is sometimes effected by treaty for the execution of their decrees in our Courts and our decrees in their Courts Such an arrangement was made with Travancore in 1887 and is referred to in the undermentioned case (s)

**By notification** —For notifications issued under this section see General Statutory Rules and Orders Vol I pp 618 621

(o) *Pa ch Kara v Giridhar Mal* (19 ) 30 C W N 95 94 I C 40 ( ) A C 9  
 (p) See 15 Bom 16 *supra*  
 (q) *Nalibha v D gabbas* (1916) 40 Bom 404

36 I C 369  
 (r) *Jee ce Le la v Perum I* (1917) 40 Mad 1969 10 6 10 9 4 I C 24  
 (s) (1917) 40 Mad 1060 *supra*

**46 [New] (1) Upon the application of the decree holder**

Precepts

the Court which passed the decree may, whenever it thinks fit, issue a precept to any other Court which would be competent to execute such decree to attach any property belonging to the judgment debtor and specified in the precept

(2) The Court to which a precept is sent shall proceed to attach the property in the manner prescribed in regard to the attachment of property in execution of a decree

Provided that no attachment under a precept shall continue for more than two months unless the period of attachment is extended by an order of the Court which passed the decree or unless before the determination of such attachment the decree has been transferred to the Court by which the attachment has been made and the decree holder has applied for an order for the sale of such property

Attachment under precept—It was at one time proposed to do away with the system of execution by transfer of decree under sections 30 to 4<sup>o</sup> and to substitute another system whereby the Court which passed the decree retained complete control and issued precepts to one or more other Courts to carry on execution under its direction. This proposal was abandoned and the system of execution by transfer of decree retained. But the proposal led to the insertion of the present section by which the Court which passed the decree can issue a precept of attachment to enure for two months or pending transfer of decree and application for execution. The object of a precept is to enable a decree holder to obtain an interim attachment where there is ground to apprehend that he may otherwise be deprived of the fruits of his decree. No such attachment however can continue for more than two months except in the two cases mentioned in the section. The effect of the proviso is to render re attachment unnecessary.

The Court to which a precept is issued derives its authority from that precept and has no power to do anything not authorized thereby but it must be presumed to have inherent powers to deal with all matters that may incidentally arise in connection with proceedings for attachment. It cannot therefore be said that the Court to which a precept is issued has no jurisdiction to stay execution if the judgment debtor deposits the decretal amount in Court or gives security for payment of the amount (1)

**QUESTIONS TO BE DETERMINED BY COURT  
EXECUTING DECREE**

**47 [S 224] (1) All questions arising between the**

Question to be determined by the Court executing decree

parties to the suit in which the decree was passed, or their representatives, and relating to the execution, discharge or satisfaction of the decree shall be determined by the Court executing the decree and not by a separate suit

(2) The Court may, subject to any objection as to limitation or jurisdiction, treat a proceeding under this section as a suit or a suit as a proceeding and may, if necessary, order payment of any additional court fees

(3) Where a question arises as to whether any person is or is not the representative of a party, such question shall, for the purposes of this section, be determined by the Court

*Explanation*—For the purposes of this section, a plaintiff whose suit has been dismissed and a defendant against whom a suit has been dismissed, are parties to the suit

*Change\* introduced in the section*—This section corresponds with s 244 of the Code of 1892 except in the following particulars—

- 1 Sub clauses (a) and (b) of s 244 which provided for the determination of questions regarding the amount of mesne profits and interest in execution proceedings have been omitted as it was deemed expedient that such questions should be determined by the decree and not in execution See O 20 r 12
- 2 The words or to the stay of execution thereof which occurred in s 244 after the words execution discharge or satisfaction of the decree have been omitted in the present section As to the effect of the omission see notes Stay of execution
- 3 Sub section (2) of the present section is new It gives legislative recognition to the practice followed by the Courts under the Code of 1882 See notes below under the head Sub section (2) Court may treat suit as an application
- 4 Under the old s 244 the Court executing the decree had the *option* when a question arose as to who was the representative of a party itself to determine the question or to stay execution until it was determined by a separate suit Sub section (3) of the present section renders it *obligatory* on the executing Court itself to determine the question as it was considered inexpedient that separate suits should be instituted for the decision of such question See notes below under the head \* Sub-section (3) Inquiry as to who is the representative of a party
- 5 The Explanation sets at rest a conflict of judicial decisions noted below in the commentary under the head Explanation to the section and parties to suit

*To what decrees section applies*—This section has no application when the decree is a nullity for such a decree is not a decree at all If the defendant dies after the hearing of the suit is concluded and judgment reserved the decree is binding on his estate see O 21 r 6 This is on the principle that *actus curie nemini facit injuriam* and judgment is entered up *nunc pro tunc* (u) But if the defendant dies before the hearing is concluded and the decree is passed without bringing his legal representative on the record the decree is a nullity and incapable of execution (v)

(u) *Chel* *Lal Bahadur* (1899) 11 All. 314

(v) *Padma Pr* *I v. Lal S P B* (1891) 13 All. 311 *I A 10* *Ju a Nam v Iam* *Hamira* (1903) 5 F m 317 *Sripad v* *Trilok* (1914) 49 All. 434 I C 1

*I daf Ali v J* *a L I* (189) 17 All. 48 *Ya endra v I pal* (191) 17 Cal. L J 631 O I C 506 *S bra na a v* *I ad* *tha* (191) 34 Ma 1 60 I C 465 *J gis Lal v Laid I am* (1919) 41 Cal. L J 40 O I C 3 (F B)





*Ali v. Cops. Kanth* (c) the High Court of Calcutta held that he is entitled to raise the objection by way of defence. The ground of the decision was that what is prohibited by the section is the determination of questions relating to execution by a separate suit and not their determination in a separate suit. *Ibrahim Husein* and the Calcutta cases which followed it have been overruled by a recent Full Bench ruling of the same High Court in *Lakshmi Chandra v. J. M. L. Mondal* (c). The grounds of the decision are (1) that the words "shall be determined by the Court executing the decree" amount to a direction that the executing Court alone shall determine questions relating to the execution, discharge or satisfaction of the decree, thus giving the Court executing the decree exclusive jurisdiction to determine such questions and (2) that the prohibition conveyed by the words "and not by a separate suit" is a provision in aid of the previous direction. In the Full Bench case the decree was satisfied by an adjustment but the adjustment was not certified to the Court as required by Order 21. The decree holder applied for execution and the judgment debtor's property was put up for sale and purchased by the decree holder himself. The decree holder afterwards sued the judgment debtor for possession. The judgment debtor contended that the decree had been satisfied and that the sale was therefore fraudulent and void. It was held that the judgment debtor was precluded by this section from raising this defence. The Full Bench held that it did not make any difference whether the objection was raised by the judgment debtor by a suit of his own or by way of defence in a suit brought against him. Similarly if I claim a decree against B and B's representative of C and in execution of the decree property alleged to belong to the estate of C is sold and purchased by I and I sue B for possession. This is precluded by this section from contending that the property belonged to him and that it did not form part of the estate of C (c). *Ibrahim Husein* has been followed by the High Court of Madras (c). The Madras decisions require reconsideration in the light of the Full Bench ruling referred to above.

**Questions relating to execution discharge or satisfaction.**—Questions relating to the execution, discharge or satisfaction of the decree arising between the parties to the suit or their representatives are within this section and they must be decided in execution and not by separate suit. The following are examples of such questions—

1. *Is property rightly taken in execution.* If the decree holder takes in execution land not included in the decree or in execution of the decree the judgment debtor must apply under this section for the recovery of such land and a separate suit for that purpose will not lie (f).

2. *Is property taken in execution of decree suit and equally amended.* If a mortgagee brings property to sale in execution of a decree for sale and an error in the mortgage amount is suitably discovered the judgment debtor claiming a refund of the excess (g) or the decree holder claiming to recover the deficit (h) must apply under this section and a separate suit will not lie.

3. *Is property taken in execution of ex parte decree a sale.*—If property is realized in execution of an ex parte decree which is afterwards set aside the judgment debtor

(a) 119 (1903) 1 C 1 755  
(b) 119 (1903) 755 (W N) 95 118 (C) 85 (C) 9  
119 (1903) 755 (W N) 95 118 (C) 85 (C) 9  
(c) 86 (1903) 117 (C) 85 (C) 9 (1903) 56  
(d) 119 (1903) 755 (W N) 95 118 (C) 85 (C) 9  
(e) 119 (1903) 755 (W N) 95 118 (C) 85 (C) 9  
(f) 119 (1903) 755 (W N) 95 118 (C) 85 (C) 9  
(g) 119 (1903) 755 (W N) 95 118 (C) 85 (C) 9  
(h) 119 (1903) 755 (W N) 95 118 (C) 85 (C) 9

(a) 119 (1903) 755 (W N) 95 118 (C) 85 (C) 9  
(b) 119 (1903) 755 (W N) 95 118 (C) 85 (C) 9  
(c) 119 (1903) 755 (W N) 95 118 (C) 85 (C) 9  
(d) 119 (1903) 755 (W N) 95 118 (C) 85 (C) 9  
(e) 119 (1903) 755 (W N) 95 118 (C) 85 (C) 9  
(f) 119 (1903) 755 (W N) 95 118 (C) 85 (C) 9  
(g) 119 (1903) 755 (W N) 95 118 (C) 85 (C) 9  
(h) 119 (1903) 755 (W N) 95 118 (C) 85 (C) 9

must apply for restitution under this section (1) There is however a conflict of decisions as to whether this case falls under section 144 See note under that section Where the decree is varied or reversed

4 *Injunction granted by decree*—A suit to enforce a permanent injunction granted by a decree is barred by this section The remedy is by execution (j)

5 *Objection to attachment or sale by parties or their representatives*—See notes below under the same heading

6 *Adjustment of decree*—The question whether a decree has been paid or adjusted out of Court is one for the Court of execution to decide under this section If the judgment debtor applies to enter up satisfaction of a decree by a writing in the nature of a compromise and the decree holder objects that the writing was obtained by fraud the question is one relating to the discharge of the decree to be decided by the Court of execution under this section (k) If the adjustment has not been certified by the judgment debtor within the time allowed by law and the decree holder proceeds to execute the decree the dispute no doubt is one relating to the satisfaction of the decree but it cannot be dealt with either under this or any other section relating to execution for an uncertified adjustment cannot be recognized by any Court executing the decree (l) See O 21 r 2 (3)

7 *Agreement not to execute decree*—If the judgment debtor objects that the decree holder had prior to the passing of the decree agreed not to execute it or to execute it only in part the question is one which according to all the Courts (m) except Calcutta (n) and Rangoon (o) should be determined under this section by the Court of execution The Calcutta and Rangoon Court consider that the real question in such a case is whether the decree to be executed is the decree as passed by the Court or as agreed upon by the parties and that such an inquiry is outside the scope of this section for the section presupposes the existence of a decree as to which there is no dispute The Lahore High Court has held that an objection that the decree holder had agreed prior to the decree that the judgment debtor would not be personally liable cannot be heard by a Court of execution for that would be to alter the terms of the decree (p)

8 *Substituted share*—Where a decree gives a right to possession of a share in an imahi mahal which has prior to the date of the decree been partitioned under the Estates Partition Act (Beng Act 5 1897) the Court in proceedings for execution of the decree has power under this section to put the decree holder in possession of the specific land substituted for his share on partition (q)

9 *Accretion to mortgaged property*—The question whether certain property is an accretion to the mortgaged property is a question to be determined under this section in execution of a decree for redemption obtained by the mortgagor against the mortgagee (r)

|  |   |   |  |   |   |  |  |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|--|---|---|--|--|---|---|---|
| (a) <i>Am v. I. g.</i> (1903) 411 441<br>0 5 I C 1 <i>Iale t e</i> (19 0) 44 Bom | (b) <i>S. J. P. d. v. Amarn th</i> (1919) 46 Cal<br>107 4 I C 864 | (c) <i>M. J. d. f. a. n. F. I. a. B. g. a.</i> (1919)<br>41 All 441 0 I C 6 | (d) <i>I. r. a. v. M. t. l. f. a. l.</i> (1893) 91 C 1 43<br>1 7 I v. B. p. a. (185) 15 M. l.<br>30 D. r. o. B. f. i. v. Har. (1904) 31<br>(1 4 0 I t. L. p. l. 11 v. M. l. 11<br>(1 1) 3 Lah. 319 67 I C 503 ( )<br>A 1 4 9 | (e) <i>I. l. i. v. A. J. o. n. l.</i> (1899) Bom 467<br>I k a. Ar k a ach ry (1911)<br>W. M. I. T. 464 81 C 10 I Subra<br>M. n. v. A. r. r. l. (1916) 39 M. d.<br>541 33 I C 66 (h d. m. b. r. a. v. Ar. k. a.<br>(191 140 M. l. 33 37 I t. 836 (E. B.)<br>I t. v. Ar. k. a. (19 5) 48 M. d. J. | (f) <i>R. I. C. v. ( ) A. 31 591 ( )</i><br>A. J. h. (a. J. Mar. D. i. a. (1904) 6 All I J<br>403 I C 604 I t. tan. b. a. 31<br>I. d. l. (19 6) 40 M. d. 13 D. J. I ( )<br>4 9 ( ) 6) A. 31 5 | (g) <i>H. n. A. l. v. C. i. r. A. l.</i> (1904) 31 C 1 1 2<br>I. n. o. d. v. B. y. n. d. r. a. (1907) 23 Cal 110<br>(hot. N. a. m. n. M. t. A. m. A. n. a. r. (1907)<br>6 ( ) W. N. 96 | (h) <i>M. U. v. M. g. f. o.</i> (19 ) 4 Ra. 112<br>96 I C 3 ( ) A 1 140 Moolia v<br>(h. r. e. r. e. l. B. a. k. o. f. d. a. (19 ) 6 Kan<br>683 | (i) <i>D. u. v. l. a. v. L. a. l. l. m. D. i. a.</i> (19 ) 9 Lah<br>L. J. 190 I C 1 6 ( ) A. L. 124 | (j) <i>P. a. J. th. v. F. r. a. h. a.</i> (1922) 43 I A 132<br>11 1 3 63 I C 1 1 10 ( ) A. P. 4 | (k) <i>M. o. d. a. t. v. B. S. l. a.</i> (19 5) 1 A 12<br>43 Bom 233 67 I C 365 ( ) A. P. C. 66 |
|--|---|---|--|---|---|--|--|---|---|---|

*Ali v Gopi Kanth* (e1) the High Court of Calcutta held that he is entitled to raise the objection by way of defence. The ground of the decision was that what is prohibited by the section is the determination of questions relating to execution by a separate suit and not their determination in a separate suit. *Bhram Ali's* case and the Calcutta cases which followed it have been overruled by a recent Full Bench ruling of the same High Court in *Lakshan Chandra v Ramdas Mondal* (e2). The grounds of the decision are (1) that the words shall be determined by the Court executing the decree amount to a direction that the executing Court alone shall determine questions relating to the execution discharge or satisfaction of the decree thus giving the Court executing the decree exclusive jurisdiction to determine such questions and (2) that the prohibition conveyed by the words and not by a separate suit is a provision in aid of the previous direction. In the Full Bench case the decree was satisfied by an adjustment but the adjustment was not certified to the Court as required by O 25 r 2. The decree holder applied for execution and the judgment debtor's property was put up for sale and purchased by the decree holder himself. The decree holder afterwards sued the judgment debtor for possession. The judgment debtor contended that the decree had been satisfied and that the sale was therefore fraudulent and void. It was held that the judgment debtor was precluded by this section from raising this defence. The Full Bench held that it did not make any difference whether the objection was raised by the judgment debtor by a suit of his own or by way of defence in a suit brought against him. Similarly if A obtains a decree against B as legal representative of C and in execution of the decree property alleged to belong to the estate of C is sold and purchased by P and P sues B for possession B is precluded by this section from contending that the property belonged to him and that it did not form part of the estate of C (e3). *Bhram Ali's* case has been followed by the High Court of Madras (e4). The Madras decisions require reconsideration in the light of the Full Bench ruling referred to above.

**Questions relating to execution discharge or satisfaction**—Questions relating to the execution discharge or satisfaction of the decree arising between the parties to the suit or their representatives are within this section and they must be decided in execution and not by separate suit. The following are examples of such questions—

1 *Property wrongly taken in execution*—If the decree holder takes in execution land not included in the decree or in excess of the decree the judgment debtor must apply under this section for the recovery of such land and a separate suit for that purpose will not lie (f).

2 *Property taken in execution of decree subsequently amended*—If a mortgagee brings property to sale in execution of a decree for sale and an error in the mortgage amount is subsequently discovered the judgment debtor claiming a refund of the excess (g) or the decree holder claiming to recover the deficit (h) must apply under this section and a separate suit will not lie.

3 *Property taken in execution of ex parte decree set aside*—If property is realized in execution of an ex parte decree which is afterwards set aside the judgment debtor

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| (1) (189) 4 Cal 5                                 | 2 All 61 <i>Abd ul Fatin Idris v. a</i>         |
| ( ) (19 9) 33 C W 9, 118 IC 857 ( 9)              | <i>Ba</i> (1918) 34 All 330 343 34 IC 231       |
| AC 4  | <i>Goptra v. Ma Rao</i> (19 0) 44 Bom           |
| (e3) <i>ee Leni Madhab v. Ras Charan</i> (19 9) 6 | 97 51 C 96 <i>Sharf v. Mir Khan</i> (1919)      |
| Cal 467 117 IC 554 ( 9) AC 247                    | 1 L h I J 30 <i>Rei rath m v. Sheikh</i>        |
| (e4) <i>Te Lalaram achariar v. Meenatchisun</i>   | <i>H nh</i> (19 6) 131 d L J 5 07 IC            |
| <i>da a amai</i> (1909) 19 M L J 1 <i>Thattu</i>  | 1031 ( 6) A N 964 <i>Rath Charan v</i>          |
| <i>Naek v. Kondu Padda</i> (1909) Mad             | <i>Kal h</i> ( 8) A C 6                         |
| 4 <i>Munishi Ch na Dandani v. Munishi</i>         | (g) <i>Il iam v. Mul tan t</i> (190 ) 27 All 48 |
| <i>Pedda Tati h</i> (19 1) 41 Mad L J 61          | <i>Dhan Jannar v. M Itab Si gh</i> (1900)       |
| f) <i>D Jcet v. Reval</i> (1874) W R 435 B u      | 2 All 9   |
| <i>Mah ta v. Shya a Churn</i> (1895) 2 Cal        | (h) <i>Valatan v. Pa Patton</i> (1901) 5 C W N  |
| 483 <i>Patab Si gh v. Beni P m</i> (1880)         | 6 7   |



10 *Waste committed by judgment debtor after decree for possession*—The question whether the judgment debtor has committed waste e.g. cut down trees after a decree against him for possession is one to be dealt with under this section and not by a separate suit (s)

11 *Decree for possession*—Where a decree is passed for possession in a suit for pre-emption conditional on the plaintiff paying a specified sum of money within a time fixed by the Court and the money is paid but possession is not delivered to the plaintiff his only remedy is by an application under this section. A suit for possession is barred under this section (t)

Questions not relating to execution discharge or satisfaction—If the question that arises between the parties or their representatives does not relate to the execution discharge or satisfaction of the decree the section does not apply and a separate suit will lie. The following are leading cases on the subject—

(1) *Questions as to the validity of the decree*—The Court executing the decree has no power to go behind the decree and question its validity. See note—*Powers of Court executing the decree*—under sec 38 *supra*. Such a question can only be tried by regular suit (u) and the same applies to an objection that the decree was obtained by fraud (v). A reversioner against whom a decree is being executed as legal representative of the deceased judgment debtor cannot object in execution that the debt for which the decree was passed was not due but may file a separate suit for a declaration to that effect (w)

(2) *Mal administration of judgment debtor's estate*—A decree holder failing to realize his decree by execution against the judgment debtor's executor may file a suit against the executor for the administration of the estate and for an account on the footing of mal administration. This is his only remedy for the conduct of the executor is not a matter for the Court of execution (x)

(3) *Second suit for redemption*—When a mortgagor is in effect bringing a suit to execute a previous mortgage decree for redemption the suit is barred under this section (y). But if the right to redeem was reserved to him by the decree in the previous suit a fresh suit for redemption will lie (z). The better opinion is that if the former mortgage decree does not extinguish the right of redemption a fresh suit for redemption will not be barred. See note *Finality of decree in redemption suits* at page 73. Such a suit is not an execution of the former decree but a fresh exercise of the same right.

*Parties to the suit*—If the question is one relating to the execution discharge or satisfaction of the decree but does not arise between the parties to the suit the section does not apply and a suit is not barred. Parties mean parties who are opposed to each other in the suit though not necessarily as plaintiff and defendant (a) for in a partition suit co-defendants may be opposed to each other. Questions arising between parties who are not opposed to each other or between a party and a stranger do not fall under section 47. The following are illustrations—

(1) *Questions between decree holders inter se*—Disputes between rival decree holders seeking to attach the same property (b) or claiming against each other in the distribu-

(s) *Hari v Salharam* (1933) 3 Bom I R 449  
31 C 443 (3) A B 391

(t) *Ramchand v J. & Parn* (1911) 43 All 10  
S. 41 v. B. 111 (1911) 1 Pat 1 (1911)  
A P 40. *Abd. Karim v. Islam un Nissa*  
(1916) 38 All 339 34 I C 31

(v) *Chitman v. Chitman* (1898) Bom  
4. *Gom. Khan v. K. M. Dur* (1904)  
7 M d 313. *Rang. my v. Th. p. ti*  
(1901) 9 M d 6. *K. Maretha v. Saba*  
*pathi* (1907) 30 Mad 6. *I. et. apul v.*  
*Sh. jima* (1904) 3 C 1 6. *L. dhar v.*  
*C. t. rbi* (1899) 1 All 77. *H. ra Lal*  
*v. I. ar eshar* (1893) 21 All 36

(w) *S. d. dru v. Budan* (1886) 9 Mad 80

*Dh. P. n v. L. chaves* (1896) 3 Cal 639

(u) *T. Haprag da Boorig pull* (1907) 30  
Ma 1 40. *A. S. g. v. W. S. uer* (1913)  
P R 14 15 I C 2

(x) *Sarumani v. Bata* (1908) 35 Cal 1100

(y) *Hari v. S. P. rj* (1886) 10 Bom 461

(z) *Tani v. Har* (183) 16 B m 6 J (T B)  
*Abd. L. v. I. aman* (1911) 45 Bom 1335  
63 I C 90

(a) *Mangaja v. Sr ramulu* (1913) 94 Mad  
L J 477

(b) *Ram. Cl. nter v. Ham ran* (1906) 11 C W V  
433. *Rama. affan v. Ka. i. ppa. ja* (19 6)  
51 M d L J 438 97 I C 10 6 (20) A M.  
1104.

tion of assets (c) or between joint decree holders inter se (d) are not within the section

(2) *Questions between judgment debtors inter se*—The Allahabad High Court has held that questions between judgment debtors inter se are not within the section (e) But the Madras High Court has recently held that they are (f) and this has been followed by Rangoon (g)

(3) *Questions between a party and his own representative* are not within the section (h)

A surety is under sec 140 not a party except for purposes of appeal (i) When a party is suing or being sued in a representative capacity [sec 11 Explanation VI and O 1 r 8] all persons whom such party represents are parties. Thus if a decree is passed against a karnavan of a tarwad in his representative capacity all members of the tarwad are parties to the suit (j) in their capacity of members of the tarwad (k) A minor (l) or a lunatic (m) not represented by a proper guardian ad litem is deemed not to be a party to the suit. An objection however on this ground cannot be taken in execution proceedings against the minor or lunatic for an executing Court cannot go behind the decree but the judgment may be attacked in revision or by appeal or by a regular suit (n). A judgment debtor who objected to a sale of property on the ground that he had acquired a free title to it subsequent to the decree was held not to be a party to the suit in respect of that objection (o). A benamidar is neither a party nor a representative of a party within this section (o)

**Explanation to the section and parties to suit**—Under section 244 of the Code of 1882 the High Courts of Allahabad (p) and Calcutta (q) held that a plaintiff whose suit had been dismissed and a defendant against whom a suit had been dismissed ceased to be parties to the suit. On the other hand it was held by the High Court of Madras (r) and Bombay (s) that such persons continued to be parties to the suit. The Explanation gives effect to the latter view. Objections therefore to attachment or sale by such persons come within this section and not O 21 r 38 (t). In *Krishnappa v Periyasamy* (u) the Madras High Court held that a defendant against whom the suit was dismissed on account of misjoinder is not a party. In a later case (v) however the same High Court held that a defendant against whom the plaintiff abandoned his case was still a party but that if his name had been struck off the record under O 1 r 10 (2) he would not have been a party. This was approved of in *Sathu Kanar v Ramaswami* (w) which

- (c) *Sa j r v Panna* (199) 8 M 1 494  
(d) *Mu h Pasi v J p v* (13) 6 1 at 386 103 I C 4 ( ) A I 99 B 18e  
*Abi l s tar v Chs Doe Rhs* (19 6) 4 Rang 418 99 I 4 418 ( ) A P 45  
(e) *Rayor v Mus oorie B nl* (188) 7 All 681  
*Abd l 422 v Abdul Rih m* (19 9) All L J 757 ( ) A C 91 per S n J  
(f) *J a v M* etc (19 14) Mad L J 4 8 7 I C 145 ( ) A M 363  
(g) *Abd l Sattar v Chs Doe Jh* (19 ) 4 Rang 418 99 I C 418 ( ) A R 4  
(h) *M p ni L v J h* (1901) Bor 1 631  
*J iio v M s oo H l* (189 ) All 681 646  
*Bhag t v B sr* (1899) 31 All 8 1 I C 416 (k B)  
(i) *J shabar v J v Ind a Bahadur Singh* (1919) 46 I A 28 738 4 All 1 9 166 P a H w v L Ha s n 78 (19 6) 6 All L J 1160 ( ) A A 5  
(j) *M irat v J thir* (190 ) 30 M 1 1 A at K u v Jb ys (1901) 4 Mad 604  
(k) *Va ay n v Tl a fm n* (19 ) 1 Mad 46 106 I C 70 ( ) A M 1043  
(l) *Pash m v a v ad* (1907) 31 All 26 I A 164 3 I C 864

- (m) *Kil pati v P ri* (191 ) 44 C I 6 7 3  
1 C 4 8  
(n) *Sia v L d v A ar Pr il* (191 ) 1 at L J 19 31 I C 6 5  
(o) *Je l mma v r thasauri* (19 6) 1 Mad L J 331 94 I C 14 ( ) A M 1091  
(p) *J ila v J t* (1901) 1 All 346 500  
*J rj v A v n jh* (1910) 3 AU 1 51 I C 426  
(q) *J l j v Lall M r A* (190 ) 3 Cal 604  
*J a J d v J j th* (1903) 40 I 131  
(r) *J a v A h r a* (1900) 1 M d 361 (t B)  
(s) *Cour v J s v wa* (193) 1 I m 42  
(t) *J m v K l Frusid* (19 1) 34 Cal L J 4 7 54 K h A too I hola atk (19 5) 6 Pat L J 5 Musammal Madho v Hazara M l (19 9) 8 Pat 1  
(u) (191 ) 40 M 1 964 34 I C 7 I Dowd 10 I A 10 v M H n (190 ) 427  
110 104 I C 94 ( ) A R 13  
(v) *S mma v J Adhokay* (191 ) 41 Mad 414 43 I C 93  
(w) (19 6) 49 M d 494 94 I C 6 ( ) A M 4 4

ruled that the ground of exoneration is immaterial and the real test is whether or not the defendant's name remains on the record. If the defendant's name is struck off the record he is not a party (x). An order that the other defendants be exempted is equivalent to an order of dismissal of the suit as against them (y).

Representatives.—The term representative in this section includes not only legal representative in the sense of heirs executors or administrators but also representative in interest that is any transferee of the decree holder's interest or any transferee of the judgment debtor's interest who so far as such interest is concerned is bound by the decree ( ) It was at one time supposed that a transferee by judicial sale could not be a representative (a) but this view is no longer tenable It was also said that a representative is a person who succeeds to the rights of any of the parties after suit (b) but this is incorrect for a transferee may be bound by the decree on the doctrine of lis pendens (c) The Bombay High Court has recently held that a purchaser lite pendente is not the representative of his vendor (d) but this it is submitted is incorrect A Calcutta case said that to determine whether a particular person is a representative of a party the two tests to be applied are first whether any portion of the interest of the decree holder or of the judgment debtor which was originally vested in one of the parties has by the act of parties or by operation of law vested in the person who is sought to be treated as representative and secondly if there has been a devolution of interest whether so far as such interest is concerned that person is bound by the decree (e) A devisee (f) a legatee (g) and a person taking joint property by survivorship (h) have been held to be representatives The following are illustrations of persons held to be representatives under this section

(1) A transferee of a decree or of the interest of any decree holder in a joint decree within the meaning of O 21 r 16 is a representative of the decree holder (1) A transferee from such transferee is also a representative of the decree holder (2)

A judgment creditor who attaches a decree held by the judgment debtor against another is a representative of the judgment debtor. A holds a decree against B. C obtains a decree against A and in execution attaches the decree held by A against B. C is a representative of A in proceedings in execution of A's decree against B. (L) See O 21 r 53 (J).

(2) A obtains a decree against B for Rs 5000. B then sells certain property belonging to him to C. C is not a representative of B for the decree is a simple money decree and does not relate to the specific property sold to C (1)

- (x) *Nallaperi al v S k i l* (19 8) 54 M d  
L J 1 108 I C 408 ( 9 ) A M 76  
But see *L i g a v L i k a n a n* (19 6)  
50 M d L J 337 94 I C 1 3 ( 6 )  
A M 68 a c a w l e e the phr e was  
wrongly u d
- (y) *Sa Pula a d v Radhapat* (19 8) 6 All LJ  
524 ( 8 ) A A 34
- ( ) *Ish n C i n d e r v B e s M a i h b* (189 )  
- 4 Cal 6 G l o r L i M a d h o R n  
(1904) 6 All 447 *T a a P r a a n a v*  
*N u l m o n i* (1914) 41 Cal 418 I C 118
- (a) See *G i f v d r v H e m C h u n d e* (1889)  
16 Cal 33 and *S a b h j u v S r i G p a t*  
(189 ) 17 All
- (b) *P a i r P r a s a d v H e m B a i n r* (1886)  
1 Cal 4 8
- (c) *S i e V a r a n v C h e d i l* (1900) 2 All  
- 43 *C o p i t h v S a j a i* (190 ) 10 C W \  
40 G *P r a a d v R m a i a l* (1899) 1  
All 0
- (d) *B a s a p p a v B i n g a n d w a* (19 8) 5 Bom  
203 108 I C 1 ( 3 ) A B C
- (e) *A y o l l j a R o j v H a r d w r P o y* (1907) 9 Cal  
L J 48
- (f) *B h a n v M a l v N a r a s h l e r* (1897)  
3 Bom 436
- (g) *C i t t a r P r a v T e o L S a n* (19 ) 5 Ran  
333 104 I C 1 1 ( ) A R 3
- (h) *P e s L i C h a n t C h r a* (1906) 11 C W \  
163
- (i) *D u a r B l e h v F e l l i* (1899) - 6 Cal 2 0  
*B i d r a V a n v J i l u t e n* (1894) 16  
All 483 *S h e P r a a d v L a l i* (19 ) 4 Pat  
1 0 86 I C 564 ( ) A 1 440
- (j) *G y a D a s v I n a k u b A h* (1900) 7 C 1 6 0
- (k) *S a i M a n M a i l v A j a s b a p a t h i* (1893)  
16 M d 0 *F r k a m i e k t p a t h i*  
(1906) 3 Mad 318 *I e a r y M o b n v*  
*R o n e s t* (1884) 1 Cal 3 1
- (l) *M a H o D a v R a m* (1894) 16 All 286  
*S h r a n v J r a m* (1889) 13 Bom 34  
*R a s h k g y v S n o m y* (1881) 7 C 1  
403 *M t B p h i t H a r b l a h S g l*  
(191 ) 1 R n 64 p 4 14 I C 40  
[gift by judgment-d btor of his entire  
property]

(3) A purchaser *le see* or mortgagee from a judgment debtor of property belonging to the judgment debtor *and attached* in execution of a decree against him is the representative of the judgment debtor within the meaning of this section for the property being *under attachment* at the date of the purchase lease or mortgage the purchaser lessee or mortgagee is bound by the decree so far as the interest transferred to him is concerned (m). See section 64.

(4) *Purchaser of judgment debtor's equity of redemption under a private sale*—*A* obtains a decree against *B* for sale of certain property mortgaged to him by *B*. After the date of the decree *B* sells his equity of redemption in the mortgaged property to *C*. *C* is a representative of *B* the judgment debtor for the property having been purchased after it was affected by *A*'s mortgage decree. *C* is to that extent bound by *A*'s decree. Hence any question relating to the execution of *A*'s decree and arising between *A* and *C* must be determined by the Court executing *A*'s decree and not by a separate suit (n). The same procedure would apply even if *B* had transferred his interest in the property to *C* during the pendency of the suit and before the passing of the decree (o).

(5) *Purchaser of judgment debtor's equity of redemption at a judicial sale* — A obtains a decree against B for the sale of certain property mortgaged to him by B. Before the property could be sold in execution of A's decree, X who holds a money decree against B brings B's equity of redemption in the mortgaged property to sale in execution of his decree and it is purchased by C. C is a representative of B, the judgment debtor for the property having been purchased after it was affected by A's mortgage decree. C is to that extent bound by A's decree. Hence any question relating to the execution of A's decree and arising between A and C must be determined by the Court executing A's decree and not by a separate suit (p).

(6) A purchaser of property from a party to a suit in which an injunction has been granted affecting such property is not a representative within the meaning of this section—A obtains a decree against B restraining B by an injunction from obstructing him in the exercise of his right of way to his land over B's land. A then sells his land to C. If B obstructs C in the enjoyment of the right of way C's proper remedy is by way of suit against B and not in execution under this section. The reason is that an injunction does not run with the land and C cannot therefore claim the benefit of the decree against B (g). Note that C is not a transferee of the decree but of the property only. See notes to s. 50. Decree for injunction.

(7) The Official assignee claiming property on behalf of the creditors of an insolvent judgment debtor is not a representative of the judgment debtor within the meaning of this section (r)

(8) The High Court of Allahabad has held that a purchaser from a judgment debtor under O 21 r 83 is a representative of the judgment debtor within the meaning of this section (i) A obtains a decree against B. In execution of the decree certain property belonging to B is attached and an order is made for the sale thereof. B then obtains a certificate from the Court under O 21 r 83 to sell the property by private sale and the property is sold to C in pursuance of the certificate. C is a representative of B within the meaning of this section.

[illegible][illegible]



(9) A purchaser from the judgment debtor of an *occupancy holding not transferable by custom* is a representative of the judgment debtor. If the holding is sold in execution of the decree against the judgment debtor and he is dispossessed by the auction purchaser he may apply for possession under this section and not under O 21 r 100 (t)

(10) A purchaser from a judgment debtor of a portion of a holding is so far as his interest is concerned bound by the decree for rent obtained against the judgment debtor under s 1484 of the Bengal Tenancy Act 8 of 1880 and by the sale in execution of that decree. He is therefore a representative of the judgment debtor and if he is dispossessed by the auction purchaser he may apply for possession under this section but not under O 21 r 100 (u)

(11) A surety for the performance of a decree is not a representative of a party within the meaning of this section (t). See s 145 below

**Objections to attachment or sale by parties or their representatives —**  
Objections to attachment made by a judgment debtor or his representative must be distinguished from those made by either of them on behalf of a third person. In the former case the objection comes under this section and a separate suit is barred. The order however operates as a decree and a second appeal lies from it. In the latter case the objection is in effect one by a third person and it falls under O 21 r 58. The objector may proceed either by an application under r 58 or by a regular suit. If he proceeds by an application under r 58 there is no appeal from the order but he may file a suit as provided by O 21 r 63. Such a suit must be filed within one year from the date of the order.

If the judgment debtor objects that the property is not liable to attachment or sale (u) or that the decree holder in connivance with a Court peon has misappropriated part of the property attached (x) the objection is by the judgment debtor on his own behalf and it must be decided by the executing Court under this section. Similarly if property is attached a property of a deceased judgment debtor in the hands of his legal representative and the latter objects that it is not property of the deceased but his own property the case falls under this section for the legal representative is not setting up a *ius tertii* (y). But if the objection is made by the judgment debtor or his representative not on his own behalf but on account of a third party as trustee (z) or as sebast of an idol (a) or on the ground that the property is waqf (b) the objection is under O 21 r 58 and not under this section.

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>(t) <i>P. hratt v. R. S. Ray</i> (1918) 3 Pat L J 9 43 I C 969</p> <p>(u) <i>Eliah v. B. B. B. (191) 2 Pat L J 4 8 4 I C 6</i> <i>Suendra v. n. v. (190) 13 Cal 1031</i> <i>Krishna Chandra v. Dina Nath</i> (19 8) 54 Cal 1064 10 I C 3 7 (28) A L 94</p> <p>(v) <i>R. Ghubar v. ng. Jai Indr. Bah dur</i> 51 gh (1919) 46 I A 8 36 4 All 158 160 5 I C 0</p> <p>(w) <i>T. v. L. v. Go. nda</i> (1895) 19 Bom 3 9 <i>Majed v. Raghibar</i> (1900) Cal 187 <i>Gahar v. Ja</i> (1900) Cal 41 <i>Godhia v. Ma' deo</i> (19 ) 10 I C 1 9 (27) A A 574</p> <p>(x) <i>Gaj dhar v. Ead. Arj</i> (1916) 1 Pat L J 5 8 36 I C 30</p> <p>(y) <i>Sethchand v. Durpa</i> (1890) 1 All 313 <i>Ja chann v. Labia Biba</i> (1890) 17 Cal 711 <i>Jal Ch an v. Jewat</i> (1906) 3 All 51 <i>Je gappa, Jan v. Parim pa alai</i> (1903) 6 Ma 501 <i>M. Ihsudan v. God d</i> (1900) 27 Cal 34 <i>Mung ja v. Hay t Sahab</i> (1899) 3 Bom 3 Cal 1 8 ng v. A sen ng (1910) 34 Bom 46 71 I C 457 <i>Umehananja v. Mohendra</i></p> | <p>(1911) 14 C L J 337 11 I C 80 <i>Ajo Koe v. Gor i Nath</i> (1914) 19 C W N 1 27 I C 321 <i>D. lla v. Shub Lal</i> (191 ) 30 All 47 36 I C 31 <i>Bhag n t Ram v. Nizam D n</i> (19 1) 3 Lab L J 406 63 I C 8 3 <i>Ar nach lla m v. M v g San Ngue</i> (19 4) 2 Rang 184 83 I C 550 ( 4) A R 3 3 <i>Ishar Das v. Parma vand</i> (19 ) 6 Lah 544 93 I C 30 (26) A L 134 <i>Ma Shus v. Va ng Bu</i> (19 7) 6 Ran 6 9 107 I C 856 ( 8) A R 29 <i>Navda v. Rajendra</i> (19 8) 48 C L J 551 <i>Maria v. Pana</i> (19 8) 30 Bom L R 1447 (28) A B 534</p> <p>(z) <i>M. rigya v. H. jat Saleb</i> (1899) 3 Bom 37 <i>B. drudin v. Abdul Rahim</i> (1908) 31 M d 1 5 I t mal v. Joga har (1906) 28 All 644 <i>Roop Lal v. Bekam</i> (1890) 16 C L 43</p> <p>(a) <i>Kartik Chandra v. Ishuto h</i> (1912) 39 Cal 98 1 I C 163 <i>Upendra Nath v. Kistum</i> (1915) 4 C 1 440 27 I C 3 9 <i>Contra Shah v. m v. G. dhar</i> (19 ) 2 Luck 145 100 I C 464 (27) A O 1 0</p> <p>(b) <i>Shah Naz v. Muhammad</i> (19 ) 1 Pat 637 67 I C 438 (22) A P 106</p> |
|---|--|

**Objections to attachment or sale by third parties**—If the objection to attachment is made by a *third party* he may proceed either under O 21 r 58 or by a regular suit (c) and the claim cannot be dealt with under this section (d) See notes above

**Objection to attachment or sale by parties or their representatives**

**Execution purchaser**—We now proceed to consider cases where property of the judgment debtor has been sold in execution of the decree and questions in which the auction purchaser is concerned arise *subsequent* to the sale. These questions fall into two classes according to the parties between whom they arise —

A—Questions between the decree holder on the one hand and the judgment debtor on the other hand the auction purchaser being only interested in the result

B—Questions between the auction purchaser on the one hand and a party to the suit or his representative on the other hand

A Questions between the decree holder on the one hand and the judgment debtor on the other the execution purchaser being only interested in the result —

These questions being essentially questions between parties to the suit fall within this section (e). It is well settled that as between the judgment debtor and a decree holder an objection to the sale in execution can only be taken in execution and sec 244 (now sec 47) prohibits a suit by a party or his representative against an auction purchaser to raise a question which as between the judgment debtor and the decree holder must have been determined under that section (f). The fact that the auction purchaser who was not a party to the suit is interested in the result does not prevent the question being a question between the parties. These questions therefore must be determined by the Court executing the decree and not by a separate suit. The leading case on the subject is *Prosunno Kumar v Kali Das* (g) where their Lordships of the Privy Council said. It is of the utmost importance that all objections to execution sales should be disposed of as cheaply and as speedily as possible. Their Lordships are glad to find that the Courts in India have not placed any narrow construction on the language of section 244 [now s 47] and that when a question has arisen as to the execution discharge or satisfaction of a decree between the parties to the suit in which the decree was passed the fact that the purchaser who is no party to the suit is interested in the result has never been held a bar to the application of the section. In *Prosunno Kumar's* case a suit was brought by the judgment debtor against his co sharers and against the judgment creditor and the auction purchaser to set aside a sale in execution on the ground of fraud. The fraud alleged was that the judgment creditor had obtained a decree against the judgment debtor and co sharers and in execution of the decree attached the whole of the zamindari which belonged to the judgment debtor and his co sharers that thereafter the judgment debtor paid his quota of the judgment debt and it was arranged with the judgment creditor that the judgment debtor's share should be exempted from sale that pursuant to the arrangement the judgment creditor sold the shares of the co sharers and obtained satisfaction of his decree but that afterwards the judgment creditor in collusion with the co sharers the decree holder and the auction purchaser got the sale set aside and caused the whole zamindari including the

(c) *Ka h ja Lal v National Bank of India* (1913) 40 Cal 94 40 I A 56 18 I C 943  
*See also* *Shri G. A. G. A.* (1906) 18 All 410  
*Ighum th v Sarosh* (1892) 3 Bom 68

(d) *Pam n than v Lee* (1900) 23 M 1 10  
*J. Lal v Ali b bid Pa k* (19 6) 4  
*All LJ 334 9 IC 14 (-6) A 4 44*

(e) *Ba t l v F r i* (1906) 8 All 146 (F B)  
*Di ni l i v Ch t r k j* (1893) All 104

(f) *Natarm v Terrahal* (1911) 34 M 1  
 41 418 81 C 4 J G 1 I J v K u n  
 5 gh (1910) 31 Bom 546 I C 45  
*M haw v gh v F haw* (19 6)  
 3 C 183 92 I 140 ( ) A C 106

(g) (189) 19 C 1 683 19 I 4 166 *Sadho v*  
*Abde and* (1904) 26 All 101 *Gaya*  
*Pro ad v F midh v gh* (1906) 28 All  
 681 *Di th ra Das v Lakshma* (1907)  
 28 All 36 *Harika Kant v Kuma*  
*la t* (1909) 33 Bom 602 4 I C 23

judgment debtor's share to be attached and sold. The Privy Council held that the plaintiff's remedy was by an application under this section and the question being one relating to the execution discharge or satisfaction of the decree a separate suit to set aside the sale was barred under this section.

### Illustration

A judgment debtor may seek to set aside an execution sale—

- [1] on deposit under O 21 r 89
- [2] for material irregularity under O 21 r 90
- [3] for fraud under O 21 r 90
- [4] for other reasons

[1] As to case (1) see note under O 21 r 89 below Appeal

[(2) (3)] As to cases (2) and (3) see notes under O 21 r 90 below Suit to set aside sale on ground of material irregularity Fraud in publishing or conducting sale Application to set aside sale on other grounds and Appeal

[4] A judgment debtor may seek to set aside a sale on grounds other than those mentioned above. A judgment debtor seeking to set aside a sale on any of the following grounds must proceed by an application under this section and not by a separate suit—that the sale is illegal or a nullity for want of notice under O 21 r 22 (h) that the judgment debtor has been adjudged insolvent and the decree gives no charge upon the land (i) that the property is not liable to attachment and sale (j) that the sale is in contravention of O 34 r 14 (k) that the sale was not warranted by the terms of the decree (l) that the property sold did not belong to the judgment debtor (m) that the decree holder had purchased without leave of the Court (n) that the decree had been adjusted (o) that the sale is invalid having been held after a stay order (p) that the decree holder's own property was sold by mistake instead of that of the judgment debtor (q).

*B Questions between the auction purchaser on the one hand and a party to the suit or his representative on the other hand —*

One class of cases arising under this head is where the decree holder himself is the purchaser and the judgment debtor claims to set aside the sale in execution. In such a case the judgment debtor must proceed by an application under this section and not by a separate suit (r).

Another class of cases arising between the auction purchaser on the one hand and the judgment debtor on the other is where the auction purchaser seeks to recover possession of the property purchased by him. The question that arises in such cases is whether the Court purchaser must proceed by an application under this section coupled with

- (A) *Imam t n nissa v Isal t H a* (1881) 3 All 44 *Sahd o v Ghazir m* (1831) 1 C 1 19 *R ja Gopala v Ramam tyi chariar* (19 4) 47 Mad 259 80 I C 9 ( 4 ) A M 431
- (v) *t atharan a v t ettath* (1916) 30 Mad L J 611 34 I C 8 J
- (j) *Pam Gop l v khial Ra i* (1894) 6 All 448 *Bast P m v Fatti* (1886) 8 All 146 *Durga Cl an v Kals Proso a* (1839) 6 Cal 1
- (k) *4th t al v Beh ri Lal* (1908) 3 Cal 61 *Ish a v Ith ran* (1907) 30 M d 313 *Lt wchand v R khoda* (19 1) 4 B m 174 8 I C 31
- (l) *Ganga De i v Gan Irasad* (19 ) 93 All L J 8 83 I C 303 ( ) A A 51

- (m) *Gol In g v K ar i g* (1910) 34 Bom 546 7 I C 4
- (n) *Gena v Salaram* (1892) Bom 21 *Durga v Balu t* (1901) 3 All 4 8 *I a aghaas v Fe k ta* (1803) 16 Mad 237 *Ba k of Upper Ind a v Fuzh lme* (19 8) 103 I C 606 ( 28 ) A L 666
- (o) *Dha i R m v Chitu bh j* (1900) All 86
- (p) *S p w Bank v B dh Si gh* (19 4) All L J 413 83 I C 10 8 ( 4 ) A 698
- (q) *Hafez Uzu v Vani nanne sa* ( 8 ) A C 86
- (r) *G pathy v Arish mach y* (1918) 45 I A 4 60 41 M d 403 44 I C 8 5 *Ramabhad a v Aad riy sami* (19 1) 48 I A 15 41 Mad 483 63 I C 08 ( 2 ) A PC

O 21 r 93 or whether he is entitled to bring a separate *suit* for possession? This depends on who is the purchaser for the property may be purchased by the decree holder himself with the leave of the Court under O 21 r 72 or it may be purchased by a stranger

*First where the decree holder himself is the purchaser*—Whether the decree holder purchaser must proceed by an application depends upon—(1) whether for the purpose of recovering possession of the property he is to be regarded as a party to the suit within the meaning of s 47 or whether he has ceased to be a party to the suit by reason of his purchase and (2) whether the question as to delivery of possession is a question relating to the execution discharge or satisfaction of the decree within the meaning of s 47 Upon these points there is a conflict of decisions

According to the view taken by the High Court of Madras (s) and by a Full Bench of the High Court of Calcutta (t) the decree holder *retains* his character of a party to the suit though he is also the purchaser and the question as to delivery of possession is a question relating to the execution discharge or satisfaction of the decree within the meaning of s 47 The two conditions laid down by the section are therefore satisfied and a separate suit for possession is barred under s 47 The High Court of Madras has also applied sec 47 to an application by a purchaser from a decree holder purchaser resisted by the judgment debtor in obtaining possession the reason given being in one case (u) that a purchaser from a decree holder who has purchased at a Court sale is a representative of the decree holder and in another (t) that he is a representative of the judgment debtor within the meaning of this section In two of the cases cited above however the Madras Court observed that if this question had not already been settled by previous decisions of that Court they would be disposed to hold that proceedings for obtaining possession could not be regarded as those relating to the execution discharge or satisfaction of the decree within the meaning of this section (u) In a recent Full Bench case it seems to have been assumed that such proceedings related to the execution of the decree (z)

According to the other view which is the view taken by a Full Bench of each of the High Courts of Allahabad (y) Patna ( ) and Bombay (a) and in recent cases by the High Court of Lahore (b) a decree holder purchaser stands on the same footing as a purchaser who is a stranger so that he may proceed either by an application under O 21 r 93 or by a separate suit for possession This view proceeds on the ground that sec 47 does not apply either because the question as to delivery of possession is not one relating to the execution discharge or satisfaction of the decree or because a decree holder after he becomes purchaser of the property can no longer be said to be a party to the suit In a recent case a Divisional Bench of the Patna High Court took quite the opposite view on both points (c) without reference to the Full Bench

- (s) *Ko malla v Lih sa sa* (190 ) 2 Mad 9  
*Intajat v Hla n* (1903) 6 Mad 740  
*Sa Hla H an* (1905) 4 Mad 87  
*J d a t v May Natia* (19 0)  
 43 N 1 10 116 4 I C 09 B B 1  
 (t) *Ta laah v Copal* (19 6) 53 Cal 81 95 I C  
 494 ( ) A C 94 appo 1 g *Al dhu*  
*dau v Gob la* (1900) Cal 34 *Naria*  
*tada v Raja m r* (1900) Cal 02  
*I n v i nda Peralt* (1904) 31  
 Cal 3 *Ha t a M ha*  
 (1914) 18 Cal N N 0 I C 8 4  
 (u) *Sa dh v H a* (190 ) 4 M d 8  
 (v) *J t t M th v Ma Natia* (19 0) 43  
 M 1 10 1 4 I C 09  
 (w) 6 M 1 740 and 8 M d 8 *pra*  
 ( ) (19 0) 43 (a) 10 4 I C 99 *pra*  
 (y) *Bh gurt v i wa i Jal* (1909) 31 All 8  
 114 416 1 B (t m C J and An s  
 J dha n (t) B dha M s *Rha jraha*

- (1918) 40 All 118 4 I C 936 *Wala v*  
*Ha der* (19 8) 0 All 80 ( ) A 4 35  
 (z) *Har ted l t v Pa i m* (1916) 1  
 Cal 1 J 23 3 I C 463 *D v der Du*  
*v B B A* (1914) 31 t L J 1 4 11  
 1 9 *Naria v Jap hwa* (1919) 4 Cal  
 L J 16 5 I C 11  
 (a) *Ha por d v B h la* (19 4) 33 B m 4 0  
 83 I C 93 ( ) 4 B 499 0 m 112  
*Nad t v Varav* (1911) 3 B m 45  
 11 I C 949 *Lak hman v Goral* (191)  
 6 B m L H 843 (4) 4 B 86 I C  
 503  
 (b) *Clotha P v Karmon B* (1916) 11 I n  
 8 p 31 44 I C 163 *v eral t v Sak n*  
*B gam* (1919) 11 no 11 p 31 3 I C  
 460 *See also J a Lal v Durga* (19 0)  
 1 Lah 131 58 I C 4  
 ( ) *Lak ra v Pagi sh* (19 ) 4 Pat 44, 84  
 I C 104 (2) 4 I 4 4

decision of the same Court in *Naji Abdul v. Raja Ram* (d). The Oudh Court has held (e) that though the decree holder purchaser is a party to the suit yet the question is not one under section 47 because the act of placing the purchaser in possession does not involve the decision of a question relating to the execution discharge or satisfaction of the decree. The cases in which it has been held that an auction purchaser even if he is the decree holder is not a party to the suit require reconsideration in view of the ruling of the Judicial Committee that such an auction purchaser is a party to the suit (f).

These two divergent views lead to different results —

- (1) According to the first view that is the view taken by the High Courts of Madras and Calcutta a decree holder purchaser who seeks to recover possession from the judgment debtor of the property purchased by him at the auction sale can proceed only by an application under O 21 r 95 which raises a question under sec 47 such application must be made within 3 years from the date on which the sale becomes absolute [Limitation Act Sch I art 181] According to the latter view that is the view taken by the High Courts of Allahabad Patna Bombay and Lahore and the Chief Court of Oudh he may proceed by an application under O 21 r 95 Such an application according to that view does not raise a question under sec 47 therefore if he does not proceed by an application or if he makes the application but it is unsuccessful he may fall back upon his title and sue for possession Such suit may be brought within 12 years from the date when the sale becomes absolute [Limitation Act 1908 Sch I art 138] so that even if the time for an application under O 21 r 95 has expired he may proceed by way of suit
- (2) According to the other view the application for delivery of possession falls under s 47 and the order made on the application amounts to a decree [s 2 (2)] and is appealable as such According to the latter view s 47 does not apply to the case and the application is entirely one under O 21 r 95 and no appeal lies from an order made upon such application

If the decree holder purchaser is obstructed in obtaining possession by the judgment debtor and a stranger to the suit the case does not come within s 47 and he may bring a suit for possession against them (g)

When a decree holder at a Court sale obtained possession of land in excess of what was included in the mortgage and the decree the Allahabad High Court held the judgment debtor's suit to recover the excess was not barred as the auction purchaser was not the representative of the decree holder (although he was the same person) (h)

*Secondly where the purchaser is a stranger*—Where a stranger auction purchaser seeks to recover possession from the judgment debtor two questions arise (1) whether the purchaser is a representative of either party to the suit and 2) whether the question of possession is one relating to the execution discharge or satisfaction of the decree. The second question has already been discussed with reference to the decree holder purchaser and the conflict of decisions on the subject has been noted. With reference to the first question the case does not fall under the section if the stranger auction purchaser is a representative of the judgment debtor for then the question would be between a party and his own representative. But it would fall under the section if he were a representative of the decree holder. Again the case would not come under the section if he

(d) (1016) 1 Pat L J 3 35 I C 488  
( ) G pa B k h v R ar lly dra (10 8) 3 Luck  
18 110 I C 83 ( 8) A O 199 (E B)  
(f) See Ga ap lly v Kri hnamacha sar (1918)  
45 I A 54 60 41 Mad 403 411 44

I C 85  
(g) *Col' v Sakharan* (10 0) 44 Bom 977 59  
I C 386  
(h) *B Jal' Das v Keesr* (19 8) 50 All 686 (28)  
A A 363

was a representative of neither. The decisions on all these points are very conflicting. The High Court of Bombay has consistently held that an auction purchaser who is a stranger is not the representative of either party to the suit (i). The High Courts of Calcutta (j) and Allahabad (k) have held that he is not the representative of the decree holder but that he is the representative of the judgment debtor. In Madras there is a hopeless conflict of opinion. The conflict was sought to be set at rest by a reference to a Full Bench in *Leindramuthu v. Vaya Nadan* (l) but it cannot be said that the object was attained. Oldfield J and Sheshagiri Ayyar J held that a stranger purchaser at a sale in execution of a money decree was a representative of the judgment debtor but not of the decree holder while Abdur Rahim A C J held that whether he was to be regarded as a representative of the one or the other depended upon the nature of the question raised and the right set up by the contesting party. The preponderance of authority in Madras seems to be in favour of the view that a purchaser at a sale in execution of a money decree who is a stranger is the representative of the judgment debtor and not of the decree holder with reference to questions relating to the execution discharge or satisfaction of the decree. Madras cases cited in footnote (m) decided that a stranger purchaser is not the representative of the decree holder while those in footnote (n) decided that he is. Madras cases cited in footnote (o) decided that a stranger purchaser is the representative of the judgment debtor while those cited in footnote (p) decided that he is not. The High Court of Lahore has expressed the view that a stranger purchaser is not the representative of the judgment debtor (q). The Oudh Court has adopted the view taken by Abdur Rahim A C J (r).

All the High Courts (3) except the High Court of Madras seem to hold that where an auction purchaser who is a stranger is resisted in obtaining possession by the judgment debtor of the property purchased by him in execution he may apply for delivery of possession under O 21 r 9, or he may bring a regular suit for possession. The provisions of s 47 do not apply either because he is not the representative of the decree holder or because the question as to delivery of possession is not one relating to the execution discharge or satisfaction of the decree within the meaning of the section. The period of limitation for an application under O 21 r 9 is 3 years from the date when the sale becomes absolute [Limitation Act 1908 Sch I art 181] and that for a suit is 12 years from the same date [*ibid* art 133]. He is entitled to bring the suit without making any application under O 21 r 9, and he may sue even after an unsuccessful application. The High Court of Bombay has held that an auction purchaser even though a benamidar for the decree holder is a *stranger* for the purposes of this rule (1). In Madras the Full Bench decision in *Leendramuthu v. Nava Nadan* (u) has been taken

- (j) *Maglalay Dula'y Mulya* (1901) Bom 631  
B3 C 1 1 1 *gh v kava zi gh* (1910) 34  
B3 m 546 7 I C 4 *Bol Ji a i la*  
*Fallat* (1919) Bom LR 14 7 I C  
0 ( 3) A B 14
- (j) *Isa (i ler v Ben Naib b* (1936) 9a  
Cal 6 (F B)
- (k) *( larv F i a J i ho P* (1904) 6 AH  
44 (F B) 4m d *A war v Ayudha*  
*Nath* (1908) 30 AH 3 9 383 384  
(1909) 43 Mad 10 4 I C 009
- (l) *A i t v a s iul* (1904) 31 Mad 1  
*A i t v i ler Naier* (1910) 31 Msi  
41 81 C 4 9 S dh m a v (h y  
(1915) 41 Msi 46 47 I C 6 4 I w  
d *Hi v May v i t n* (1910) 43 M 1  
10 1 1 4 4 I C 00 [p *Oldi Ji J*  
*Sorn v Ti ura h rum i* (1926) 51  
Mad 1 1 5 96 I C 65 ( 6) A M 85
- (m) *S d i i J a* (1900) 33 M 1  
*F i j j y i s i (1910)* 30 Mad 0  
*i i q h v May v d n* (1910) 43  
Mad 10 14 4 I C 00 [p *Abd r*  
*Rahim* 4 1 1
- (n) *I a a ka v M habet* (189 ) 0 Mad  
3 8 4 1 1 am a a d a (190 )  
4 M d 119 A p p a v A v m a (1911)  
34 Mad 4 0 1 v d m t h v M y  
*Nalan* (1910) 43 Mad 10 1 4 1 C  
419 4 I C 00 [p *Oldi Ji J* s p r a  
(p) *Nadam v eeralah* (1910) 34 M 1 41  
4 1 R I C 4 3 t r a v S i k i j a  
(1916) 1 Mad 1 5 33 I C 84
- (q) *Il ka (h d v i y a Pam* (1919) 1 unj  
Rec no 1 p 43 I C 140
- (r) *I j h bar S gh v J i dra Bakul S gh*  
(1919) 46 I A 4 36 23 4 all 1 4  
166 16 5 I C 0
- (s) *Ha M P o a U i t (1913)* Bom L 1  
14 I C 6 1 3 I A B 16 *Aukori*  
*Mah I v v (A nd v A h i (1913)*  
Cal 644 *Hi gual v i wa Lal* (1907)  
31 Cal 6 1 1 C 416 (F B) See also  
cases cited unj r the h i J First where  
the d cre e l i l himself the purchaser
- (t) *Pamoh d r v jana* (1910) 44 L m 3 m  
364 46 I C 312
- ( ) (1910) 43 M d 10 4 I C 009

as an authority for the proposition that an auction purchaser though he be a stranger must proceed by an application under s 47 and that he is not entitled to bring a regular suit for possession. In the Order of Reference it was assumed that the question as to delivery of possession related to the execution discharge or satisfaction of the decree within the meaning of s 47. The judgments of the learned Judges seem to have been influenced by the observations of the Privy Council in *Prosunno Kumar* & case as to the cheap and speedy disposal of objections to execution sales. These observations were appropriate when the question is really between the parties to the suit and the auction purchaser is only an interested spectator but they are altogether irrelevant when the question is between a judgment debtor and a stranger purchaser at an auction sale. The scope of the section is expressly limited to questions between parties to the suit and their representatives and the observations of the Privy Council do not and cannot extend the section beyond those limits. It is high time that the section be amended and the conflict set at rest.

Besides cases under O 21 r 95 questions between an execution purchaser may arise in other ways. The High Court of Allahabad has held that where property not included in the mortgage deed or in the mortgage decree is sold and delivered to a stranger purchaser in execution the judgment debtor is entitled to bring a suit against the auction purchaser for recovery of the property and that the provisions of s 47 do not apply to the case (1). But the Madras High Court following the construction put upon the Full Bench decision in *Perindramuttu v. Jaya Nandan* has held that such a case comes within s 47 and that a regular suit is barred (2). A Full Bench of the Allahabad High Court has held that an auction purchaser under a decree which has been after confirmation of the sale set aside as a result of a separate suit is entitled to apply under s 47 for recovery of the purchase money from the decree holder (3).

Sub sec (3) Inquiry as to who is the representative of a party—A obtains a decree against B. B dies before the decree is fully executed and C is brought on the record as B's legal representative under s 50. D claims to be the legal representative of B. Under the Code of 1852 it was competent to the Court under these circumstances either to stay execution of the decree until the question as to who is the representative of B was determined by a separate suit or itself to determine the question. The present section makes it obligatory upon the Court executing the decree itself to determine the question (y). The same rule applies when the question arises in execution proceedings as to whether a certain person is a transferee of a decree for a transferee of a decree is as stated above a representative of a party within the meaning of this section. An order determining whether a person is or is not the representative of a party is a decree [see s 2 cl (2)] and is therefore appealable (z).

If the transferee of a decree dies pending execution the executing Court has power under this section to inquire whether the transferee was merely a benamidar for another and to allow the real owner to execute the decree (a).

Stay of execution—The words or to the stay of execution thereof which occurred in s 244 after the words execution discharge or satisfaction of the decree have been omitted in the present section. There are two possible views as regards the

- (c) *Mun n L I v Collector of Shahjhanpur* (19 3) 4 All 98 4 IC 995 (23) A A 40 (1) *Imia* *u a v* (19 1) 47 All 304 84 IC 46 (2) A A 336 See also *Yagobhatla v. Jagappa* (19 3) 46 B M 914 8 IC 8 (3) A B 6 (1) *Ilizment d lator topped as l e had not obj cted to the l e*
- (w) *J ulid v A r.* (19 1) 41 Mad L J 10 63 IC 100
- (x) *B d h I r i v Bad l S gh* (19 3) 45 All 369 41 C 8 3 (-3) A A 394

- (1) *Mi Mina Koor v D rga Prasad* (1917) 2 Lat L J 19 39 IC 1 Babu L I v Ja al (19 0) 43 All 4 94 IC 454 (6) A A 691
- (2) *B d Var J v J. Kushen* (1904) 16 All 493 *Kr h ama v lpp am* (1902) 23 Mad 445 *G a g D s v Yal b li* (1900) 7 Cal 60 *K h m S gh v Paghubir* (19 5) 4 All 76 86 IC 1049 ( ) A A 58
- (3) *Krut m v Ja l ama ru* (19 9) 51 Mad 219 105 IC 405 ( ) A M 903

omission of these words. The one is that the words omitted may have been regarded as superfluous for a plea that the execution of a decree may be stayed is equivalent to the plea that the decree should not be executed and it is thus a question relating to the execution of the decree (b). The other view is that those words having been deliberately omitted by the Legislature in the present section questions relating to the stay of execution are no longer within the section and no appeal lies from orders determining such questions (c). The latter view is submitted as the correct view.

**Sub section (2) Court may treat suit as an application**—This sub section is new. It gives legislative recognition to the practice followed by the Courts under the repealed Code. It enables the Court to treat an application under this section as a suit or a suit as an application. If a suit is brought for the determination of a question which falls under this section the Court has a discretion either to dismiss the suit or to treat the plaint as an application under this section and dispose of it accordingly provided the Court in which the suit is brought has jurisdiction to execute the decree (d) and the execution of the decree was not barred at the date of the suit (e). The power however is discretionary and the Court may or may not exercise it (f). If the decree under appeal is otherwise in order the Court of Appeal may exercise this power and treat a plaint filed in the lower Court as an application under this section and the decree as an order under this section. This is because section 47 affects procedure only and not jurisdiction (sec 99) but it will not do so unless the Court which passed the decree had jurisdiction to execute the original decree (g) and the suit was filed within the period of limitation prescribed for applications under this section namely the period prescribed by art 181 of the Limitation Act 1908 (h). In a case where a party instead of applying under this section filed a suit which he prosecuted to second appeal the High Court of Allahabad in the exercise of its discretion refused to treat the plaint as an application (i).

In a recent Allahabad case a minor objected in execution proceedings that he had not been represented by a guardian ad litem in the suit and the Court of execution refused to entertain the objection as one affecting the validity of the decree on appeal from the order the High Court of Allahabad treated the proceeding as a suit and made a declaration that the decree was not binding on the minor (j).

**Where a sale is sought to be set aside on the ground that the decree was obtained by fraud**—It has been stated above that the procedure for setting aside a sale on the ground of fraud in publishing or conducting the sale is by an application under O 21 r 90 and not by a separate suit. But an execution sale may also be challenged on the ground that the decree on which it is founded is itself tainted with

- (b) *Subra v Kumara Velu* (1918) 39 Mad 541 54 33 I C 66 *Chud mba am v Ar hna* (1917) 40 Mad 33 J 33 37 I C 836
- (c) *J dan v Maria I* (1911) 4 Bom 41 J I C 3 *H n Bha v B Hie* (1904) 46 All 33 83 I C 103 (4) A A 804 *Layend sh hor v Mathu Mahan* (1919) 1 C W N 555 5 I C 4 *Kat a Moha v nar t Ch id* (1906) 94 I C 351 (26) A C 830 *Parma a i v Raj Dev* (1919) 9 Lah L J 193 100 I C 3 ( ) A L 854
- (d) *Jhan a Lal v K wal Pam* (1900) All 11 C Ho v 464 *dan* (1904) 6 All 101 103 *Shood h i v Bhanu* (1901) 29 All 344 *Te k te Kri Ananya Arush i* (1900) 3 M d 4 41 C 3
- (e) *S La h v v rava* (1911) 35 Bom 4 461 111 C 94 *Sha cha d v f* 44 I

- d s* (1911) 45 B m 1 176 53 I C 31
- (f) *Sach Pra ad v Amarnath* (1919) 46 Cal 103 4 I C 564
- (g) *Ar. di v Lama gra* (188 ) 14 Cal 60 *B Vih i v Shyama (A m* (19 ) \* *tal 493 Dasupath v Kotha di* (1901) 124 M 1 64 *Jat ad a v Mahomed* (1901) 32 C I 33 *Debendra Nath v I a a a Kumar* (1901) C L J 3 3 *M h v nja v Janchana* (1901) 63 Cal 83 92 I C 140 ( ) A L 106
- (h) *Lama Das v J go Nath* (1900) \* All 36 See also *Sarjan Bui v dha La* (1927) 4 Cal 5 101 I C 622 ( ) A L 411
- (i) *Purn Cha dra v Fawa Das* (1900) A W N 196
- (j) *Danul gh v M haraj Raji Lawj* (1906) 48 All 36 93 I C 3 6 C 6 ) A 3



fraud and in this case the remedy is by regular suit. The following are the leading cases on the subject —

1 A suit will lie to set aside a decree and the sale held in execution of the decree where both the decree and sale are impeached on the ground of fraud (1). The reason is that the question of the validity of a decree can only be determined by a regular suit. See notes above Note C Non execution question between parties.

2 A obtains an ex parte decree against B. In execution of the decree certain property belonging to B is sold and purchased by C. The decree is then set aside under O 9 r 13. B thereafter sues A and C to set aside the sale challenging not only the sale but also the decree on the ground of fraud. The suit is not barred under this section. B is entitled to show that the decree was obtained by fraud and this can only be done in a regular suit (1).

Appeal — Sec 2 (2) provides that the determination of any question under sec 47 is a decree unless it is appealable as an order. A determination under O 21 r 90 is appealable as an order under O 43 r 1 (1). Such a determination when it is between the parties to the suit or their representatives falls under sec 47 but is nevertheless a subject to one appeal only as an order under sec 104. The same observation applies to a decision under O 21 r 34 which also is appealable as an order under O 43 r 1 (1). Similarly a decision under O 21 r 34 is appealable as an order under O 43 r 1 (1) and is subject to one appeal only. All other decisions in execution under section 47 are decrees and subject to first and second appeal.

As regards appeal therefore orders in execution proceedings may be divided into three classes —

- (1) Orders under this section which are decrees and subject to first and second appeal.
- (2) Orders which whether they fall under this section or not are declared to be orders under O 43 r 1 and are subject to one appeal only.
- (3) Non appealable orders generally of an interlocutory nature.

Attempts are frequently made on behalf of appellants to shew that orders in execution proceedings which are not appealable are appealable (m) and that orders that are subject to one appeal only are decrees from which a second appeal can be preferred (n). Conversely attempts are made on behalf of respondents that orders which are appealable are not appealable and that orders which are subject to a second appeal are subject only to one appeal e.g. that they fall under O 21 r 90 and not under sec 47 (o).

Interlocutory orders in execution proceedings — A party is not bound to prefer an appeal from every order in execution proceedings though the order is appealable. Whether the order be appealable or not it may be challenged by the party aggrieved in his appeal against the final order which determines the rights of the parties (p).

An order in execution proceedings which is merely processual or interlocutory does not come within the section. It must be an order determining the rights and liabilities of the parties with reference to the relief granted by the decree and not merely an

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>(k) <i>Abd l v M Jom d</i> (1894) 21 C 1 60. <i>I r n</i><br/> <i>N th v M Jesh</i> (1894) 4 C 1<br/> <i>Jah M ti Luf v Pus ch Ch d a</i> (1899)<br/>           6 C 1 3 d</p> <p>(l) <i>Fa v a v Sh w B r n</i> (1900) 27<br/>           Cal 19. <i>Debe tra Nuth v Pus a</i><br/> <i>K m</i> (1901) 1 J 3 8</p> <p>(m) <i>Mam o f Lo l</i> (1891) 0 M d 497. <i>B jha</i></p> | <p><i>I r n P r n ar</i> (1899) 26 C 1 5 0. <i>Pam</i><br/> <i>Har v N r D a</i> (1901) 4 M 19</p> <p>(n) <i>Bl boi Mohu v N ad L l</i> (1899) 26<br/>           Cal 3 4. <i>Laria v D o v th</i> (1901) 8<br/>           Cal 4</p> <p>(o) <i>Ra pada v Ka a Rai</i> (1906) 41 C L J<br/>           16 991 C 06 (6) A C 1 19</p> <p>(p) <i>Cha l bala v I r bodh</i> (1909) 30 Cal 42</p> |
|---|---|

incidental order made with reference to the conduct of the proceedings (q)  
See note Section 47 Execution proceeding under sec 2 and note Appeal  
under O 21 r 66

**Limitation**—An application under this section to set aside a sale in execution of a decree must be made within 30 days from the date of the sale [Limitation Act 1908 Sch I art 166] But if the sale is void as where no notice is given as required by O 21 r 22 it is not necessary to apply to the Court to set aside the sale hence the article applicable in such a case is the residuary art 181 which provides a period of 3 years from the date when the right to apply accrues and not art 166 (r) An application under this section by a representative of a judgment debtor to set aside a sale on the ground that the property sold belongs to him and not to the deceased judgment debtor is governed by art 166 and must be made within 30 days from the date of sale (a)

### LIMIT OF TIME FOR EXECUTION

48 [S 230, 3rd and 4th paras ] (1) Where an application to execute a decree not being a decree granting an injunction has been made, no order for the execution of the same decree will be made upon any fresh application presented after the expiration of 12 years from—

Execution  
certain ca. ca

barred in

granting an injunction has been made, no order for the execution of the same decree

shall be made upon any fresh application presented after the expiration of 12 years from—

- (a) the date of the decree sought to be executed, or,  
(b) where the decree or any subsequent order directs any payment of money or the delivery of any property to be made at a certain date or at recurring periods, the date of the default in making the payment or delivery in respect of which the applicant seeks to execute the decree

(2) Nothing in this section shall be deemed—

- (a) to preclude the Court from ordering the execution of a decree upon an application presented after the expiration of the said term of twelve years, where the judgment debtor has, by fraud or force, prevented the execution of the decree at some time within twelve years immediately before the date of the application or

(g) J *mol* *T* *ry* *v* *Ka* *I* *h* (180) 4 Cal  
39 5 17 m N br h (1904)  
M *I* *Drak* *B* 5 g<sup>h</sup> (131) 16  
C W N 14 10 *I* 3 *I* *M* *I* *I*  
M *q* *rab* (131) 34 *Al* 30 1 *I* C 50  
q *h* *I* *I* *I* *ru* *ai* (1011) 38 C *I*  
4 0 *I* C 86 5 *I* C *lap* *D*  
(1013) 41 *al* 160 0 *I* C *I* *h*  
M *i* (101) 16 C W N 9 0 1 *I* C  
5 *II* *Br* *B* *H* *N* *h* (19 4) 46  
*Al* *I* 31 5 40 83 *I* 103 (4) 4  
204 *ni* *m* *I* *I* *I* *art* (11 0)

fraud and in this case the remedy is by regular suit. The following are the leading cases on the subject —

1. A suit will lie to set aside a decree and the sale held in execution of the decree where both the decree and sale are impeached on the ground of fraud (1). The reason is that the question of the validity of a decree can only be determined by a regular suit. See notes above Note C Non execution question between parties.

2. A obtains an ex parte decree against B. In execution of the decree certain property belonging to B is sold and purchased by C. The decree is then set aside under O 9 r 13. B thereafter sues A and C to set aside the sale, challenging not only the sale but also the decree on the ground of fraud. The suit is not barred under this section. B is entitled to show that the decree was obtained by fraud and this can only be done in a regular suit (1).

**Appeal**—Sec 2 (2) provides that the determination of any question under sec 47 is a decree unless it is appealable as an order. A determination under O 21 r 90 is appealable as an order under O 43 r 1 (1). Such a determination when it is between the parties to the suit or their representatives falls under sec 47 but is nevertheless subject to one appeal only as an order under sec 104. The same observation applies to a decision under O 21 r 72 which also is appealable as an order under O 43 r 1 (1). Similarly a decision under O 21 r 34 is appealable as an order under O 43 r 1 (1) and is subject to one appeal only. All other decisions in execution under section 47 are decrees and subject to first and second appeal.

As regards appeal therefore orders in execution proceedings may be divided into three classes —

- (1) Orders under this section which are decrees and subject to first and second appeal.
- (2) Orders which whether they fall under this section or not are declared to be orders under O 43 r 1 and are subject to one appeal only.
- (3) Non appealable orders generally of an interlocutory nature.

Attempts are frequently made on behalf of appellants to shew that orders in execution proceedings which are not appealable are appealable (m) and that orders that are subject to one appeal only are decrees from which a second appeal can be preferred (n). Conversely attempts are made on behalf of respondents that orders which are appealable are not appealable and that orders which are subject to a second appeal are subject only to one appeal (q) that they fall under O 21 r 90 and not under sec 47 (o).

**Interlocutory orders in execution proceedings**—A party is not bound to prefer an appeal from every order in execution proceedings though the order is appealable. Whether the order be appealable or not it may be challenged by the party aggrieved in his appeal against the final order which determines the rights of the parties (p).

An order in execution proceedings which is merely processual or interlocutory does not come within the section. It must be an order determining the rights and liabilities of the parties with reference to the relief granted by the decree and not merely an

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>(k) <i>Abul K. M. Ho. I (1904) 1 C 1 605. Pra</i><br/> <i>in M. H. A. (h. d. a. (1903) 4 Cal</i><br/> <i>46 M. A. Lal v. J. a. K. I. I. a. (1909)</i><br/> <i>6 Cal 36</i></p> <p>(l) <i>I. v. S. I. w. B. H. M. (1900)</i><br/> <i>1 19 D. b. I. a. v. th. v. I. ras. a</i><br/> <i>K. mar (1903) 5 C. L. J. 33</i></p> <p>(m) <i>Mamood v. Lock (1903) 33 Ind 48 B. P. a</i></p> | <p><i>Fox v. I. a. F. a. a. (1893) 6 Cal 53 I. a. a</i><br/> <i>Idhar v. N. D. a. (1903) 4 All 19</i></p> <p>(n) <i>Bh. bon. Mal. v. v. I. L. I. (1903) 6</i><br/> <i>134 L. Ia. Ia. v. D. Nath (1901) 4</i><br/> <i>14</i></p> <p>(o) <i>Rampada. Ka. a. F. a. (1906) 44 C. L. J</i><br/> <i>16 94 I. C. 66 (6) A. C. 319</i></p> <p>(p) <i>Ch. I. bala v. I. e. bodi (1903) 38 Cal 4</i></p> |
|---|--|

incidental order made with reference to the conduct of the proceedings (q)  
See note Section 47 Execution proceeding under sec 2 and note Appeal  
under O 21 r 66

**Limitation**—An application under this section to set aside a sale in execution of a decree must be made within 30 days from the date of the sale [Limitation Act 1908 Sch I art 166] But if the sale is void as where no notice is given as required by O 21 r 2— it is not necessary to apply to the Court to set aside the sale hence the article applicable in such a case is the residuary art 181 which provides a period of 3 years from the date when the right to apply accrues and not art 166 (r) An application under this section by a representative of a judgment debtor to set aside a sale on the ground that the property sold belongs to him and not to the deceased judgment debtor is governed by art 166 and must be made within 30 days from the date of sale (s)

### LIMIT OF TIME FOR EXECUTION

**48** [S 230, 3rd and 4th paras] (1) Where an application to execute a decree not being a decree granting an injunction has been made, no order for the execution of the same decree shall be made upon any fresh application presented after the expiration of 12 years from—

Execution  
certain cases

- (a) the date of the decree sought to be executed, or,
- (b) where the decree or any subsequent order directs any payment of money or the delivery of any property to be made at a certain date or at recurring periods, the date of the default in making the payment or delivery in respect of which the applicant seeks to execute the decree

(2) Nothing in this section shall be deemed—

- (a) to preclude the Court from ordering the execution of a decree upon an application presented after the expiration of the said term of twelve years, where the judgment debtor has, by fraud or force prevented the execution of the decree at some time within twelve years immediately before the date of the application or

(q) *Jagad h r f v J a l h* (189 ) 4 Cal 39 S a f S S t a h a a (1904)  
Mad 9 D L v H r i s g h (191 ) 16 C W N 1 4 10 I C 3 1 M R t t v N i q r r b (101 ) 34 All 30 15 I C 0 N u n a h K e l o J r a s a d (1911) 53 Cal 4 9 I C 80 S a t s C l a p D (113) 41 C 1 160 -0 I C - P a h v M a (191 ) 10 C W N 90 1 I C S H J a n v H r S a h (19 4) 46 All 33 3 40 83 I C 103 ( 4) 4 4 808 S o l v J a n J H (19 0)

Lah L J 398 9 I C 601 t l a N t h M t ) J (10 0) 1st L J 0 6 I C 4 J t t t h P M K M S Ch n a y a (19 7) 5 R o g 534—[S e n h o (19 ) 5 Lang 641]  
(r) *P jagopala P a y a r i* (1904) 47 Mad 288 10 I C 6 (24) N 51 451 [F B] M m a t h a N a t h L a c h m (19 8) 55 Cal 96 105 I C 6 (24) 4 60  
(s) *Nat h C h a n d a v N A C?* d r a (1919) 46 Cal 9 54 I C 451

(b) to limit or otherwise affect the operation of article 180 of the second schedule to the Indian Limitation Act, 1877

**Changes made in the section**—This section corresponds with the third and fourth paras of s 230 of the Code of 1882 which were as follows —

Where an application to execute a decree for the payment of money or delivery of other property has been made under this section and granted no subsequent application to execute the same decree shall be granted after the expiration of twelve years from any of the following dates (namely) —

- (a) the date of the decree sought to be enforced or of the decree (if any) on appeal affirming the same or
- (b) where the decree or any subsequent order directs any payment of money or the delivery of any property to be made at a certain date—the date of the default in making the payment or delivering the property in respect of which the applicant seeks to enforce the decree

Nothing in this section shall prevent the Court from granting an application for execution of a decree after the expiration of the said term of twelve years where the judgment debtor has by fraud or force prevented the execution of the decree at some time within twelve years immediately before the date of the application

The following alterations have been made —

- (1) Section 230 applied only to decrees for the payment of money or delivery of other property. The present section applies to all decrees except decrees granting an injunction
- (2) Section 230 applied only where an application for execution had been made under this section and granted. The words under this section as also the words and granted have been omitted in the present section. The result is that the rule of limitation contained in this section applies whether the previous application for execution was made under a former Code or the present Code and whether the application was granted or not. See note below Orders on applications for execution
- (3) The words or the decree (if any) on appeal affirming the same in sec 230 cl. (a) have been omitted. See note below Date of decree
- (4) The words or at recurring periods in sub section (1) cl. (b) are new. They are intended to give effect to certain decisions under s 230 of the Code of 1882. See notes below Date of default
- (5) Clause (b) of sub section (2) is new. It gives effect to certain decisions under s 230 of the Code of 1882. See notes below Successive applications for execution of decrees of Chartered High Courts

**Successive applications for execution of decrees of Courts other than Chartered High Courts**—This section deals with the maximum limit of time for execution. It does not prescribe the period within which each application for execution is to be made (1)

As explained in the next paragraph sub section 2 (b) has the effect of excluding Chartered High Courts from the operation of the section. The section only applies to Courts other than Chartered High Court

A decree holder is entitled to present in succession any number of applications for executions of the same decree (u), and the Court has no power to refuse execution unless—

- (i) the application is barred by virtue of general principles of law analogous to the doctrine of res judicata or
- (ii) the application is barred under art 182 of the Limitation Act, 1908 or
- (iii) the execution of the decree is barred under the present section (v), in which case the application for execution may not be barred under (i) or (ii) above.

(i) —If the first application for execution is dismissed after a hearing on its merits the Court will not have regard to the general principles of law analogous to the doctrine of res judicata to entertain a subsequent application for execution of the same decree. See note to s 11 Orders in execution proceedings etc p. 77 above.

(ii) —The general effect of art 182 of the Limitation Act 1908 is to require an application for execution of a decree of a Court other than a Chartered High Court to be made within three years of the decree and each successive application to be made within three years of the date of the last application. The decree is thus enforceable any time within the time limit for execution prescribed by this section.

(iii) —This section fixes an outside period after which execution of a decree cannot be allowed even though the application may not be barred by the rule of art 182 of the Limitation Act (x) if it obtains a decree against B. F. J. on 1st January 1910 and applies for execution of the decree within three years of the date of the decree. Further applications are made for execution of the same decree at a period of three years from the date of the next preceding application. If no application is made in December 1921 A then makes a fresh application on 1st January 1924. No order can be made for execution of the decree as the application is not barred under the Limitation Act execution is barred under this section as it is made twelve years after the date of the decree. Under the Code of 1882 it was necessary to inquire if a previous application for execution had been granted. This is no longer necessary. See note below. Order for execution is granted. The twelve years period for execution is calculated from the date of the decree or from the date of default in respect of any payment or delivery to the decree holder. See note below. Terminus a quo for limitation.

Successive applications for execution of decrees of Chartered High Courts. The holder of a decree of a Chartered High Court passed in the exercise of its original civil jurisdiction is entitled to present in succession any number of applications for execution of the decree and the Court is bound to entertain any such application unless—

- (i) by virtue of general principles of law analogous to the doctrine of res judicata or
- (ii) under art 180 of the Limitation Act 1877 [now art 182 of the Limitation Act 1908] that being the article which applies to decrees of Chartered High Courts.

There is no bar under this section because it does not limit the operation of art 183 of the Limitation Act 1908 as it does the words the twelve years rule does not apply to decree passed by Chartered High Courts. Art 183 of the Limitation Act permits a revivor in the case of a decree of a Chartered High Court.

- (a) *Trial & Practice of the High Courts* (1883) 1 All 106 111 11 I A 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 82 83 84 85 86 87 88 89 90 91 92 93 94 95 96 97 98 99 100
- (b) *Decrees & Orders of the High Courts* (1893) 1 All 84 100

- (c) *See Decrees & Orders of the High Courts* (1893) 1 All 84 100
- (d) *See Decrees & Orders of the High Courts* (1893) 1 All 84 100

High Courts in the exercise of ordinary original civil jurisdiction or of orders of His Majesty in Council. This was inconsistent with section 230 of the Code of 1859 and so that section was held to be independent of the corresponding article 180 of the Limitation Act 1877 (y). These decisions have now been given statutory authority by sub section 2 (b). The twelve years rule therefore does not apply to decrees passed by a Chartered High Court in its original civil jurisdiction. Such decrees may be kept alive for any number of years and so may orders in Council made in Privy Council appeals ( ). Decrees of Chartered High Courts in the exercise of their Appellate Civil jurisdiction are not within article 183 of the Limitation Act 1908 (a).

**Orders on applications for execution**—An application for execution may either be—

(1) *granted* or

(2) *refused*—

(a) in circumstances operating as a bar to future execution as where it is refused on the ground that it is barred on the principle of *res judicata* or barred by the law of limitation or

(b) in circumstances not operating as a bar to future execution as where it is refused on the ground that it is not in accordance with law [O 21 r 17] (b) or

(3) *withdrawn* by the applicant—

(a) in circumstances operating as a bar to future execution as where the withdrawal was with the object of abandoning execution or

(b) in circumstances not operating as a bar to future execution (c).

Under s 230 of the Code of 1859 the twelve years limitation imposed by that section applied only if one at least of the previous applications was *granted* by the Court but not otherwise. Under the present section it matters not whether the previous applications have been granted or refused or withdrawn. All that the section now provides is that where an application to execute a decree *has been made* no order for the execution of the same decree shall be made upon any fresh application presented after the expiration of twelve years from the date specified in the section.

**Fresh application**—The phrase *fresh application* has been substituted for *subsequent application* to make it clear that the application referred to in this section is a *substantive* application for execution and not merely an *ancillary* application made with the object of moving the Court to *proceed* in the matter of a *substantive* application already on the file (d). Thus where property has been attached on an application for execution an application for sale of the attached property is not a fresh application to execute the decree within the meaning of this section (e). Similarly where a warrant issued for the arrest of a judgment debtor on an application for execution is returned with the remark that the judgment debtor could not be found a subsequent application for the arrest of the judgment debtor is not a fresh application to execute the decree within the meaning of this section but is

(y) *M J h v Tr W va das* (18 ) 6 Dom  
505 ( path v B la d (1884)  
31 a 41 *Jog Ira v Sl va Da* (1909)  
36 (a) 545 44 11 C 168

(z) *F H h v a* ( h dr bats (1903) 40 Cal  
1

(a) *Kr at K E r v B vrod ca t* (15 ) 14  
M I A 46

(b) *Dho t I v P l k* (1893) 1 All 84 100

(c) *Tlak r Ir I v F l pullah* (199 ) 1 All  
306 110 111 J 3 44 Ch la an

v B l A t (18 ) 16 B m 93 301  
5 at rna v (a t d (1834) 1  
31 1 61 F l 41 v I h l (ha d  
(1806) 14 All 48 446

(d) *Pal n 41 I l (ha d* (1896) 19 All 49  
*I am S rup v D atk* (1911) 37 All 1  
91 C 81 *Pa a I v A m h* 31 n (1941)  
9 C L R 9 *I vrdh r J l v l*  
Ch va (19 6) 4 All 1 J 43 94 1 (

913 ( 9) A A 371  
(e) *C nedhry I oo h l m h l* (1890) 17  
Cal 63

merely an *incidental* application to carry on proceedings already commenced (f) On the same principle it has been held that an application to revive execution proceedings which have not terminated is not a fresh application within the meaning of this section (g) nor an application by the legal representatives of a decree holder for execution on his death pending execution proceedings (h). But an application for attachment of property cannot be treated as a continuation of a previous application for arrest (i) nor an application for attachment of other property not included in the previous application for attachment (j)

An application to transfer a decree to another Court for execution is not an application for execution within the meaning of this section. Such an application though made *within* twelve years from the date of the decree will not entitle the decree holder to execution if the application for execution to the Court to which the decree is transferred is made *after* the expiration of twelve years (k)

**Terminus a quo for limitation**—The period of limitation within which a decree may be executed is twelve years from—

(a) the date of the decree or

(b) the date of default in respect of the payment of money or the delivery of property when such payment or delivery has been ordered to be made at a certain date or at recurring periods either by the decree or by any subsequent order

**Date of decree**—The decree capable of execution is the decree of the Court of first instance until appeal and after that the decree of the Court of last instance see note. What decrees may be executed under sec 36 above. If the decree is that of a Court of first instance the period runs from the date of the decree. If there is a preliminary decree and a final decree the two must be read together and the date is the date of the final decree (l). If the decree to be executed is an appellate decree the period runs from the date of the appellate decree whether it affirms sets aside or modifies the original decree (m) but not if no appeal lies (n) or if the appeal is dismissed for default (o). The words *or of the decree* (if any) on appeal affirming the same in section 230 of the last Code have been omitted as misleading being open to the construction that where the original decree was *modified or set aside* on appeal the period of twelve years was to run from the date of the *original decree*. Where a decree is passed in favour of the plaintiff against the defendant and part of the decree is appealed from and the rest is not the period of 12 years prescribed by this section runs from the date of the *appellate decree* both as regards the application to execute the portion appealed from and the portion not appealed from. The reason is that there is only one decree that can be executed and that is the decree of the appellate Court (p). Where a decree is passed not jointly but severally against two or more defendants and one of the defendants appeals from the decree the period of 12 years as against the

- (f) *Jit M v Jwal Prasad* (1899) 41 All 1  
(g) *S L v Ga e h* (1918) 3 Pat L J 103  
44 I C 560 *Chait r Singh v Kamal Singh* (1927) 49 All 276 *B v Nath v P n B r os* (19 ) 49 All 509 104 I C 116 (2) A A 16  
(h) *Baij Nath v Pam Bhara* (19 7) 49 All 509 104 I C 116, (7) A A 165  
(i) *Met L v h* (191 ) 9 All I J 1  
(j) *S J mado v S b r pa* (19 ) 5 Mad L J 13 100 I C 0 ( ) A M 34  
*H m s v 4th r K r at in* (19 3) 50 C I 47 4 I C 101 (4) A C 131  
*Pam Patt v I m Dwar* (8) A L 804 *S o al o T r da mart v D r ga nba* (9) A M 11 4  
(k) *Su tar v N gh v Dori Sh I r* (1938) 0

- All 8 *Nalmo v B res* (1899) 16 Cal 44 *S ja H ei v Mo oh Da* (18 ) 2 Cal 9 1 *J rva dat v Pan hodias* (1911) 3 Bom 103 8 I C 168  
*K r opat v T ka S gh* (191 ) 34 All 306 14 I C 1  
(l) *S rda D rpa v Gopi* (191 ) 3 C L J 73 33 I C 180  
(m) *Mah ed M d v Moh r Ka ta* (190 ) 34 Cal 8 4  
( ) *Sah v dlat v Sah Dharom* (19 6) 42 All 3 44 I C 961 (76) A A 440  
*di thim-shing P p v S hoo Prakash* (19 1) 43 All 40 61 I C 1 9  
(o) *Pam Adhin v I m Lot* (1918) 4 I C 1 5  
(p) *Krut ana v Mangammal* (1903) 6 M d 91



barred as the section applies to mortgage decrees and the law of limitation applicable to a suit or proceeding is that in force at the date of its institution (j)

**Fraud**—Fraud or force on the part of a judgment debtor at any stage of the execution gives a new starting point for the period of limitation (k) The word fraud in this section should not be narrowly interpreted (l) The fraud dealt with by this section is such as prevents the execution of the decree within twelve years and judges ought to take a broad view of conduct deliberately adopted by judgment debtors with a view to defeating and delaying the just payment of their debts by frivolous and futile objections which are dishonest upon the face of them (m) Locking up the house so as to prevent attachment of movable property (n) or evading arrest by any contrivance or dishonestly evading payment by eluding service of warrant (o) is fraud within the meaning of this section So is a fictitious transfer of his property made by a judgment debtor to defeat or delay execution (p) If the judgment debtor presents an application to set aside a decree passed ex parte against him with the sole object of delaying execution proceedings he is guilty of fraud within the meaning of this section (q) But though the Court has the power to grant execution after the expiration of twelve years from the date of the decree on the ground of fraud or force on the part of the judgment debtor the Court should not use that power unless it is satisfied that the decree holder on his part had been diligent in proceeding with execution since the date of the decree (r) It is doubtful whether the fraud of one of several judgment debtors keeps the decree alive against all of them (s)

**Limitation Act section 4**—When the twelve years period expired on a day on which the Court was closed the Calcutta High Court applied section 4 of the Limitation Act on the principle that when a party is prevented from doing a thing on a particular day by the act of the Court he is entitled to do it at the first available opportunity (t)

**Limitation Act section 15 (1)**—Sec 15 (1) of the Limitation Act 1908 cannot be applied in computing the period of 12 years prescribed by the present section (u)

**Minority**—A decree is passed in August 1897 on behalf of a minor in a suit brought by his guardian for partition and mesne profits Various applications for execution are made by the minor through his guardian within 3 years of each other The period of 12 years prescribed by this section expires in August 1909 The minor attains majority in November 1909 and in November 1910 he applies for execution of the decree and claims an extension of the period on the ground of minority Is he entitled to any extension either under sec 6 of the Limitation Act 1908 or under any other law? The High Court of Madras answered the question in the negative on the ground that sec 6 of the Limitation Act is expressly limited to cases where the limitation is provided in the Limitation Act itself and that there is no law apart from the said sec 6 under which minority is a ground of exemption from the operation of the law of limitation (v) The High Court of Bombay agrees with the Madras High Court in

- (j) *Her v S R v S R v B gam* (1906) 49 All 1190 IL 4 (6) AA 33 dissenting  
*re m Aa al v Jodhs S gl* (1910) 3 All 431 IL 384 B *mar v Jasad Jal* (1913) 40 Cal 101 IL 331 C *pal di v Trilho* (1913) 45 Bom 36 1 IL 90 M *r v S Lina* (1916) 1 IL 113 J 14 341 C  
 (k) *1 k yia v I gl a* (1893) 9 Mad 30 M *r 41 v Man n Al* (1911) 34 All 111 IL 6  
 (l) *I n k a v I gam m* (1893) 6 Mad 36 36 *Lia Lraad v S of A m* (1904) 44 All 313 3 IL 8 (7) AA 145  
 (m) (16) 44 All 319 3 IL 8 1 IL 877 ( )  
 AA 145 pra  
 (n) *Bh gu Jar h b* (1908) 9 Bom 318 1 IL 111 Y *I gh a* (1899) 2 M d 30

- (o) *Patt la a v P gann* (1881) 6 M 1 365 46d *I h te v Ahn n d* (1911) 35 M d 601 IL 60 *re a nahan v M d en* (1914) 4 M d L J 48 80 IL 31 (4) 4 M 836  
 (p) *Fu l i v S r s la a* (1894) 4 Mad 20  
 (q) *Pa Shan A s v Di ar h r D b* (1908) 11 C W 449  
 (r) *Ibod B t seo 46d I A h d r v Ahammad* (1911) 3 Mad 601 IL 69  
 (s) *46d I A h d r v I h d* (1911) 3 Mad 601 IL 69  
 (t) *I ary Moh v v I da* (1891) 18 Cal 631  
 (u) *S M v n v v d ja* (1900) 4 M d 601 IL 36 ( ) M 63  
 (v) *I am Babu* (1914) 37 M d 184, 18 IL 106

Holding that sec 6 of the Limitation Act applies only to cases dealt with by the Act itself but differs from that Court in that it holds that the minor is entitled to an extension of the period under the general principle of law that time does not run against a minor (w). The same Court has held that where the decree has been obtained in the first instance by an adult the fact that the decree on his death passes to an heir who is a minor does not extend the period of 12 years prescribed by the present section (x). The latter case was decided under the Limitation Act for it was said that time having begun to run against the decree holder the subsequent disability of the minor heir was under that Act ineffectual to stop it. The Lahore Court does not apply section 6 of the Limitation Act on the ground that sec 48 is enacted for the benefit of the judgment debtor in order that he should not be harassed for ever by execution proceedings (y). The High Court of Allahabad has followed the Madras decision (z).

Where decree transferred for execution—The Court to which a decree is transferred for execution has power to determine whether execution is barred under this section (a).

Execution by Collector—The words period of limitation in para 11 (3) of Schedule III to this Code are not confined to periods of limitation prescribed by the Limitation Act. The period during which the Collector is acting under that Schedule is excluded in calculating the twelve years period under this section (b).

Dekkhan Agriculturists Relief Act 17 of 1879—In computing the period of 12 years provided by this section the time taken up in procuring a conciliator's certificate as required by the D A P Act is to be excluded (c). A decree for sale on a mortgage passed under that Act does not require to be made absolute hence the period of 12 years is to be computed from the date of the decree and not from the date of the order making the decree absolute (d).

## TRANSFEREES AND LEGAL REPRESENTATIVES

**49 [S 233]** Every transferee of a decree shall hold the same subject to the equities (if any) which the judgment debtor might have enforced against the original decree holder

Transferee

Equity of judgment debtor—This is the same principle as that enacted in sec 132 of the Transfer of Property Act 1882. A right of set off is an equity and if the judgment debtor has the right to set off a cross decree under O 21 r 18 he has this right also against the transferee of the decree holder (e). The section applies to all decrees including mortgage decrees (f).

### Illustrations

1. A holds a decree against B for Rs 1000. B holds a decree against A for Rs 3000. A transfers his decree to C. C cannot execute the decree against B for more than Rs 2000 (g).

(i) *Mor v. Farj* (183) 16 Bom 536

(ii) *Bl. J. a. t. v. Taj. M. Fa. nal* (191) 36

(v) *Jl. da v. Mohan J. l.* (1834) 1 R 18

(i) *Ire. Nat. v. C. F. J. l.* (191) 3 AU 638

(a) *v. J. l. ma v. J. l. ma v. J. l. ma* (19) 5 Rang

(b) *A. J. n. v. J. l. o. l. c. o. af J. l. s.* (19 0)

4 AU 118 5 I C 4...

(c) *Sh. J. ma v. S. t. ppa* (1918) 4 Bom 36 4...

(i) *Il. ro. h. d. v. Aba* (19) 46 Tom 61 67

(e) *J. l. 13 (-) 4 19 9*

(f) *J. l. 41. Lakha k. s. (1 65) 1 Be. g. L.P. 23*

(g) *J. l. A. sol. m. n. v. And. r. (18) 116 Cal*

(f) *Shro. J. r. s. l. v. Lalt* (19 4) 41 t. l. 1 261

(g) *A. n. H. Lakha k. s. (19 4) 1 B. L.P. 23*

2 A obtains a decree against B for Rs 5000 B then sues A to recover Rs 2000 Pending B's suit C obtains a transfer of A's decree with notice of B's suit A decree is then passed for B in his suit against A C applies for execution against B of the whole decree for Rs 5000 He is not entitled to execute the decree for more than Rs 3000 as the transfer was taken with notice of B's suit (h)

The second illustration is the case of *Kristo Ramani v Kedarnath* (i) in which it was assumed that the assignee must have notice of the equity It is submitted however that it matters not that the assignee was unaware of the equity provided it was existing at the time of the assignment see sec 132 of the Transfer of Property Act 1882 illustration (1) and the case of *Mon Mohan v Duarka Nath* (j) In the latter case the Court said Under section 49 of the Code the assignee of a decree stands in no better position than the assignor and takes it subject to all the equities and defences subsisting at the time of the assignment which the judgment debtor could have asserted against it in the hands of the judgment creditor notwithstanding that the assignee may have had no notice thereof

**50 [S 234] (1)** Where a judgment debtor dies before the decree has been fully satisfied, the holder of the decree may apply to the Court which passed it to execute the same against the legal representatives of the deceased

(2) Where the decree is executed against such legal representatives he shall be liable only to the extent of the property of the deceased which has come to his hands and has not been duly disposed of and for the purpose of ascertaining such liability the Court executing the decree may of its own motion or on the application of the decree holder compel such legal representative to produce such accounts as it thinks fit

**Changes in the law**—The present section differs from the corresponding section 234 of the Code of 1882 in one respect viz that the words fully satisfied have been substituted for the words fully executed See notes below under the head Before the decree has been fully satisfied

**Extent of liability of legal representative**—This section enables a decree holder to execute his decree against the legal representative of a deceased judgment debtor The property that can be attached is the property of the judgment debtor found in the hands of the representative and the property of the representative from whatever source derived to the extent of that which he has wasted out of the assets come to his hands without satisfying the debts of the deceased (k)

The liability of a legal representative in execution proceedings is confined to the property of the deceased which has actually come to his hands If the decree holder seeks to make the legal representative answerable also for the property of the deceased which with due diligence on his part would have come to his hands his proper remedy is by way of suit against the legal representative and not by proceedings in execution under this section (l)

(h) *Kristo Ramani v Kedarnath* (1899) 16 Cal

(i) (1893) 16 Cal 619

(j) (1910) 1 Cal 137

(k) *J. Prasad v. J. Prasad* (1915) 16 Cal 1

(l) *Ch. J. v. Dr. Moh. Akbar* (1896)

3 Cal 44

(m) *Ka. Shroff v. H. Zaid* (1897) 11 Bom

100 3 Cal 1102



legal representatives on the record for a decree cannot be said to be fully satisfied merely because the property was attached. Under the present section if the judgment debtor dies after attachment his legal representatives may be brought on the record. At the same time it has been held that omission to bring the legal representatives on the record does not render the sale void but amounts merely to an irregularity within O 21 r 90 and the sale will not be set aside unless substantial injury is proved (u)

May apply to execute the decree against the legal representative"—Where execution proceedings have been commenced against a judgment debtor they can be continued after his death by substituting the name of the legal representative in place of that of the judgment debtor in the application for execution already on the files of the Court. It is not necessary to file a fresh application for execution under O 21 r 11 (t). See O 22 r 12. At the same time notice should be given to the legal representative under O 21 r 22. If such notice has been served on the legal representative the order substituting his name can be made *ex parte* (w)

The executing Court has power to allow execution against legal representative and to transfer the decree for execution to another Court without giving any notice to the legal representative leaving it to him to raise all just objections to execution in the transferee Court (x)

To which Court application should be made—According to the High Court of Bombay (x) Allahabad (y) and Madras ( ) the application to execute a decree against a legal representative must be made to the Court which passed the decree and a Court to which a decree is transferred is not competent to entertain it. The Calcutta High Court has held that the application may also be made to the Court to which the decree is transferred for execution and that the omission to apply to the Court which passed the decree is only an irregularity which is cured by section 99 (a). The Lahore High Court has followed the Calcutta view (b). The Calcutta view has recently been approved by the Privy Council (c)

Death of legal representative—If the legal representative of a judgment debtor against whom execution has been taken out under this section dies before the decree has been fully executed the decree holder may execute the decree against the legal representative of the legal representative to the extent of the assets of the original judgment debtor that may have come into his hands (d)

Legal representative bound by previous proceedings—The legal representative is bound by orders passed in execution against the deceased judgment debtor. A obtains a decree against B. A then transfers the decree to C. C applies for execution against B and an order is made for execution after notice to A and B as provided by O 21 r 16 [Code of 1882 s 232]. A then dies and his legal representative D is brought on the record under this section. The order for execution having been passed in his lifetime D cannot object to execution on the ground that the transfer to C was fraudulent (e)

- (u) *Jagadsh v Dama S* (1919) 3 C W N 608. *Dorazum v Ch dambaram* (19 4) 4 M d 63. 5 I C 46 (1904) A M 130. *T r v Jaj Arishna* (19 ) 3 C W N 418 ( 8) A C 7.
- (v) *Pravlat v J jha* (1910) 34 Bom 14. 4 I C 839. See also *Bhagya Das J g j Ashor* (19 0) 18 All L J 35. 5 I C 610. *Nachamma v Subramaniam* (19 3) 12 Ind 36. 806 I C 853 (1905) A R 25.
- (w) *Nachamma v Subramaniam* (1905) 12 Ind 106 I C 853 ( 3) A L 40.
- (x) *H a ha d v J stur* (1 24) 18 Bom

- (y) *S th Kap r v S t* (189 ) 1 All 431.
- ( ) *Suramatha v I ly th* (190 ) 5 Ma L 466.
- (a) *S t n Lal v Motsh nd* (189 ) Cal 5 m.
- (b) *M s t Beg v B t g S t* (19 0) 90 I C 10 0 ( 6) A L 34.
- (c) *J g B ad r v B f of Upper I d* (19 4) 1 A 3. 3 Luck 314. 109 I C 41 ( 9) A L 16.
- (d) *J fr feg m v a R b* (1900) All 36.
- (e) *M l ha d v CAH* (1886) 10 Bom 4. *Lalhar v Chakraborty* (1892) 1 All 2.

**Decree for injunction**—An injunction obtained against a defendant restraining him from obstructing plaintiff's ancient lights may on the death of the defendant be enforced under this section against his son as his legal representative by procedure under O 21 r 32 [Code of 1882 s 260] (f). But such an injunction cannot be enforced under this section against a purchaser of the property from the defendant for an injunction does not run with the land. The remedy of the decree holder is to bring a fresh suit for an injunction against the purchaser (g). See notes to s 11. **Decree for injunction and res judicata** on p 43 above and notes to s 47. **Representatives No 6**—Purchaser of property etc. The Bombay High Court has held that an injunction can be enforced against a person who has purchased while execution proceedings are pending by virtue of the doctrine of lis pendens (h).

## PROCEDURE IN EXECUTION

**51 [New]** Subject to such conditions and limitations as may be prescribed, the Court may, on the application of the decree holder, order execution of the decree—

Powers of Court to enforce execution

- by delivery of any property specifically decreed,
- by attachment and sale or by sale without attachment of any property,
- by arrest and detention in prison
- by appointing a receiver, or
- in such other manner as the nature of the relief granted may require

**Simultaneous execution**—Simultaneous execution both against the property and person of the judgment debtor is allowed under O 21 r 30. But the Court has discretion under O 21 r 21 to refuse simultaneous execution and to allow the decree holder to avail himself of only one mode of execution at a time. The Privy Council has said that the difficulties of a litigant in India begin when he has obtained a decree (i) and the Court is not justified in refusing execution against the person on the ground that the decree holder should first proceed against the property (j).

**Receiver in execution proceedings**—A receiver may be appointed to realize a decree attached in execution proceedings. A obtains a decree against B. In execution of the decree A attaches a decree held by B against C (O 21 r 53). The Court may appoint a receiver to realize the attached decree if that course is likely to benefit the parties more than the sale of the attached decree (k). Similarly a receiver may be appointed to realize a debt attached in execution of a decree (l). See notes to O 21 r 46. **Procedure where garnishee denies debt**

- (f) *S. I. I. v. J. I. I.* (1901) 6 Bom. 83  
(g) *D. v. B.* (1901) 6 Bom. 140  
1001 v. S. I. I. (1901) 1 Bom. 1 R.  
84 se. 1 v. J. I. I. v. H. I. I. (1901) 3 Bom. 181  
(h) *F. v. S. I. I.* (1901) 51 Bom. 3  
1001 v. S. I. I. (1901) 3 Bom. 181  
(i) *C. v. S. I. I.* (1901) 14 Bom. 181  
(j) *C. v. S. I. I.* (1901) 14 Bom. 181

- 131 C.  
(f) *H. v. S. I. I.* (1901) 6 Lah.  
548 931 C. 4 (6) A. L. 110  
(g) *P. v. S. I. I.* (1901) 39 All. 393  
(h) *T. v. S. I. I.* (1901) 11 Bom. 449  
(i) *T. v. S. I. I.* (1901) 3 Lah.  
23 811 C. 94 (2) A. L. 315 (rent to own)

**Receiver of future maintenance**—The Privy Council has held that though a right to future maintenance cannot be attached [s 60 (1) (n)] the Court may in a proper case *e g* where provision is made for the maintenance of the judgment debtor out of the income of villages appoint a receiver for realizing the rents and paying thereout to the judgment debtor a sum sufficient for his maintenance and the balance to the decree holder (m)

**Appeal**—*A* obtains a decree against *B*. By consent of parties *C* is appointed receiver to take charge of certain properties for the execution of the decree. *A* then applies to the Court for the discharge of *C* as receiver but the application is refused. The order is one relating to execution within the meaning of s 47 and is therefore appealable (n)

**Clause (e)**—This clause does not authorize a Court to read into a decree a supplementary or alternative relief which is not in the decree. Thus where a decree in a suit for redemption directs the defendant mortgagee to deliver to the plaintiff mortgagor the documents of title relating to the mortgaged property but does not provide for an alternative relief the Court has no power under this clause to award damages in execution (o). This conclusion might have been arrived at on the simple ground that a Court executing a decree has no power to add to the terms of a decree

**52 [S 252] (1)** Where a decree is passed against a party as the legal representative of a deceased person, and the decree is for the payment of money out of the property of the deceased, it may be executed by the attachment and sale of any such property

(2) Where no such property remains in the possession of the judgment debtor and he fails to satisfy the Court that he has duly applied such property of the deceased as is proved to have come into his possession, the decree may be executed against the judgment debtor to the extent of the property in respect of which he has failed so to satisfy the Court in the same manner as if the decree had been against him personally

**Scope of the section**—Section 50 provides for the case where a decree has been passed against a party and the party dies before the decree is fully satisfied and the decree is sought to be executed against his legal representative. The present section provides for the case where a decree is passed against the legal representative of a deceased person. In the latter case the legal representative is the judgment debtor (p) and if the decree is for the payment of money out of the property of the deceased the section allows the decree to be executed against the property of the deceased in the hands of the legal representative. But in so far as the property of the deceased which has come into the hands of the legal representative has not been duly applied by him the decree may be executed against the legal representative as if the decree was to that extent

(m) *I j d r a v a v s a n d s r B l t (19 )*  
*I A r 4 A l l S 4 8 1 ( 5 )*  
*A l 1 6 I l l i y v A r u h*  
*(191 ) 40 M a 1 30 34 1 C 391 [R e v i v*  
*n t i i I n t e l l S e c r e t r y o f S i t a*  
*T r i p r n a (19 6) 49 M a d 50 94 1 C.*  
*54 6) A A 6*

(n) *P a J u r i s d i c t i o n H i d a s p h (1918)*  
*3 1 t L J 513 46 1 C 6 5*  
 (o) *M a t h S e h e (19 ) 4 M a 1 L J 3 6*  
*0 1 t 5 9 ( ) A M i v*  
 (p) *B e d u h d B i d A b (19 7) 4 B o m*  
*L R 13— 94 1 C 911 ( 7) A B*





will Where a decree is obtained against such person and property belonging to the estate of the deceased is sold in execution of the decree the sale does not bind the estate (x)

**53 [New]** For the purposes of section 50 and section 52, property in the hands of a son or other descendant which is liable under Hindu law for the payment of the debt of a deceased ancestor, in respect of which a decree has been passed, shall be deemed to be property of the deceased which has come to the hands of the son or other descendant as his legal representative

Liability of ancestral property

**Scope of the section**—The section has been enacted to enforce the recognized rule of the Hindu law namely that members of a joint Hindu family may not escape the payment out of the joint family property of any debt incurred and decreed against their father before his death provided that such debt is not tainted by immorality The section does not apply where the joint family property passes by survivorship to a collateral e.g. a nephew as he is under no obligation to pay his uncle's debts (y)

**Decree**—The High Court of Madras has held that the term decree in this section is not confined to money decrees but also includes a decree obtained against a Hindu father for possession of joint family property which the father could sell and which is liable to be sold for his debts (z) The term decree however does not include a decree for an injunction against a Hindu father restraining him from obstructing the plaintiff from using a water tank for such a decree cannot after the father's death be enforced in execution against the sons (a)

**Liability of ancestral property in execution proceedings**—This section is new It settles a question of procedure on which there was a conflict of judicial decisions To understand the precise scope of the section it is necessary to bear in mind the rule of Hindu law that where a son or grandson takes any ancestral property by survivorship he is bound to pay out of such property all debts including judgments of his ancestor not incurred for immoral or illegal purposes The question is by what procedure is this liability to be enforced? We proceed to consider the subject under the following four heads—

1 *If a money decree has been passed against the father and the father dies before sale of execution*—A and his sons B and C constitute a joint Hindu family owning an ancestral house D obtains a decree against A for Rs. 5000 A dies and on his death B and C take the ancestral property by survivorship D applies for execution of the decree against B and C by attachment and sale of the whole of the family house (b) Is he entitled to do so or must he institute a fresh suit against B and C to recover the debt? According to the procedure prescribed by this Code D should bring B and C on the record as the legal representatives of A under s. 50 and then apply under that section to the Court which passed the decree to execute it against B and C to the extent of the ancestral property come to their hands The words in s. 50 are to the extent of the

(x) *M. Ram d. v. J. d. Roy* [1894] A. C. 437

(y) *Jagann. (A) v. Mot. Lal* (1903) 4 A. 114 3  
1 C. 928 (3) A. A. 39 *Nesha K.*  
*v. J. m. Aca. Das* (1901) 6 Ind. L. J.  
451 462 6 J. C. 905 (3) A. 1 147

(z) *Meyappa v. Meyappa* (1904) 46 Mad.

(a) L. J. 471 R. I. C. 98, ( ) A. M. 3 1  
(b) *Ch. I. R. U.* (1914) 4 Bom. 101  
46 I. C. 743

(b) D. r. only is not confined to the one-  
third part of the father's estate  
S. g. *bal* (1904) 42 Bom. 113 8 J. C.  
181 (5) A. B. 193

property of the deceased which has come to his [legal representative's] hands. According to the present section the ancestral property in the hands of B and C being liable under Hindu law for the payment of A's debts is deemed for the purposes of s 50 to be the property of the deceased which has come to the hands of B and C as the legal representatives of A. If B and C object that the debt in respect of which the decree was passed was tainted with immorality the question is one relating to the execution of the decree between the decree holder and the representative of the judgment debtor within the meaning of s 47 and it should be determined by the Court executing the decree (c). This coincides with the view taken by the High Courts of Bombay and Calcutta under the Code of 1882 (d). According to the Madras and Allahabad decisions under that Code a decree against a Hindu father could not be executed against ancestral property in the hands of the sons even to the extent of the father's interest in the property and the only remedy of the decree holder was to institute a regular suit against the sons. This view proceeded on the ground that the question whether the debts were tainted with immorality was not one that could be gone into in execution proceedings and that the sons were not the legal representatives of their father so far as the ancestral property was concerned within the meaning of s 234 of the Code of 1882 (e). These decisions are no longer law.

2 Where a money decree has been passed against the father and the father dies after attachment but before sale of the ancestral property.—All the High Courts are agreed that where the father dies after attachment of the ancestral property the proceedings in execution can be continued against the sons (f). In fact having regard to the provisions of the present section a separate suit against the sons would be barred by s 47.

3 Where a mortgage decree has been passed against the father and the father dies before sale of the mortgaged property.—Where a decree is obtained against the father for sale of ancestral property mortgaged by him and he dies before sale the proceedings in execution may be continued against the sons. But the sons not being parties to the suit are entitled to raise in execution proceedings such questions as they could have raised if they had been made parties (g). They can dispute the factum of the debt or they can show that the debt was incurred for immoral purposes and is not therefore binding on the property (h). See notes to O 34 r 1 Mortgage of joint family property.

4 Where a decree has been passed against the sons in respect of their father's debt for payment of the debt out of the ancestral property.—In such a case the decree holder may proceed to execute the decree by attachment and sale of the ancestral property come to the hands of the sons. The proceedings would be under s 52. The expression property of the deceased in that section would be construed in the light of the present section. In fact s 53 is an Explanation to ss 50 and 52 explaining the meaning of the expression property of the deceased.

It will be seen from what has been stated above that a creditor can now follow the property in the hands of the sons or grandsons in execution not only in cases (1) (3) and (4) but also in case (1).

- (c) S. J. a a d v (M) l y Lal (19) 20 All L J 909 711 C 417 (3) A A 1 1  
(d) T m l C m n B l a j a (1896) 01 m 385  
A 7 a S l h a n (1909) 33 B m 39  
11 (4) 9 t o r (h d r v S b a l C l a d  
(1907) 31 C 11 84 S H t C h  
(1919) 43 L m 61 at 1 6 6 511 C 61  
(e) F l r d v h (18) 5 M 1 3  
417 J d a v D (18) 4 11 Mad  
413 J e s v S t h m (1904)  
7 M 1 t d (4) 13 B 1 K a d a a  
v d t h r (1890) 13 M 1 6 L a c h  
A n r v h j a Lal (191) 16 All 449

- J g a t h v S t l (189) 11 All 30  
S g h a v Lal (1901) 23 All 206  
(f) S i a j a Z m l a v T e r u e n g d a (1831)  
7 M d 333 L a h m a v a n h u n j Lal  
(1891) 16 All 449 T e a r y Lal v C h n d  
C h a a (1905) 11 C W 163  
(g) S e e h d r d l e r h d v I m h o r (1906) 33  
C 1 6 6 C m a m h r a a v S j a p e r m l  
(184) 8 M d 376 S e e a l l a Lal v  
I r m e h a (1899) 41 All 356  
(h) S e e l m t h a v l a y t (1910) 31 Bom  
31 51 C 067 I d a l a l v I m p e r i a t  
E a t (1915) 37 All 214 31 C 93

Provided, thirdly, that, if the room is in the actual occupancy of a woman who is not the judgment debtor and who according to the customs of the country does not appear in public, the officers authorized to make the arrest shall give notice to her that she is at liberty to withdraw, and, after allowing a reasonable time for her to withdraw and giving her reasonable facility for withdrawing may enter the room for the purpose of making the arrest

Provided, fourthly, that, where the decree in execution of which a judgment debtor is arrested, is a decree for the payment of money, and the judgment debtor pays the amount of the decree and the costs of the arrest to the officer arresting him, such officer shall at once release him

(2) The Local Government may by notification in the local official Gazette, declare that any person or class of persons whose arrest might be attended with danger or inconvenience to the public shall not be liable to arrest in execution of a decree otherwise than in accordance with such procedure as may be prescribed by the Local Government in this behalf

(3) Where a judgment debtor is arrested in execution of a decree for the payment of money and brought before the Court the Court shall inform him that he may apply to be declared an insolvent, and that he *may (w)* be discharged if he has not committed any act of bad faith regarding the subject of the application and if he complies with the provisions of the law of insolvency for the time being in force

(4) Where a judgment debtor expresses his intention to apply to be declared an insolvent and furnishes security, to the satisfaction of the Court that he will within one month so apply, and that he will appear when called upon, in any proceeding upon the application or upon the decree in execution of which he was arrested, the Court *may (x)* release him from arrest, and if he fails so to apply and to appear the Court may either direct the security to be realized or commit him to civil prison in execution of the decree

Sec O 21 r 40 [proceedings on appearance of judgment debtor in obedience to notice or after arrest]

(w) The word *may* was substituted for ( ) The word *may* was substituted for  
will by Act 3 of 1911 at all by Act 3 of 1911

**Changes introduced by the section**—This section corresponds with s 336 of the Code of 1882 except in the following particulars —

- 1 Any outer door of a dwelling house may now be broken open to effect the arrest of a judgment debtor in execution of a decree. But the dwelling house must be in the occupancy of the judgment debtor. See sub section (1) proviso (2)
- 2 The security under sub sec (4) must not only be for the filing by the judgment debtor of a petition in insolvency but also for his appearance when called upon in any proceeding upon the application in insolvency or upon the decree in execution of which he was arrested. See notes below.  
Discharge of surety
- 3 A power has been conferred on the local Government to exempt certain persons from arrest. See sub section (2)

**Breaking open of outer door**—Under the Code of 1882 the breaking open of any outer door of a dwelling house was strictly prohibited. This prohibition has now been removed to this extent that where a dwelling house is in the occupancy of the judgment debtor and he refuses or prevents access thereto the officer authorized to make the arrest may break open any outer door of such dwelling house. But this does not authorize him to break open the outer door of a dwelling house merely because the judgment debtor is to be found in that house. The prohibition above referred to as well as the prohibition against entering a dwelling house after sunset for effecting an arrest are to be traced to the maxim of English law that a man's house is his castle. Referring to this maxim Bentham wrote more than a century ago. This poetical expression is certainly no reason for if a man's house be his castle by night why not by day? The course of justice is sometimes interrupted in England by this puerile notion of liberty (y)

**Sub section (2)**—This sub section is new. It is intended to cover the cases of certain persons or classes of persons whose summary arrest might as in the case of railway servants be attended with danger or inconvenience to the public.

**Sub section (4)—Insolvency after order for arrest**—If a judgment debtor against whom an order for arrest has been made is adjudicated insolvent without a protection order the adjudication does not prevent his arrest and the Court of execution must require the judgment debtor to give security under the latter part of sub section (4) that he will appear when called upon in any proceeding in insolvency or upon the decree in execution of which he was arrested (z)

**Sub section (4)—Within one month**—The Court has no power to extend the period of one month for applying for adjudication. Sec 148 does not apply to such a case (a)

**Sub section (4)—Discharge of surety**—Under the Code of 1882 the security required was that the judgment debtor will appear when called upon and that he will within one month apply under section 336 to be declared an insolvent. It was held upon the construction of those words that where a security bond provided that the surety would produce the judgment debtor when the Court should direct him to do so the surety was released from his obligation under the bond when the judgment debtor filed a petition to be declared an insolvent. Neither the withdrawal of the petition nor failure to proceed with the petition nor even failure on the part of the judgment debtor to appear in Court when the direction to appear was made subsequent to the filing

(y) 1 Williams Theory of Legislation 2nd edn  
(z) 1 L. L. A. 1480 then 148d L. M. J. d  
(19) 3 Hong 187 89 1 L. 381 (3)

A II 305  
(a) 1480 mhs. Re gaferi (1970) 50 Mad.  
L. J. 47 9 1 L. 444 (6) A. M. 6.9

of the petition was held to affect the surety's discharge (b). And this was so even when a surety undertook that the judgment debtor would appear before the Court when called upon and would within one month file a petition to be declared an insolvent (c). These decisions are no longer law. Sub section (4) now makes it clear that where a security bond is passed in the terms of that sub section that is where a surety undertakes (1) that the judgment debtor will within one month apply to be declared an insolvent and (2) will appear when called upon in any proceeding upon the application or upon the decree in execution of which he was arrested the security will be realized when there is a failure to comply with either condition (d). The surety however is not released by the mere filing by the judgment debtor of the petition in insolvency the security continues until a final order is made on the petition (e).

A surety under this section is discharged by the death of the judgment debtor before breach of either of the two conditions mentioned above (f). But the death of the judgment debtor after the first condition has failed namely the undertaking to apply to be declared an insolvent within one month cannot affect the surety's liability with regard to that condition (g). A surety is also discharged if the execution proceedings are struck off (h) but not if liability had already accrued under the bond by a breach of either of the two conditions before the proceedings were struck off (i).

Sub sec (4) provides that if the judgment debtor fails to apply or to appear the Court may either direct the security to be realized or commit the judgment debtor to prison. This does not mean that the Court may proceed both against the surety and the judgment debtor for if the surety is proceeded against and the amount is recovered from him under the conditions of the bond then the judgment debtor cannot be committed to jail in execution and if the judgment debtor is committed to jail the state of affairs is just the same as if the surety had never come forward. But the mere issue of a warrant against the judgment debtor the warrant remaining unexecuted is not sufficient by itself to discharge the surety (j).

Realization of security—See s 145

## 56 [S 245 A] Notwithstanding anything in this Part, the Court shall not order the arrest or detention in the civil prison of a woman in execution of a decree for the payment of money

Prohibition of arrest or detention of women in execution of decree for money

Security for costs—This section provides that a woman shall not be arrested in execution of a decree for the payment of money. At the same time if the plaintiff is a woman and her suit is for the payment of money she may be required to give security for the defendant's costs. See O 2 r 1 (3).

(b) *Koel sh Chand v Christophoridis* (1899) 15 C 1 11 *Ram v Ger rd* (1891) 13 All 100 *Dwarikadas v Isobhai* (189 ) 19 Bom 10 *Ash h ay v Krishnas my* (1903) 6 Mad 366

(c) *Banna M l v Jamna Das* (1893) 15 All 183 *Imb l n v Lalji* (1901) 4 Mad 560

(d) *Worur Commercial Bank v Kaya Ma oop* (19 6) 5 Mad L J 5 3 101 IC 5 ( 6) A M 1081

(e) *Abdul v M tra* (19 ) 46 Bom 70° 64 IC

648 ( ) A B 340

(f) *Frash n v It nan* (1901) 4 Mad 637 *Nab n Ch d a v Miru joy* (1914) 41 Cal 50 19 IC 931

(g) *Malani v Bhulanda* (19 4) 48 Bom 500 86 IC (24) A L 4 8

(h) *Lalji v Odoya* (1887) 14 Cal 757

(i) *D sh ay v Mahabi* (19 0) 5 Pat L J 417 4 0 57 IC 303

(j) *Maka pl v Bh landas* (19 4) 48 Bom 500 86 IC 57 ( 4) A B 4 8

**57** [S 38] The Local Government may fix scales, graduated according to rank, race and nationality, of monthly allowances payable for the subsistence of judgment debtors

Subsistence allowance

See O 21 r 39 [subsistence allowance]

**58** [Ss 341, 342] (1) Every person detained in the civil prison in execution of a decree shall be so detained,—

Detention and release

- (a) where the decree is for the payment of a sum of money exceeding fifty rupees, for a period of six months, and,
- (b) in any other case, for a period of six weeks

Provided that he shall be released from such detention before the expiration of the said period of six months or six weeks, as the case may be,—

- (i) on the amount mentioned in the warrant for his detention being paid to the officer in charge of the civil prison, or
- (ii) on the decree against him being otherwise fully satisfied, or
- (iii) on the request of the person on whose application he has been so detained or
- (iv) on the omission by the person, on whose application he has been so detained, to pay subsistence allowance

Provided, also, that he shall not be released from such detention under clause (ii) or clause (iii) without the order of the Court

(2) A judgment debtor released from detention under this section shall not merely by reason of his release be discharged from his debt but he shall not be liable to be re-arrested under the decree in execution of which he was detained in the civil prison

Period of detention in jail—The first part of sub section (1) up to the words six weeks corresponds with s 342 of the Code of 1832. The phraseology of that section however has now been altered to make it quite clear that the period of detention shall be (1) six months where the amount of the decree exceeds Rs 50 and (2) six weeks in any other case and that the Court has no power to fix shorter periods than those prescribed in the section (1)

**Re arrest**—The immunity of a judgment debtor from a second arrest depends not only upon his having been *arrested* but upon his having been detained in *jail* under the arrest. Thus where a judgment debtor while acting as a pleader in Court was arrested and discharged on the ground that he was exempt from arrest under s 642 of the Code of 1882 (now s 135) it was held that he was liable to be re-arrested in execution of the same decree against him (l). Similarly where a judgment debtor was arrested but was liberated owing to non payment of subsistence money it was held that he was liable to be re-arrested in execution of the same decree (m). Sub section (2) refers to release from detention in jail.

**Interim protection order**—A is arrested and committed to jail in execution of a decree against him. While in jail he files his petition in insolvency and obtains an *interim* protection order for one week and is thereupon released from jail. He then applies for a further protection order but his application is refused. Is A liable to be re-arrested in execution of the same decree? The Calcutta High Court has held that he is not liable to be re-arrested on the ground that a judgment debtor once discharged from jail cannot be arrested a second time in execution of the same decree (n). On the other hand the High Court of Bombay has held that A is liable to be re-arrested as the only cases in which a judgment debtor is exempt from re-arrest are those specified in this section and that release under an *interim* protection order is not one of them (o). The Calcutta decision it is submitted is not correct.

**Contempt of Court**—This section does not apply to cases of imprisonment for contempt of Court (p).

**59 [S 653]** (1) At any time after a warrant for the arrest of a judgment debtor has been issued the Court may cancel it on the ground of his serious illness.

(2) Where a judgment debtor has been arrested, the Court may release him if, in its opinion, he is not in a fit state of health to be detained in the civil prison.

(3) Where a judgment debtor has been committed to the civil prison, he may be released therefrom—

- (a) by the Local Government on the ground of the existence of any infectious or contagious disease, or
- (b) by the committing Court, or any Court to which that Court is subordinate, on the ground of his suffering from any serious illness.

(4) A judgment debtor released under this section may be re-arrested but the period of his detention in civil prison shall not in the aggregate exceed that prescribed by section 58.

(l) *R. Je. dra v. Chander Mohan* (1896) 3 Cal

(m) *Habibul Fakhman v. Ram Salai* (1904) 26 All 317

(n) *Bol v. Chandra A. matter of* (1893) 0 C 1 874 *Secretary of State v. Judah* (1886) 1

Cal 5

(o) *Sh. M. v. Poonja* (190) 26 Bom 65  
*S. aj. Din v. Mahabir Prasad* (1911) 33 All 79 8 I C 743

(p) *Martin v. Lawrence* (1879) 4 Cal 655

## ATTACHMENT

60 [S 266] (1) The following property is liable to attachment and sale in execution of a decree, namely, lands, houses or other buildings, goods, money, banknotes, cheques, bills of exchange, hundis, promissory notes,

Property liable to attachment and sale in execution of decree

Government securities, bonds or other securities for money, debts, shares in a corporation and, save as hereinafter mentioned, all other saleable property, movable or immovable, belonging to the judgment debtor, or over which, or the profits of which, he has a disposing power which he may exercise for his own benefit, whether the same be held in the name of the judgment debtor or by another person in trust for him or on his behalf

Provided that the following particulars shall not be liable to such attachment or sale, namely —

- (a) the necessary wearing apparel, cooking vessels, beds and bedding of the judgment debtor, his wife and children, and such personal ornaments as, in accordance with religious usage, cannot be parted with by any woman,
- (b) tools of artizans, and, where the judgment debtor is an agriculturist, his implements of husbandry and such cattle and seed grain as may, in the opinion of the Court, be necessary to enable him to earn his livelihood as such, and such portion of agricultural produce or of any class of agricultural produce as may have been declared to be free from liability under the provisions of the next following section
- (c) houses and other buildings (with the materials and the sites thereof and the land immediately appurtenant thereto and necessary for their enjoyment) belonging to an agriculturist and occupied by him,
- (d) books of account,
- (e) a mere right to sue for damages
- (f) any right of personal service,



- (g) stipends and gratuities allowed to pensioners of the Government, or payable out of any service family pension fund notified in the Gazette of India by the Governor General in Council in this behalf, and political pensions,
- (h) allowances (being less than salary) of any public officer or of any servant of a railway company or local authority while absent from duty,
- (i) the salary or allowances equal to salary of any such public officer or servant as is referred to in clause (h), while on duty, to the extent of—
  - (i) the whole of the salary, where the salary does not exceed forty rupees monthly,
  - (ii) forty rupees monthly, where the salary exceeds forty rupees and does not exceed eighty rupees monthly, and
  - (iii) one moiety of the salary in any other case,

Provided that where the decree holder is a society registered or deemed to be registered under the Co operative Societies Act, 1912, and the judgment debtor is a member of the society, the provisions of sub clauses (i) and (ii) shall be construed as if the word 'twenty' were substituted for the word 'forty' wherever it occurs and the word 'forty' for the word 'eighty'.

- (j) the pay and allowances of persons to whom the Indian Articles of War apply,
- (k) all compulsory deposits and other sums in or derived from any fund to which the Provident Funds Act, 1897, for the time being applies in so far as they are declared by the said Act not to be liable to attachment,
- (l) the wages of labourers and domestic servants whether payable in money or in kind,
- (m) an expectancy of succession by survivorship or other merely contingent or possible right or interest,

- (n) a right to future maintenance,
- (o) any allowance declared by any law passed under the Indian Councils Acts, 1861, and 1892, to be exempt from liability to attachment or sale in execution of a decree, and
- (p) where the judgment debtor is a person liable for the payment of land revenue, any movable property which under any law for the time being applicable to him is exempt from sale for the recovery of an arrear of such revenue

*Explanation*—The particulars mentioned in clauses (g), (h), (i), (j), (l) and (o) are exempt from attachment or sale whether before or after they are actually payable

(2) Nothing in this section shall be deemed to exempt houses and other buildings (with the materials and the sites thereof and the lands immediately appurtenant thereto and necessary for their enjoyment) from attachment or sale in execution of decrees for rent of any such house, building, site or land

Changes introduced in previous law—This section corresponds with s 266 of the Code of 1882 except in the following particulars—

- 1 In cl (a) the words cooking vessels beds and and such personal ornaments as in accordance with religious usage cannot be parted with by any woman have been added See notes below
- 2 The latter portion of cl (b) relating to agricultural produce is new
- 3 Cl (c) stood as follows in s 266 of the Code of 1882—The materials of houses and other buildings belonging to agriculturists
- 4 In cl (g) the words or payable out of any service family pension fund notified in the Gazette of India by the Governor General in Council in this behalf have been added
- 5 Cl (h) is new See notes below
- 6 In cl (i) the words or allowances equal to salary and while on duty have been added See notes below
- 7 Cl (k) is new See notes below
- 8 In cl (l) the words whether payable in moneys or in kind are new
- 9 The alterations in sub section (2) cl (a) correspond with the alterations in sub section (1) cl (c)

Subsequent amendments of the section—Sub sec (2) as it originally stood contained a clause (b) which ran thus (b) to affect the provisions of the Army Act or of any similar law for the time being in force That clause was repealed by Act 10 of 1914 Sch II See notes below Salary of Army officers

In clause (i) the word forty was substituted for twenty and the word eighty for forty by Act 6 of 1933

The proviso to clause (i) was added by the Amending Act 20 of 1925

In execution of a decree"—The expression decree in this section refers to a money decree and not a mortgage decree for attachment is not necessary in mortgage decrees. The result is that the exemptions from attachment and sale contained in the proviso to this section do not apply to a mortgage decree for sale (g).

**Saleable property**—Subject to the proviso to sub section (1) all saleable property which belongs to the judgment debtor may be attached and sold in execution of a decree against him. The equity of redemption of a mortgagor in mortgaged property is saleable property within the meaning of this section and is therefore liable to be attached and sold in execution of a decree against him (r). The share of a partner in a partnership business is saleable property and can be attached and sold in execution of a decree obtained against him by his creditor (s). The right to claim specific performance of a contract to sell land is also attachable and saleable (t). A life interest in trust funds is attachable and saleable in execution of a decree against the life tenant (u). Similarly a vested remainder can be attached and sold in execution of a decree against the remainderman (v).

The word saleable in this section means saleable by auction at a compulsory sale under the orders of the Court. It has no reference to property made non transferable by an agreement between the parties to a transaction. It has accordingly been held that a condition in a permanent lease that the landlord would re enter if the tenant made any transfer of the land demised does not make the land unsaleable in execution. The lease forbids a sale by the tenant but does not prevent a sale by the Court (w). Country liquor is saleable property within the meaning of this section though the permission of the Collector may be necessary to the sale under the Abkari Act (x).

**Security for performance of duty**—Money or other valuable security deposited as security for the due performance of duty by a servant with his master may be attached in execution of a decree against the servant but the attachment will be subject to the lien which the master has upon the deposit and the deposit cannot be sold until the same is at the disposal of the servant free from the lien of the master at the expiration of the period of employment (y).

**Land assigned for maintenance**—Where land was assigned to a Hindu widow for her maintenance with a proviso against alienation it was held that she had no saleable interest in the usufruct (z).

**Non transferable offices**—A religious office is not saleable property (a). Similarly the right of managing a temple or officiating at the worship conducted in it and of receiving the offerings at the shrine is not saleable (b). The right to officiate at funeral ceremonies is also not saleable (c). The property of a temple cannot be sold away from the temple. But there is no objection to the sale of the right title and interest of the servant of a temple in land belonging to the temple which he holds as remuneration for his service the interest sold being subject in the hands of the alienee to determination

(g) *Mubarak v Ahmad* (194) 46 All 483 84  
1 C 749 (4) A A 3 8 (F R)

(r) *Parashram v Gorind* (1897) 1 Bom 6

(s) *Jagat Chunder v Isu r Chunde* (1833) 0  
Cal 69 See O 1 r 49

(t) *R dra v Krish a* (1887) 14 C 1 211

(u) *Abdul Latief v Doure* (1889) 12 Mad 50

(v) *An aj v Chand abai* (1893) 17 Bom 503

(w) *Keshab v Aj har* (1911) 19 C W 118  
8 IC 837 *Golak Nath v Maturanath*  
(1893) 20 Cal 3

(x) *Purelottam v Bellant* (1905) 10 Bom L  
R 13

(y) *Karathan v Subramanya* (1886) 9 Mad 03

(z) *Dra li v Apara* (1886) 10 Bom 31 See  
also *Gulab Awar v Ba s d h r* (1893) 1

All 371 and *Bansidh r v Gulab Kuar*  
(1891) 16 All 413

(a) *Puppa v Dorasami* (1883) 6 Mad 6

*Narasimma v Anantha* (188) 4 Mad 391

*Panga am v R ga* (1893) 16 Mad 116

*Ma haram v i anshankar* (188) 6  
Bom 98 306

(b) *Durga B b v Clancel* (188) 4 All 81

*Rama Varma v Ramanna r* (188) 5

Mad 89 *Rajah r rmah v Kati Iurmah*

(18 6) 1 Mad 23 4 I A 76 *Gnana*

*ba da I nd a Sannadh v Velu*

*Pa da am* (1900) 3 Mad 71 7 I A

69 *Srinivas R tanmani* (1897) 1 C W N

493 *Sheti j ni d v Peary* (190) 29

Cal 5 0  
(c) *Jh immu v Dinooth* (18 1) 16 W E 171

by the death of the original holder or by his removal from office for failure to perform the service (d)

*Service of a public nature*—Land burdened with the performance of a service of a public nature e.g. land held on Swastivachalam service tenure is inalienable and cannot be attached (e)

*Restraint upon anticipation*—The income of property subject to a restraint upon anticipation accruing due after the date of the judgment cannot be attached in execution of a decree against the separate property of a married woman passed under s 8 of the Married Women's Property Act 1874 (f)

*Right of residence*—The right of a widow under the Hindu law to reside in her husband's family house is a purely personal right and cannot be transferred. Such right cannot be attached in execution as it is not saleable property (g). For other kinds of property which cannot be alienated, see Transfer of Property Act 1882 s 6

*Burmese marriage property*—The interests of parties to a Burmese Buddhist marriage in the marriage property is an indeterminate interest and not saleable within the meaning of this section (h)

*Property*—A sues B for partnership accounts. The question of accounts is then referred to arbitration with the consent of the parties. Before the award is made X a creditor of A applies for attachment of the rights and interest of A in the award. The attachment cannot be allowed for the expectant claim under an inchoate award is not property within the meaning of this section (i). Money paid into Court as a fine in a criminal case against a judgment debtor is after the order imposing the fine is set aside attachable under this section as money belonging to the judgment debtor even before the issue of a refund certificate (j)

The doors and windows of a building cannot be separately attached, for they have no separate existence as property (k). An unascertained right in unascertained property could not be the subject of attachment (l)

*Disposing power*—A property may not belong to a judgment debtor and yet he may have a disposing power over it exercisable for his own benefit. In such cases the property is liable to attachment and sale subject to the proviso to this section.

*Trustee of a charity*—A trustee of a religious endowment has no disposing power over the corpus of the trust estate exercisable for his own benefit hence the corpus cannot be attached (m)

*Life interest*—Where under a compromise with a reversioner a Hindu widow was allowed to keep certain property for her life and she agreed not to alienate it and on her death the property was to pass to the reversioner it was held that she had no disposing power over the property (n)

*Bonus sanctioned by railway company*—A bonus sanctioned by a Railway Company to its servant is virtually a gift which must be completed either by a registered document or by actual payment as required by s 123 of the Transfer of Property Act. A Railway Company sanctioned a bonus to A and the amount was forwarded to the District Master of the Company for payment to A. Before the amount was paid to A it was attached in the hands of the Paymaster by a creditor of A. It was held that the amount

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| (d) <i>Lallia v Bagg</i> (1884) 6 I M 596 500<br>also <i>Bislen Ch d v Nadir Hossein</i><br>(1885) 15 C I J 91 I A 1 | (i) <i>Jud Taff v Tuff</i> (1851) 11 M<br>1 A 40 |
| (e) <i>A v B</i> (1884) 14 C I J 91 I A 1  | (j) <i>H v M</i> (1884) 14 C I J 91 I A 1        |
| (f) <i>Corbett v B</i> (1884) 14 C I J 91 I A 1  | (k) <i>F v T</i> (1885) 11 Cal 161               |
| (g) <i>Sal Ishi v Lakshmi</i> (1884) 31 M 1 500  | (l) <i>B v T</i> (1885) 11 Cal 161               |
| (h) <i>M v J</i> (1884) 31 M 1 500   | (m) <i>B v T</i> (1885) 11 Cal 161               |
| (i) <i>Rang d v B</i> (1884) 31 M 1 500  | (n) <i>B v T</i> (1885) 11 Cal 161               |

could not be attached for the gift was not complete and *A* had therefore *no disposing power* over the money (o)

*Delivery to post office* — *A* sends a cover containing currency notes to the Post Office for delivery to *B* the addressee. Can the cover be attached while it is still in the Post Office by a creditor of *B*? It has been held that it can be attached the reason given being that the cover is in the *disposing power* of *B*. When once the letter has been posted the property in it becomes vested in the addressee (p)

*Auctioneer* — An auctioneer has no disposing power over the whole of the sale proceeds of goods sold by him but only over that portion of it which represents his commission. Hence the whole of the sale proceeds in the hands of an auctioneer cannot be attached in execution of a decree against him but only so much of it as represents his commission (q)

*Life policy* — Where a married man effects a policy on his own life and the policy is expressed on the face of it to be for the benefit of his wife or of his wife and children or any of them then in cases to which the married Women's Property Act 1874 applies the simple declaration on the face of the policy that the policy is for the benefit of his wife or children amounts to a trust for them and the policy cannot be attached by his creditors [see s. 6 of the Act]. But in cases to which that Act does not apply such a declaration is not sufficient to create a trust and the insured has a disposing power over the policy for his own benefit and the policy may be attached by his creditors unless it has been assigned as provided by s. 130 of the Transfer of Property Act 1822 or a trust has been declared in respect thereof as provided by s. 5 of the Indian Trusts Act 1882. There was a conflict of opinion as to whether s. 6 of the Act applied to Hindus for it was held by the High Court of Madras that it did (r) and by the High Courts of Bombay (s) and Calcutta (t) that it did not. But the Act has now been amended [see Act 13 of 1923] and the provisions of that section are made applicable to policies of insurance effected by Hindus, Muhammadans, Sikhs or Jains in Madras after the 31st day of December 1913 [being the year of the Madras decision] and in other parts of British India after the 1st day of April 1923 but nothing contained in the Amending Act is to affect any right or liability which has accrued or been incurred under any decree of a competent Court passed before the 1st day of April 1923.

*Debts* — Debts are expressly mentioned in the section and they are liable to attachment and sale. A debt is an *obligation* to pay a *liquidated* (or specified) sum of money (u). Money that has not yet become due does not constitute a debt for there is no obligation to pay that which has not yet become due. The word debt in this section means an actually existing debt that is a perfected and absolute debt. Rent which has not become due is not a debt and cannot be attached (v). A sum of money which might or might not become due or the payment of which depends upon contingencies which may or may not happen is not a debt (w). A money claim that has already become due is a debt and it may be attached as such though it may be payable at a future day but a money claim *accruing due* is not a debt and cannot be attached. The attachment must operate at the time of the attachment and not be anticipatory so as to fasten on a claim that may ripen into a debt at some future time (x). A mere right to receive profits the profits not having yet accrued due is not attachable (y).

(o) *Janki Das v. East Indian Ry.* (1888) 6 All 634. *Natha v. Schuler* (1973) 25 Bom L R 599 (4) A B 88 87 I C 312.

(p) *Varanmuhulu v. Adappa* (1890) 13 Mad 24.

(q) *Smuth v. Allahabad Bank* (1901) 23 All 135.

(r) *Balamba v. Krishnappa* (1914) 37 Mad 483. O I C 934 (F B I).

(s) *Shankar v. Umabas* (1913) 37 Bom 471. 19 I C 736.

(t) *Esha v. Dasi v. Gopal* (1914) 18 C W N 133. I C 236. *Krishna v. Mast Promila*

(19 8) 5 Cal 1315 (8) A C 518.

(u) *Webster v. Webster* (186) 31 Beav 393.

(v) *Lachm n v. J. bu d n* (19 8) 0 All 507.

108 I C 29 (8) A 193.

(w) *Haridas v. Baoda E shore* (1900) 7 Cal 38.

(x) *Syed T. fooral v. Rughnath* (1871) 14 M I A 49 50. *Sher Singh v. Sri Ram* (1908) 30 All 246.

(y) *Jagannath v. Kishen* (1867) 7 W R 66. *Sher Singh v. Sri Ram* (1908) 30 All 246.

*Amob Khajeh Habibulla v. Raviraj* (16 8) 33 C W N 282 (9) A C 35.

A debt that is enforceable only by a foreign Court is not liable to attachment under this section (2)

### Illustrations

1 A delivers goods to his agent B for sale B sells the goods and receives the sale proceeds The sale proceeds in the hands of B constitute a debt due to A and they may therefore be attached while in B's hands in execution of a decree against A *Madho Das v Ramji* (1894) 16 All 286

2 A is bound under a deed to pay a monthly allowance to B for B's maintenance C who holds a decree against B attaches in August the allowance for September The attachment is not valid for the allowance can only be attached as a debt and the allowance for September was not a debt due to B at the time of attachment in August *Haridas v Baroda Kishore* (1900) 27 Cal 38 *Milkunto v Hurro* (1878) 3 Cal 414

3 A agrees to sell his property to B for Rs 2 000 to be paid to A on the execution of the conveyance The purchase money payable to A is not a debt owing to him by B until the conveyance is executed Hence it cannot be attached before the execution of the conveyance in execution of a decree against A *Ahmaduddin v Majlis Ras* (1881) 3 All 12 But once the sale is completed the amount representing the purchase money may be attached in the hands of B and it does not make any difference that the whole is payable in one sum or by instalments or in the shape of periodical payments *Harshankar v Bagnath* (1901) 23 All 164 As to attachment of right to claim specific performance see note above Saleable property

4 Maintenance allowance that has already become due *private pensions* that have already become due and the wages of private servants [other than those mentioned in cl (1)] that have already become due are debts within the meaning of this section *Kasheeshuree v Greeh Chunder* (1866) 6 W R Mis 64 (maintenance) *Bhojrub v Madhub Chunder* (1880) 6 C L R 19 (private pensions) *Ayyarayyar v Virasami* (1898) 21 Mad 393 *Devi Prasad v Lewis* (1903) 31 All 304 (wages of private servants)

5 A agrees to advance Rs 5 000 to B on a mortgage of B's property B advances Rs 3 000 only C who holds a decree against B seeks to attach the balance of Rs 2 000 payable by A to B as a debt due by A to B C cannot attach the balance for it is not a debt due by A to B It is clear that if A fails to pay the balance B is not entitled to specific performance and his only remedy against A is by way of damages for non payment of the balance *Phul Chund v Chand Mal* (1908) 30 All 252

As to the mode in which a debt may be attached see O 21 r 46 See also O 21 r 49

Clause (a) ornaments —Ornaments on the person of a Hindu wife forming part of her *stridhan* cannot be attached in execution of a decree against the husband even though the Hindu law concedes him a personal right of user (a) The *mangalsutra* a neck ornament which is worn by a Hindu married woman during the lifetime of her husband without ever removing it is also exempted from attachment (b)

Clause (b) implements of husbandry —Charaks kadhais and planks of timber used by an agriculturist for extracting sugar juice from sugarcane which he has grown on his field and for turning it into jaggery are implements of husbandry within the meaning of cl (b) and are exempt from attachment (c)

Clause (c) houses occupied by agriculturists —The term agriculturist includes persons engaged in cultivating the soil for remuneration although they may have no interest in the soil either as proprior or tenant (d) It means a small holder who

(1) *Chunha Lal v Bhaas* (1881) 5 Bom 19

(2) *Tulsi v C. S.* (1881) 8 B H C 4 C

(3) *Appa v T. gamma* (1885) 9 Bom 106

(4) *Lakshmi v. N. Kari* (1903) 2 Bom L F

111 111 C 69 (1) 4 B 24

(5) *D. v. S. S. S.* (1917) 41 Bom 4 32

1 C 639

tills the soil and cultivates it and not a large landed proprietor even though his sole income is from land (e) The Code of 1882 (s 266) exempted from attachment only the materials of houses occupied by agriculturists But it was held that even a house occupied by an agriculturist could not be attached provided it was occupied by an agriculturist as such (f) that is to say it was occupied by him *bona fide* for the purposes of agriculture (g) The burden of proving that it was so occupied lies on the agriculturist debtor and it must be proved by him in execution proceedings (h) The exemption extends after the death of the agriculturist to his representative occupying the house in good faith as an agriculturist (i) But if by a consent decree an agriculturist agrees in consideration of time being given to him that his house may be attached and sold on default in payment of the decretal amount the house may be attached and sold on default (j) for the privilege is one that may be waived (l)

If a house occupied by an agriculturist is specifically mortgaged it is not protected from sale in execution of a decree upon the mortgage Clause (c) does not prohibit the sale of property specifically mortgaged though it may be occupied by an agriculturist as such unless he is prohibited by law from mortgaging or selling it (l)

Clause (e) right to sue for damages — Mesne profits are in the nature of damages and the right to sue for mesne profits is a right to sue for damages Such a right cannot therefore be attached and sold in execution of a decree against the person entitled to the right Thus if A is entitled to claim mesne profits from B for wrongful dispossession of his lands A's right to claim mesne profits from B cannot be attached and sold in execution of a decree against A If the right is attached and sold and purchased by X X is not entitled to sue B for the mesne profits the sale to him being void (m)

Clause (f) right of personal service — A *riti* is a right to receive certain emoluments as a reward for personal service and is therefore exempt from attachment and sale (n) But a priest's share in the *utpal* or net balance of the offerings to a deity may be attached and sold (o) The *birt* *Maha brahmins* or right to officiate as a priest at the funeral ceremonies of Hindus dying within a particular district is a right of personal service and cannot therefore be attached (p) *Jatri bakhis* which merely contain the names and addresses of pilgrims who are clients of the judgment debtor and which are of use to him to perform personal service to the pilgrims are not attachable (q)

Clause (g) gratuities allowed by Government — The gratuity referred to in this section is a bonus allowed by Government to its servants in consideration of past services It may be allowed to one who is not a pensioner or it may be allowed to a pensioner in addition to his pension In either case it is exempt from attachment (r)

Stipends payable out of service family pension fund notified in the Gazette of India — For notifications issued under this clause [i.e. cl (g)] see General Statutory Rules and Orders vol IV p 69.

- (e) *M. Thiruv. Ve. kola. amma v. Official Receiver* (19 6) 49 Mad 279 I C 398 (6) A M 30  
 (f) *Radhakrishnan v. Bahant* (1883) 7 Bom 530  
 (g) *Ji. an v. Hira* (1888) 12 Bom 363  
 (h) *Pandurang v. Krish. n.* (1904) 28 Bom 1  
 See also *Jamna Prasad v. Raghunath* (1913) 35 All 307 19 I C 15  
 (i) *Padmakis n v. Balant* (1883) 7 Bom 50  
 (j) *U. r. v. Haradab Das* (19 0) 24 C W N 575 57 I C 49  
 (k) *Ganga Bishun v. Jagmohan* (19 7) 6 Pat 254 10 I C 610 (27) A P 33  
 (l) *Bhag. a d s v. H. b. b.* (1880) 4 Bom 5  
*B. la. Yath v. Kislori* (1919) 31 All 11 I C 616 *Mubarak v. Ahmad* (19 4)

- 49 All 489 84 I C 740 (4) A A 38 [FB]  
 (m) *Shyam Ch. d v. Land Mortgage Bank* (1883) 9 Cal 69  
 (n) *Ganesh v. Shankar* (1886) 10 Bom 39  
*G. r. d v. Pamkrishna* (1888) 1 Bom 366 *P. j. r. m v. G. nesh* (1893) 23 Bom 131  
 (o) *Dugamber v. Hari* (19 7) 2 Bom L R 10 100 I C 1008 (27) A B 143  
 (p) *Du. ga. I. asad v. Shambhu* (1919) 41 All 656 51 I C 539  
 (q) *Lachman v. Balid o* (19 1) 1 Pat 619 69 I C 944 (2) A P 556  
 (r) *B. can Das v. Mut Chand* (1884) 6 All 173 *Mul. mmad v. Ca. ter* (188 5) 5 Mad 272 (d added under the Code of 1877 which did not include gratuities)

**Political pensions**—All pensions of a political nature payable directly by the Government of India are political pensions. A pension which the Government of India has given a guarantee that it will pay by a treaty obligation contracted with another sovereign power is a political pension (s). Arrears of political pension due to a pensioner and lying in the hands of Government at the time of his death do not lose their character of political pension by reason merely of the pensioner's death. The character of the funds remains unchanged so long as it remains unpaid in the hands of Government and it is not liable to attachment in the hands of Government in execution of a decree against the deceased. But once the fund has passed out of the hands of Government into the hands of the legal representative of the deceased it may be attached like any other portion of the deceased's estate (t).

A grant of a Zamindari by Government as a reward for past services rendered by him to Government is not a pension but a gift and may therefore be attached in execution of a decree against the grantee. The word pension in this section implies periodical payments of money by Government (u). Allowances granted to the Candyan pensioners of Ceylon (v) to the members of the family of the King of Oudh (w) to the members of the Mysore family (x) and to the descendants of the Nawab of Carnatic (y) or paid by a foreign State by an arrangement with the Government of India to a deposed Maharaja (z) are instances of political pensions.

**Private pensions**—Private pensions as distinguished from Government pensions are not exempt from attachment and they may be attached either as debts or as property belonging to the judgment debtor within the meaning of this section. But they neither constitute debts nor property belonging to the judgment debtor until they have become due and payable. Hence they cannot be attached before they have become due and payable. Pensions granted by Railway Companies to their servants are private pensions (a).

**Clause (h) allowances being less than salary of a public officer while absent from duty**—This clause is new. The allowances (being less than salary) of a public officer [s 2 (17)] while absent from duty are now wholly exempt from attachment. Under the Code of 1882 it was held in the absence of any specific provision as to these allowances that they stood on the same footing as the salary of a public officer while on duty and were exempt from attachment only to the extent to which such salary was exempt and no more [see cl (i)]. Thus where an officer was on sick leave on half pay which was Rs 100 it was held that the decree holder could attach Rs 70 (b). Under this clause the whole of Rs 100 is exempt from attachment.

**Clause (i) salary of public officer while on duty**—The salary of a public officer [s 2 (17)] can be attached only partially except where it does not exceed Rs 40 monthly in which case the whole of it is exempt from attachment. The object of the exemption appears to be to enable a public officer to maintain himself and his family in a position suitable to his rank. This exemption did not occur in the Code of 1859 hence the salary of a public officer and of the other persons mentioned in this clause was attachable to the extent of the whole as debt. And since it could only be attached as a debt it was not attachable until it had become due (c). Under the Codes of 1857 and 1882 and under the present Code the salary to the extent to which it is attachable

(i) *Ditamb v Imdad Ali* (191) 13 Cal 16  
17 I A 1st Mth Jan 1911 Cal 16  
(1903) 6 M d 43

(ii) *F. L. v. Anuja* (1903) 6 M d 69

(iii) *La. Am. v. Narain v. M. K. d.* (1901) 6 All 61

(iv) *M. K. v. Prince Alaya* (1903) 6 Mad  
43

(v) *E. Amba Nath v. Imdad Ali* (191) 13 Cal  
16 17 I A 151

(vi) *Malamed v. M. K. d.* (186) 7 W I 162

(vii) *Mahomed v. C. M. d.* (182) 4 M H C "

(viii) *D. v. K. d. v. M. d.* 5 M (19) 10 M d  
111 I C 1 C 8 ( ) 4 M 604

(ix) *E. v. K. d. v. M. d.* 5 M (19) 10 M d  
111 I C 1 C 8 ( ) 4 M 604

(x) *E. v. K. d. v. M. d.* 5 M (19) 10 M d  
111 I C 1 C 8 ( ) 4 M 604

(xi) *E. v. K. d. v. M. d.* 5 M (19) 10 M d  
111 I C 1 C 8 ( ) 4 M 604



may be attached *in advance* (d) It is no valid reason for refusing the attachment that the attachment if allowed would not leave the officer enough to live on (e) As to the salary of Army officers see notes below under the head Salary of Army officers See note above Amendment of the section

Salary of private servant—The salary of a private servant can be attached as a debt hence it cannot be attached *before* it has become due (f)

Clause (j) Indian Articles of War—The Indian Articles of War apply only to soldiers and followers of the Native Army see Act V of 1869 as amended by Act XII of 1894 Both these Acts have been repealed by the Indian Army Act 8 of 1911 and the reference to the Indian Articles of War in this clause must be read as referring to Act 8 of 1911 The pay of soldiers and followers of the Indian Army is under section of that Act exempt from attachment (g).

Clause (k) compulsory deposits in Provident Funds—The expression compulsory deposit is defined in s 2 (a) of the Provident Funds Act 19 of 1923 as being a subscription to or deposit in a Provident Fund which under the rules of the Fund is not until the happening of some specified contingency repayable on demand otherwise than for the purpose of the payment of premia in respect of a policy of life insurance and includes etc By s 3 of the Act it is provided that a compulsory deposit in any Government or Railway Provident Fund shall not be liable to attachment under any decree or order of any Civil Revenue or Criminal Court in respect of any debt of liability incurred by the subscriber or depositor A compulsory deposit cannot be attached so long as it retains the character of compulsory deposit A deposit which when it was made was a compulsory deposit continues to retain that character so long as it remains in the hands of the Railway Company It does not lose that character though the employee may have ceased to be in the service of the Company by retirement resignation or dismissal and though he may have become entitled in that event to be paid the amount due to his credit in the Provident Fund But once it is paid out by the Company on the happening of any of the above events it loses the character of compulsory deposit and it may be attached in the hands of the party to whom it has been paid (h) The same principle applies to the case of an optional subscriber who cannot under the rules demand payment of his deposits at his option (i)

Clause (l) wages of labourers—A labourer is a person who earns his daily bread by personal manual labour or in occupations which require little or no art skill or previous education Thus persons who agree to spin cotton and to receive a certain amount of money for a certain quantity of cotton spun by them are labourers and their wages cannot be attached (j)

Clause (m) expectancy of succession etc—The interest which a Hindu reversioner has in the immovable property of a deceased Hindu on the death of the deceased's widow is an expectancy of succession by survivorship in other words it is an interest expectant on the widow's death to which the reversioner could only succeed if he survived the widow (k) The interest in the pre-empted property of a successful

(d) *Beard v Egerton* (1883) 6 Mad 179 *Bhoyrub v M. dhub Chunder* (1880) 6 C L R 19

(e) *Deb Pra ad v Lewis* (1913) 40 All 13 43 I C 984

(f) *Ayva ayyar v Prasanna* (1898) 21 Mad 93 *Devi Prasad v Lewis* (1900) 31 All 304 I C 166

(g) *Browne v Pearce* (19 6) 48 All 73 39 I C 88 (26) A A 1 (2)

(h) *Terchand v B B & C I Railway* (190 ) 29 Bom 259 *Seti Manna Lal v Gainsford* (1908) 35 Cal 641 *H. naley v Joy Na san* (1919) 46 Cal 962 54 I C 439 *Secretary of State v Kaj Auma* (19 3) 50 Cal 347 7 I C 10 5 (73) A C 585 *Devi Prasad*

*v Secretary of State* (19 3) 45 All 554 74 I C 746 (24) A A 65 See also *Official Assignee v Madras v Mary Dalgarno* (1903) 28 Mad 440 and *Nagandas v Ghela bhas* (19 0) 44 Bom 873 56 I C 450 [Insolvency of railway servant] *Gauri Shankar v R J DeGruis* (1926) 1 Luck 313 92 I C 673 (27) A O 2 [Insolvency of railway servant]

(i) *Jagannath v Tara* (19 3) 3 Pat 74 80 I C 424 (24) A P 54

(j) *Jechand v Aha* (1881) 5 Bom 13

(k) *Ram Chunder v Dhurma* (1871) 15 W R FB 17 *Anandibai v R Jaram* (1898) 22 Bom 984

pre emptor who has not yet paid the pre emptive price fixed by his decree is a merely contingent interest which cannot be attached (l) see O 20 r 14 But the interest which a coparcener has in money awarded to him on partition is a vested interest although payment is deferred (m)

Clause (n) right to future maintenance.—If A is entitled to a monthly maintenance allowance under an agreement the allowance cannot be attached until after it has become due (n) It cannot be attached prospectively that is before it has become due (o) In other words *arrears* of maintenance may be attached but not the right to future maintenance A hereditary grant of an allowance of paddy out of the melwaram of certain land is not a right to future maintenance so as to be exempt from attachment under this section (p) Where a person holds villages under a deed which provides that he is to hold them and receive the profits in lieu of maintenance without power of transfer the interest of such person in the village is a right to future maintenance (q) But an annuity is not a right to future maintenance and it may be attached and sold (r) See note to s 51 Receiver of future maintenance

Salary of Army Officers — Sub sec (2) of the present section as it stood originally was as follows —

(2) Nothing in this section shall be deemed—

(a) to exempt houses and other buildings (with the materials and the sites thereof and the lands immediately appurtenant thereto and neces ary for their enjoyment) from attachment or sale in execution of decrees for rent of any such house buildings site or land or

(b) to affect the provisions of the Army Act or of any similar law for the time being in force

The italicized words and letters were replaced by the Repealing and Amending Act 10 of 1914, sch. II

It is provided by s 136 of the Army Act 1881 [stat 44 and 45 Vict] amended by the Army (Annual) Act of 189 that the pay of an officer or soldier of His Majesty's Regular Forces serving in India shall be paid to him *without deduction* unless the Legislature in India has directed to the contrary in that behalf. Under section 60 of the Code as it stood before the amendment above referred to questions arose as to the extent of application of the Army Act. As regards officers in the *British Army* it was held that they were officers of His Majesty's Regular Forces within the meaning of s 136 of the Army Act and that their salary therefore could not be attached at all (s). As regards officers in the *Indian Army* there was a conflict of decisions. The High Courts of Calcutta and Madras (t) held that an officer in the *Indian Army* was not an officer of His Majesty's Regular Forces within the meaning of s 136 of the Army Act and that his salary therefore was liable to be attached to the extent mentioned in s 60 (1) (i). On the other hand it was held by the High Court of Bombay (u) relying on s 190 sub s (8) of the said Act that an officer in the *Indian Army* was an officer of His Majesty's Regular Forces and that his salary therefore could not be attached at all.

|  |  |
|--|--|
| (d) <i>Corallorhiza innata</i> (1906) 3 All 383  | 6 1 b A v B <i>adla</i> (1923) 1 AU<br>71 (Hindu wild w)   |
| (m) <i>Alagurus m. v. Lalajma n</i> (19 6) 50 Mad<br>1 J 9 9 1 C 10 1 ( 6) 4 M 5 1   | (r) <i>S. dar B b v. Fay I da</i> (19 1) 43 AU<br>617 63 I C 181   |
| (n) <i>E. f. f. e. G. r. e. f. l. und</i> (1966) 6<br>W R M 61   | (s) <i>Electa d v. Fo. her</i> (1913) 3 Lorn 6<br>17 I C 13 <i>Lecky B. f. f. p. p. r. I. da</i><br>(1911) 33 All 5 v 9 I C 10 3 See 103<br>6 I C 8 6 <i>Fal la v. Aris</i> (1917)<br>40 Mad 30 31 I C 391 |
| (p) <i>I. f. y. a. th. a. v. E. g. y. a</i> (1907) 30 Mad 5  | (t) <i>C. cutta</i> <i>Trad. 4 socia n v. I. land</i><br>(1996) 1 Cal 1 B. a. r. o. n. v. L. y. d.<br>(1901) 5 Mad 4   |
| (q) <i>Faj d a v. a. r. g. u. n. v. S. u. n. d. a. s. B. b.</i> (19 5) 5<br>1 6 4 AU 33 87 I C 35 ( )<br>A 1 C 1 6 v. I. s. o. B. n. e. J. a. r. v. 6 1 b<br>A. u. (1 4) 16 AU 443 In app from | ( ) <i>A. g. h. i. v. C. v. D. r. i. d. s. o. n.</i> (1914) 33<br>Lorn 66 3 I C 5  |

Cl (b) of sub s (2) having been repealed the question arises whether the salary of an officer of His Majesty's Regular Forces can be attached under this section as salary of a public officer to the extent mentioned in cl (1) of sub s (1). It has been held by the High Courts of Allahabad (v) and Bombay (w) that it can be so attached. These cases must be distinguished from a Bombay case in which the question was whether the salary of a First Class Warrant Officer can be attached under the provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure in execution of a decree for maintenance obtained against him by his wife. It was held that it would not be attached under the Code. The ground of the decision was that a First Class Warrant Officer was a soldier as defined by s 190 of the Army Act that under s 145 of the Act no execution can issue against his pay in respect of the maintenance of his wife but a specified sum may be deducted for such maintenance from his pay and that an order had already been made for such deduction by the Commander in Chief (x).

Objection that property not liable to attachment and sale when to be raised—A obtains a decree against B and applies for execution of the decree by attachment and sale of certain property belonging to B. The property is attached and sold and purchased by C. B then applies to the Court to set aside the sale on the ground that the property was not liable to attachment and sale. Can the application be entertained? It has been held that if B was a party to the order for sale or was aware of it and did not appeal against it he is precluded from questioning the propriety of the order after the sale and he cannot therefore impeach the sale. A judgment debtor who might have raised objections prior to the sale but who has refrained from doing so and who might have appealed against the order for sale has no right after the sale has been carried out to prefer an objection that the property sold was not legally saleable (y). But if B was not aware of the proceedings in attachment of the property or of the proceedings in connection with the sale thereof the application to set aside the sale may be entertained even after the sale is confirmed (z). The same rule applies where a sale effected by the Collector is sought to be set aside on the ground that the property was not ancestral and therefore could not legally be sold by the Collector (a).

## 61 [New] The Local Government may, by general or special order published in the local official Gazette, declare that such portion of agricultural produce, or of any class of agricultural produce, as may appear to the Local Government to be necessary for the purpose of providing until the next harvest for the due cultivation of the land and for the support of the judgment-debtor and his family shall, in the case of all agriculturists or of any class of agriculturists, be exempted from liability to attachment or sale in execution of a decree

Partial exemption of agricultural produce

cultural produce, as may appear to the Local Government to be necessary for the purpose of providing until the next harvest for the due cultivation of the land and for the support of the judgment-debtor and his family shall, in the case of all agriculturists or of any class of agriculturists, be exempted from liability to attachment or sale in execution of a decree

(v) *Ho j v Ram Chanda* (1917) 39 All 509 39 J C 9 [case of an officer of the Indian Army]

(w) *Kering Rupch d d Co v Murray* (1919) 43 Bom 716 50 J C 643

(z) *Duckworth v Duckworth* (1919) 43 Bom 368 50 J C 427 *Brown v Pearce* (1919) 43 All 73 89 J C 88 (26) A A 122 (2) 7

(y) *Ramchha bar Misr v Bechu Bhavai* (188 ) 7 All 641 *Umed v Jaf Ram* (1907) 29 All

612 *Pa durang v Krishna* (1904) "8 Bom 15 *Dua Kanath v Tarini Sankar* (1907) 34 Cal 199 *Lala Ram v Thakur Prasad* (1918) 40 All 680 47 J C 947

(a) *Du ga Cha an Eali Prasanna* (1899) 26 Cal 727 73

(d) *Daulat Singh v Jugal Kishore* (1900) 22 All 108 See s 69 and Sch III to the Code

Be exempted from liability to attachment or sale —These words are wide enough to include agricultural produce which has been hypothecated See s 60 cl (b)

As to attachment of agricultural produce see O 21 rr 44 45 As to sale of such produce see O 21 rr 74 75

**62 [S 271]** (1) No person executing any process under this Code directing or authorizing seizure of movable property shall enter any dwelling-house after sunset and before sunrise

Seizure of property in dwelling house

(2) No outer door of a dwelling house shall be broken open unless such dwelling house is in the occupancy of the judgment debtor and he refuses or in any way prevents access thereto, but when the person executing any such process has duly gained access to any dwelling house, he may break open the door of any room in which he has reason to believe any such property to be

(3) Where a room in a dwelling-house is in the actual occupancy of a woman who, according to the customs of the country, does not appear in public, the person executing the process shall give notice to such woman that she is at liberty to withdraw, and, after allowing reasonable time for her to withdraw and giving her reasonable facility for withdrawing, he may enter such room for the purpose of seizing the property, using at the same time every precaution, consistent with these provisions to prevent its clandestine removal

Changes introduced in the section —This section corresponds with s 271 of the Code of 1882 except that the prohibition against breaking open any outer door of a dwelling house has been relaxed where the dwelling house is in the occupancy of the judgment debtor See note to s 55 Breaking open of outer door

Dwelling house —A shop or a godown is not a dwelling house within the meaning of this section (b)

**63 [S 285]** (1) Where property not in the custody of any Court is under attachment in execution of decrees of more Courts than one the Court which shall receive or realize such property and shall determine any claim thereto and any objection to the attachment thereof shall be the Court of highest grade, or, where there is no

Property attached in execution of decrees of several Courts

difference in grade between such Courts, the Court under whose decree the property was first attached

(2) Nothing in this section shall be deemed to invalidate any proceeding taken by a Court executing one of such decrees

Changes introduced in the section—This section corresponds with s 285 of the Code of 1882 except in the following particulars —

(1) The words *is under attachment* have been substituted for the words *has been attached* See notes below under the head *Is under attachment*

(2) Sub section (2) is new See notes below

Object of the section—The object of this section is to prevent different claims arising out of the attachment and sale of the same property by different Courts in other words it is to prevent confusion in the execution of decrees (c)

Application of the section—*A* attaches certain property in execution of a decree obtained by him against *B* in the Small Causes Court at Surat. The same property is subsequently attached by *C* in execution of a decree obtained against *B* in the Court of the Subordinate Judge at Surat. The Court of the Subordinate Judge is a Court of higher grade than the Small Causes Court and it is therefore the proper Court under this section for deciding objections to the attachment for determining claims made to the property and for ordering the sale thereof and receiving the sale proceeds (d)

Sub section (2)—This sub section is new. It declares in effect that a proceeding in execution shall not be deemed to be invalid merely because it was taken by a Court which having regard to sub section (1) ought not to have taken it. Under the Code of 1882 there was a conflict of decisions on the question whether the rule contained in s 285 of that Code [now sub sec (1)] was a rule of procedure only or whether it affected jurisdiction. The High Courts of Calcutta (e) Bombay (f) and Madras (g) held that the rule was merely a rule of procedure and did not oust the jurisdiction of the inferior Court in proceedings in execution of its own decree. On the other hand the High Court of Allahabad held that the section affected jurisdiction that is to say it took away the jurisdiction of the inferior Court in the several matters specified in the section (h). The result was that where a sale was effected by a Court of lower grade in a case where it ought to have been effected by a Court of higher grade the sale according to the Calcutta Bombay and Madras decisions was not for that reason invalid but according to the Allahabad decisions it was absolutely void as one made without jurisdiction. Sub section (2) gives effect to the Calcutta Bombay and Madras decisions (i).

There is yet another point which may be considered in the form of an illustration. *A* obtains a decree against *B* in the Court of a Subordinate Judge. In execution of the decree certain property belonging to *B* is attached by the Subordinate Judge's Court. *C* obtains a decree against *B* in a District Court. The same property is then attached by the District Court in execution of *C*'s decree. The

(c) *Pam Nara n v M's* (1898) — Cal 46 48  
*Byland Nath v Rajendra Nara n* (1896)  
1 Cal 333 338

(d) *Turmulil v Kalyandas* (189 ) 19 Bom 197  
*Bailu Lam v Kaphubur* (1894) 16 All 11

(e) *Bhakt Nath v P Jend o Narayan* (1886) 1  
C 1 333 *Ram Va n v M's* (1898)  
Cal 46 (op. Chand v Kartimunnassu  
(1907) 34 Cal 836

(f) *Abdul Karim v Thalordas* (1898) \* Bom  
88 *Tumullil v Kalyandas* (189 ) 19

Bom 17 *Patil V anji v Haridas*  
(1894) 18 Bom 458

(g) *K nhas n v Ith Kuttis* (1899) — Mad 9

(h) *Chis akji v Ja ak r* (1904) 26 All 538 *Ha*  
*Irased v Jag n Lal* (1905) 7 All 56

*D rpat v B bi Lam ach Pal* (1909) 31  
All 57 3 IC 31

(i) *Sr nsa harar v Appavoo* (1904) 47  
Mad L J 97 84 IC 263 ( 4)  
*A M 889 G ras v Sri Krishna* (19 3)  
33 Cal L J 65 69 75 IC 35 ( 4)  
AC 169

property is sold by the Subordinate Judge in execution of *A*'s decree although the proper Court to sell the property is the District Court and it is purchased by *X*. Subsequently the same property is sold by the District Court in execution of *C*'s decree and it is purchased by *Y*. Which of the two purchasers has the better title? According to the decision of the Calcutta High Court in *Bykant Nath v Rajendro Narain* (j) *X* the first purchaser would take an indefeasible title (1) if the sale was held by the Subordinate Judge's Court in ignorance of the attachment by the District Court and (2) the purchase was made by *X* without notice of the attachment by the District Court but if the sale was held by the Subordinate Judge's Court after notice of the attachment by the District Court or the property was purchased by *X* with notice of that attachment the purchase of *X* would be liable to be defeated by the purchase of *Y*. According to the decision of the Bombay High Court in *Abdul Karim v Thakordas* (k) it is quite enough to give an indefeasible title to *X* if he purchased without notice of the attachment by the District Court. The Bombay Court does not regard any notice which the inferior Court may have of the attachment by the superior Court as of any consequence for the simple reason that the jurisdiction of a Court cannot depend upon notice. A similar view has been taken by the Madras High Court (l). Under the present section it seems *X* would take an indefeasible title to the property whether or not he or the Subordinate Judge's Court had notice of the attachment by the District Court.

The result therefore is that where property is under attachment by two Courts of different grade and the property is sold by the Court of lower grade in contravention of the provisions of sub section (1) the sale is not thereby rendered invalid though the Court selling the property and the purchaser at the Court sale may be aware of the irregularity. The course to be adopted by the Court of higher grade in such a case is to accept the sale made by the lower Court and to call for the proceeds of the sale and to distribute them rateably amongst all the decree holders (m). Where both the Courts are subordinate to the District Court the procedure according to the Bombay High Court (n) is for the party interested to apply to that Court to have the sale proceeds transferred to the Court of higher grade according to the Calcutta High Court (o) the Court of higher grade should move the District Court for that purpose. In a recent case the Bombay High Court held that it is competent to the petitioner to apply to the Court of the higher grade for a transfer of the sale proceeds to that Court and that Court is competent to make the order (p).

If the same property is attached by a Munsiff and by a Subordinate Judge and is then sold by the Munsiff to *A* the sale is valid. But if after the sale the decree holder in the Subordinate Judge's Court applies to that Court for sale the question arises whether *A* is entitled to apply to the Subordinate Judge under s. 47 to stop the sale on the ground that the title to the property has passed to him. According to the Madras High Court he is the reason given being that he is the representative of the judgment debtor within the meaning of s. 47 (q). According to the Calcutta High Court he is not the reason given being that he is not the representative of the judgment debtor (r).

Is under attachment.—These words have been substituted for the words 'has been attached' to make it clear that the provisions of this section do not apply unless there are two or more attachments existing at the same time (s).

- (j) (1886) 12 Cal 333  
 (k) (1898) — Bom 88  
 (l) See *Kunhayan v Ilukuttu* (1899) — Mad 9  
 (m) See *Bykant Nath v Rajendro Narain* (1886) 12 Cal 333 335 *P.T.I.* v *J. v. H. Ridas* (1891) 18 Bom 458 463 *Vukanta v* (to (1919) 46 Cal 61 44 I C 49  
*A. Rupiah v Somasundaram* (1926) 51 Mad 601 641 I C 64 ( ) 4 A M 6

- (n) (1891) 18 Bom 458 *s. pra*  
 (o) (1919) 46 Cal 61 68-69 44 I C 49 *supra*  
 (p) See *Kayra v Chabhasappa* (1925) 49 Bom 625 80 I C 980 ( ) 5 A L 470  
 (q) See *Rasacharar v Apparao* (1914) 47 Mad 137 70 I C 84 I C 6 (21) A.M. 882  
 (r) *Mahdeo Lal v Darsan* (1911) 15 C W N 54 9 I C 194  
 (s) See *low H. Sjudha* (1 ) 6 All 5

**Decrees of more Courts than one** —This section applies only as between Civil Courts of different grades or as between Revenue Courts of different grades. It does not apply where one decree is that of a Civil Court and another that of a Revenue Court. Hence where the same property is attached by a Civil Court and a Revenue Court and it is sold by the Revenue Court the purchaser is entitled to the property and it cannot be sold in execution of the decree of the Civil Court (1)

**Rateable distribution**—See notes to s 73. Court to which application for execution should be made

**64 [S 276]** Where an attachment has been made, any private transfer or delivery of the property attached or of any interest therein and any payment to the judgment debtor of any debt, dividend or other moneys contrary to such attachment, shall be void as against all claims enforceable under the attachment

Private alienation of property after attachment to be void

**Explanation**—For the purposes of this section, claims enforceable under an attachment include claims for the rateable distribution of assets

Section 276 of the Code of 1882 was as follows —

When an attachment has been made by actual seizure or by written order duly intimated and made known in manner aforesaid any private alienation of the property attached whether by sale gift mortgage or otherwise and any payment of the debt or dividend or a delivery of the share to the judgment debtor during the continuance of the attachment shall be void as against all claims enforceable under the attachment

Private alienation of property after attachment to be void

**Changes introduced by the present section**—The present section differs from the corresponding s 276 C P C 1882 in the following respects —

- (1) The words by actual seizure or by written order duly intimated and made known in manner aforesaid after the words where an attachment has been made in s 276 have been omitted as being mere surplusage (u). See notes below. Where an attachment has been made
- (2) The words during the continuance of the attachment which occurred in s 276 have been omitted and the words contrary to such attachment have been substituted for them. See notes below. Contrary to such attachment
- (3) The explanation to the section is new. See notes below. Explanation to the section etc

**Object of the section**—I sue *B* for Rs 5000. *B* owns a house worth Rs 5000 and he has no other property. *B* may sell or mortgage the house notwithstanding the institution of the suit against him and he may sell or mortgage it even after a decree has been passed against him in the suit and the sale or mortgage in either case will be perfectly valid and pass a good title to the transferee (v). But if the property is attached

(1) *P. Shan L. v. Muham ad* (1911) 43 All 612  
63 I C 909

(u) *Sinnoppan v. Arun Chalam* (1919) 4 Mad

844 S.I.B. 53 I C 0  
(v) *P. Hen Chetty v. P. Malaga Chetty* (18 0) 2  
M H C 363

in execution of the decree any private transfer of the property by B contrary to such attachment shall be void as against all claims enforceable under the attachment. The object of the section is to prevent fraud on decree holders (u) and to secure intact the rights of the attaching creditor against the attached property by prohibiting private alienations pending attachment (x).

Where an attachment has been made —An attachment to render a subsequent alienation invalid must be made in the manner prescribed by the Code. Thus a promissory note must be attached by actual seizure as provided by O 21 r 51 and not by the issue of a prohibitory order. The mere issue of a prohibitory order does not amount to an attachment within the meaning of this section (y). Similarly in the case of immovable property the attachment to render a subsequent alienation invalid must be made in the manner prescribed by O 21 r 54 (z). An attachment made under that rule operates as a valid prohibition against alienation from the date on which the necessary proclamation is made and a copy of the order of attachment is affixed as provided by that rule and not from the date of the order of attachment (a). In *Mutha Chetti v Palaniappa* (b) Lord Shaw said — A fasciculus of clauses beginning at O 21 r 41 and applicable to attachment of property shows instance after instance that attachment is a real thing with a variety of real applications suited to the nature of the property to be attached. These instances go to show that under the Civil Procedure Code in India the most anxious provisions are enacted in order to prevent a mere order of a Court from effecting attachment and plainly indicating that the attachment itself is something separate from the mere order and is something which is to be done and effected before attachment can be declared to have been accomplished. Their Lordships need not repeat in another form these propositions. The order is one thing the attachment is another. No property can be declared to be attached unless first the order for attachment has been issued and secondly in execution of that order the other things prescribed by the rules in the Code have been done.

Attachment before judgment —An alienation of property made after attachment before judgment is void to the same extent as an alienation made after attachment under a decree (c). The attachment however must be made in the manner prescribed by the Code and in the case of immovable property as prescribed by O 21 r 54 (d). The High Court of Madras has held that an alienation of property after it is attached pursuant to an order for attachment before judgment is void under this section even though the property was not actually attached until after the passing of the decree (e) but this decision is of doubtful authority. See Notes above. Where an attachment has been made

Private transfer —The expression private transfer means a voluntary sale, gift or mortgage in contravention of the attachment and not the enforced execution of a conveyance or assignment in obedience to a decree of a Court competent to pass it (f). The decree may be one on an award (g). Releasing an easement by the

(w) *Shil ngappa v Chanbasappa* (1906) 0 Lom 337 339

(x) *Dobunthu v Jeymaraja* (190) 9 Cal 14 91 A 9

(y) *Sibbu v Chellaiya* (1903) 46 Mad 41 (3) A M 31 1 C 182

(z) *Nur sifm v (t f) (1904) All 58*

(a) *Dobunthu v Jeymaraja* (1904) 41 All 99

(b) *Satyajit v Madhob* (1905) 9 C W N 633 46 C 100 11 A 100

(c) *L. J. 501 88 1 C 31 (1) A 1 5 3*

(d) *L. J. 501 88 1 C 31 (1) A 1 5 3*

(e) *L. J. 501 88 1 C 31 (1) A 1 5 3*

(f) *L. J. 501 88 1 C 31 (1) A 1 5 3*

(b) (1904) 14 6 109 IC 66 (4) A PC 130

(c) *Gan v Jang Lal* (1902) 8 Cal 531 54 A 1136

(d) *L. J. 501 88 1 C 31 (1) A 1 5 3*

(e) *L. J. 501 88 1 C 31 (1) A 1 5 3*

(f) *L. J. 501 88 1 C 31 (1) A 1 5 3*

(g) *L. J. 501 88 1 C 31 (1) A 1 5 3*

(h) *L. J. 501 88 1 C 31 (1) A 1 5 3*

(i) *L. J. 501 88 1 C 31 (1) A 1 5 3*

(j) *L. J. 501 88 1 C 31 (1) A 1 5 3*

(k) *L. J. 501 88 1 C 31 (1) A 1 5 3*



dominant owner to the servient owner is a transfer within the meaning of this section (A)

**Contract for sale**—A contract of sale entered into before attachment does not create any interest or charge on the property which can prevail over the attachment (1)

A private transfer under this section is not absolutely void that is void as against all the world (2) but void only as against claims enforceable under the attachment —

(1) In execution of a decree obtained by A against B certain property belonging to B is attached. During the pendency of the attachment B mortgages the property to C. The property is then sold in execution of the decree and purchased by D. Here the mortgage having been made contrary to the attachment is void as against A's claim and D is entitled to take the property free from the mortgage created by B (1). This illustration shows the operation of the section. See note below. Private sale of property attached to decree holder

(2) B's property is attached in execution of a decree obtained by A against him. While the attachment is pending B sells the property to C and pays out of the sale proceeds the amount of the decree into Court and the attachment thereupon ceases [see O 21 r 5w]. The sale to C is valid the decree having been satisfied by payment into Court and there being no claim outstanding which is enforceable under the attachment (2). Moreover an alienation by means of which the decree in execution of which the attachment was made is satisfied can scarcely be regarded as an alienation contrary to the attachment (m)

(3) On the same principle where A attaches B's property in execution of a decree obtained by him against B and applications are thereafter made by other decree holders C, D and E for rateable distribution without attaching the property in execution of their decrees and subsequently B sells the property to F and pays off A (the attaching creditor) the other decree holders namely C, D and E are not entitled to question the alienation to F. In the first place the alienation can hardly be said to be an alienation contrary to the attachment within the meaning of this section for the alienation was the means by which the decree in execution of which the attachment was made was satisfied. In the next place it cannot be said that the claims of C, D and E are claims for the rateable distribution of assets within the meaning of the Explanation to the section for to bring s 73 [which provides for rateable distribution] into play certain conditions are necessary and one of them is that there should be assets held by the Court. In the case now under consideration no assets came into the hands of the Court at all. Therefore C, D and E are not entitled to question the alienation by B to F and the alienation is perfectly valid (m1)

(4) A decree holder though entitled to rateable distribution as contemplated by the Explanation to the section is not entitled to question a private alienation under this section unless his claim be one enforceable under the attachment within the meaning of this section. The attachment referred to in this section is the attachment under which the execution sale is made. Therefore a claim enforceable under the attachment means a claim enforceable under the attachment under which the execution sale is

- (A) *Kri lodhane v Nandar n* (1908) 35 Cal 889  
 (1) *Tarak Nath v Sanat* (19 9) 33 C W N 805  
 (2) A C 494  
 (2) *Anund Lal v Jullodhu* (187 ) 14 M I A 543 549 *Dend enath v Pamkumar* (1881) 7 Cal 107 118  
 (2) See *Srinata v Vellayan* (1926) 51 Mad L J 143 97 IC 718 (26) A.M. 966  
 (2) *Umesh Chauder v Raj Bullab* (188 ) 8 Cal

- 279 *Anund Lal v Jullodhu* (1872) 14 M I A 543 550 *Abdul Rashid v G pro Lal* (1898) 20 All 4 1 See also *Ak shachand v Vandram* (1911) 3 Bom. 516 12 IC 57  
 (m) *Annamalai v Palamala* (1918) 41 Mad 65 276 43 IC 539 [F 6]  
 (m1) *Annamalai v Palamala* (1918) 41 Mad 65 276 43 IC 539 [F B]

made (n) A claim under any other attachment is not a claim enforceable under the attachment within the meaning of this section The result is that—

if *A* obtains a decree against *B* and *B*'s property is attached in execution of the decree and

*B* subsequently alienates the property to *C* and

the property is thereafter attached and sold in execution of a decree obtained by *D* against *B* and it is purchased by *F*

and *C* sues *F* for possession

*C*'s title is to be preferred to *F*'s title and *C* is entitled to possession of the property *D* cannot object to the alienation to *C* for the alienation to *C* was prior to his attachment Nor is *A* entitled to question the alienation for the sale in execution was not made under his attachment but under *D*'s attachment The sale having been made under *D*'s attachment *A*'s claim cannot be said to be a claim enforceable under the attachment within the meaning of this section The result would be the same even if we substitute *A* for *D* that is even if the decree holder in both cases was the same person This is the effect of the decision of their Lordships of the Privy Council in *Mina Kumari v Bijoy Singh* (o) a case under s 276 of the Code of 1882 which did not contain the Explanation which now occurs at the end of the present section But the decision proceeded on the assumption that *Sorabji v Gound* (p) considered in the notes below was good law an assumption which involved the proposition now quoted in the Explanation *Mina Kumari*'s case therefore would also govern cases under the present section

If in the case put above the property was sold by the Court under *A*'s attachment instead of *D*'s and *D* had applied for execution before the Court received the proceeds of the sale the alienation to *C* would be void it being contrary to *A*'s attachment and further *D* would be entitled to rateable distribution under s 73

The attaching decree holder may agree with a purchaser of the property from the judgment debtor pending the attachment that he will not bring the property to sale in execution of his decree Such an agreement has the effect of rendering the alienation valid as against the attaching creditor (q)

Contrary to such attachment —These words have been substituted for the words during the continuance of the attachment which occurred in s 276 of the Code of 1882 The words during the continuance of the attachment were too wide in that they comprised alienations that could not possibly prejudice the rights of an attaching creditor as where property is mortgaged by *A* to *B* and the equity of redemption is subsequently attached at the instance of *C* in execution of a decree obtained by *C* against *A* and pending the attachment the mortgage is transferred by *B* and *A* to *D* In such a case the transfer of mortgage though made during the continuance of the attachment cannot prejudice *C* the attaching creditor for the effect of the transfer is merely to substitute *D* for *B* But the transfer having been made during the continuance of the attachment it came literally within the old section 2 6 though it was not contrary to the attachment and it was accordingly contended in a case before the Judicial Committee under s 276 that the transfer was void as against *C* But this contention was overruled Their Lordships held that the object of s 2 6 was merely to prohibit alienations contrary to the attachment and that an alienation such as the above by *B* and *A* to *D* cannot in any sense be said to be contrary to the attachment (r) The words contrary to the attachment have now been substituted for the words during the continuance of the

(n) *A* 6 la v I I al (1918) 41 Mad 6 6 32 43 1 C 39 [1 1]  
(o) (1917) 41 I A 7 44 Cal 60 40 I C 40  
(p) (190) 16 Bom 91  
(q) *C* ga v Fent t m ja (13) 31 44 Mad 1 J 60 1 C 832 (3) 4 M 31  
(r) *D* bu d m v Jog i ya (1901) 3 Cal 1 4

166 91 4 9 16 Sri ras v Tell i  
(19) 44 M 1 L J 913 916 917 8 I C  
349 (3) 4 M 334 [w] re the mort  
[H] r to the attachment was not k j t  
[H] J Prata a J lamart (19) 651 Mad  
L J 358 97 I C 93 (6) 4 M 11  
e 140 Q rba Ah v Ah of 1 (1  
4 AU 19 - 5

attachment and they give effect to the Privy Council ruling noted above. Similarly a renewal though pending the attachment of a mortgage already existing on the property is not a *trans* fer contrary to the attachment. But if the amount secured by the renewed mortgage exceeds the amount due under the original mortgage at the date of the attachment the additional security is to that extent void (s)

**Explanation to the section** Claims for rateable distribution of assets under s 73 are claims enforceable under an attachment within the meaning of this section—The Explanation to the section is new. A obtains a decree against B and in execution of the decree attaches Rs 7000 belonging to B in the hands of a Railway Company. B then assigns the said sum in the hands of the Railway Company to his attorneys for costs due to them subject to A's attachment. After the assignment C another creditor of B obtains a decree against B and in execution of his decree attaches the said sum in the hands of the Railway Company. Thereafter the Company pays the said sum to the Sheriff of Bombay. The assignment by B to his attorneys though made prior to C's attachment is void as against C's claim for C's claim is a claim for rateable distribution of assets [Rs 7000] within the meaning of s 73 and therefore a claim enforceable under the attachment of A by virtue of the Explanation to this section. C is therefore entitled to be paid in priority to B's attorneys. This is the law under the present Code and it is in accordance with the view taken by the Bombay High Court in *Sorabji v Gouind* (t) decided under s 276 of the Code of 1882. The view taken by the other High Courts was that C's claim being a claim merely for rateable distribution cannot be said to be a claim enforceable under the attachment but this view is no longer law (u). The Explanation gives effect to the Bombay decision. But the Explanation does not apply unless the claim of the subsequent decree holder can be said to be a claim for rateable distribution within the meaning of s 73. Now the essential condition of enforcement of claims for rateable distribution under s 73 is that there should be assets held by the Court [see s 73 below] and that condition was satisfied in *Sorabji v Gouind*. But if there be no assets received by the Court as would be the case if no payment was made by the Railway Company to the Sheriff and A's attachment came to an end [O 21 r 3] by B satisfying A's decree out of Court and then certifying it to the Court under O 21 r 2 C's claim cannot be enforced as a claim for rateable distribution and the assignment to the attorneys will prevail over any claim that may be made by C under his subsequent attachment (t). The Explanation to the section protects only those decree holders who are entitled to rateable distribution under s 73 and no decree holder can be entitled to rateable distribution under that section unless there are assets held by the Court (u). At the same time it must be noted that it is not enough that a decree holder is entitled to rateable distribution under s 73 to bring the Explanation into play it is also necessary that his claim must be one enforceable under the attachment within the meaning of the present section (x) see ill (4) on p 208 above. The result is that a decree holder is not entitled to the benefit of the Explanation and is not entitled to question a private alienation unless—

- (1) he is entitled to rateable distribution under s 73 for which it is absolutely necessary that there should be assets held by the Court and

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>(d) <i>Mahadevappa v Srinivasa</i> (188) 4 Mad 417</p> <p>(t) (189) 16 Bom 91 referred to in <i>Mina Kumari v Bhoj Singh</i> (1917) 44 I A 72 79 44 Cal 66 673 40 IC 4 and followed in <i>Chunilal v Karomchand</i> (19) 46 Lam 89 69 IC 161 (22) A B 241 <i>Pataya v A E L Mission</i> (19 6) 49 M d 38 9 IC 496 (26) A B 307</p> <p>(u) See <i>Manohar v Ram Aul</i> (1903) 25 All 431 <i>Kunhi v Makhi</i> (1900) 23 Mad 48 <i>Durga Churn v Monmohi</i> (1888) 15 Cal 771</p> | <p>(v) <i>Jetha Bhai &amp; Co v L Jay J vdas</i> (1912) 37 Bom 138 17 IC 6 <i>Mina Kumari v Bhoj Singh</i> (191) 44 I A 78 44 Cal 66 673 40 IC 21 <i>Annamalai v Palamalai</i> (1918) 41 Mad 65 78 43 IC 539</p> <p>(w) <i>Annamalai v Palamalai</i> (1918) 41 Mad 66 275 43 IC 539 <i>Chhaganlal</i> (19-8) 30 Bom L R 1488 (28) A B 545</p> <p>(x) <i>Vina Kumari v Bhoj Singh</i> (1917) 44 I A 7 79 44 Cal 662 673 40 IC 40</p> |
|--|---|

- (2) where there has been a sale in execution his claim is one enforceable under the attachment under which the sale was made as explained in ill (4) under note A private transfer under this section etc

As regards the first condition it is obvious that it cannot be present if the judgment debtor satisfies the claim of the decree holder out of Court and that is what happened in the undermentioned cases (y) In the Privy Council case of *Mina Kumari v Bijoy Singh* ( ) the first condition was satisfied or assumed to be satisfied but the second condition was not

Private transfer under O 21 r 83—The High Court of Bombay has held that a private transfer of his property by a judgment debtor made pursuant to the provisions of O 21 r 83 is absolute notwithstanding the provisions of this section even against claims enforceable under the attachment (a) The contrary has been held by the Madras High Court (b)

Attachment raised and subsequently restored—Where the property of a defendant is attached and the attachment is subsequently raised by the executing Court but the attachment is restored by the High Court on appeal the order of the High Court relates back to the date when the attachment was first made with the result that an alienation of the property made by the judgment debtor between the date on which the attachment was raised and that on which it was restored is void as against all claims enforceable under the attachment (c) The same principle applies where the property attached is released from attachment and subsequently re attached by the same Court in execution of the same decree (d)

Private sale to decree holder—A obtains a decree against B In execution of the decree B's property is attached Pending the attachment B sells the property to C A then buys the same property from B Is the sale to C void under this section? No because A bought the property not at a Court sale but by private treaty with B The title obtained by the purchaser on a private sale of property in satisfaction of a decree differs from that acquired upon a sale in execution Under a private sale the purchaser derives title through the vendor and cannot acquire a title better than his Under an execution sale the purchaser notwithstanding that he acquires merely the right title and interest of the judgment debtor acquires that title by operation of law adversely to the judgment debtor and freed from all alienations and incumbrances effected by him after the attachment of the property sold (e)

Effect of striking off execution proceedings or of removing them from the file—An attachment is not necessarily at an end because the execution case is struck off or removed from the file The effect of such a proceeding depends on the circumstances of each case Where after an attachment has been made the proceedings in execution are struck off or removed from the file under circumstances which render a fresh attachment necessary to bring the judgment debtor's property to sale a private transfer of the property by the judgment debtor made after the proceedings are struck off is valid though the same property may subsequently be re attached in execution of

(y) *Jetha Lal & Co v Ladd Jambai* (191) 37 Bom 138 17 IC 65 A *namala v Lala malai* (1918) 41 Mad 65 43 IC 539 [B] *J. G. Lam v Gangu* (1919) 1 B N 5 p 93 40 IC 134 *Bhup v Kundan Lal* (191) 43 All 399 160 IC 846 Another case in which there may be no ass't held by the Court is where the decree holder is given leave to bid and to set off the amount of the decree against the purchase money under O 21 r 7, and the former exceeds the latter *Minakari v Bijoy Singh* (1917) 44 LA 8 44 Cal 66 673 40 IC 42

(z) (191) 44 IL 7 44 Cal 66 40 IC 4  
(a) *Siveti gappa v Cha basappa* (1906) 9 Bom 337  
(b) *Tharayam v Lakshma* (1918) 41 Mad 616  
(c) *Aras Balash v Kaur* (191) 34 All 490 15 IC 49 *Gopal v Aasha* (1900) 4 All 39 5 IC 343  
(d) *Budhu v Lakshmi* (1900) 14 B L J 99 103  
(e) *Dendronath v Taralchandra* (1521) 7 Cal 107 *B. d. v. Lakshmi* (1900) 2 B L J 99

the same decree on a fresh application for execution. But if the execution proceedings are struck off or removed from the file under circumstances which do not render a fresh attachment necessary the transfer is void as against all claims enforceable under the attachment and the mere fact that a fresh application for attachment is subsequently made in execution of the same decree will not render the transfer valid. The reason is that in the former case the proceedings in execution are deemed to have terminated on their being struck off or removed from the file and the attachment is deemed to be at an end and the transfer having been made after the termination of the attachment it cannot be affected by the subsequent attachment. In the latter case however the proceedings in execution are merely *suspended* and the first attachment is therefore deemed to *subsist* and the second application for attachment is a superfluity (f). Whether the execution proceedings have been struck off or removed from the file under these or those circumstances is a question of fact in each case (g). But where a fresh application for attachment is made the presumption is that the first attachment has *ceased* and the burden of proof is on the party alleging that the first attachment was still *subsisting* when the second application was made and that the second application was superfluous (h). B's property is attached in execution of a decree obtained against him by A. The execution proceedings are then struck off. B then sells the property to C. The property is again attached on a fresh application by A. Is the sale valid? There being a fresh application for attachment the presumption is that the first attachment *ceased* from the moment the proceedings were struck off. The sale would therefore be valid and the second attachment inoperative unless A showed that the first attachment was still *subsisting* at the date of transfer and that the second application was superfluous.

The above cases would not have arisen if the Courts instead of making an order for striking off proceedings or removing proceedings from the file had made an order either dismissing the application or adjourning the proceedings where the Court was by reason of default on the part of the decree holder unable to proceed further with the proceedings in execution. The practice of striking off proceedings or removing proceedings from the file had no justification under any of the previous Codes. To put a stop to this practice it is now expressly provided by O 21 r 57 that where any property has been attached in execution of a decree but by reason of the decree holder's default the Court is unable to proceed further with the application for execution it shall either dismiss the application or for any sufficient reason adjourn the proceedings to a further date upon the *dismissal* of such application the attachment shall *cease*. Cases like the above are not likely to arise under this Code if the procedure prescribed by O 21 r 57 is strictly followed.

Attachment does not create a charge.—Attachment creates no charge or lien upon the attached property (i). It merely prevents and avoids private alienations; it does not confer any title on the attaching creditors (j). There is nothing in any of the provisions of the Code which in terms makes the attaching creditor a secured creditor or creates any charge or lien in his favour over the property attached (k). But an

- (f) *Aulien Lal v Charat Singh* (1901) 3 All 114. *Juddomo ee Doses v Muthooranath* (1874) 1 B L R 411. *Pearly Lal v Cha di Charan* (1906) 11 C W N 163. *Shauk Kamar ud-din v Jawah Lal* (1905) 3 I A 10.
- (g) *Mohunt Bhagwan v Khettar Mon* (1896) 1 C W N 617. *Pa gasom v Peras m* (1894) 17 Mad 58. *M ngul E shod v Gray Ka* (1894) 8 C I 51. *8 I A 13*. *Sri rita v S m Rao* (1894) 17 W I 180. *Mahomed v Isloor Mohu* (1894) Cal 909. 1 A 19. *David Al v Lam* (1915) 37 All 54. 30 I C 787. *Lakub Ali v D ga* (1915) 37 All 518. 30

- I C 877.
- (j) *Nafiz v Abdullah* (1894) 16 All 133.
- (k) *Sarkis v Buntho E e* (1860) 1 N W P H C Rep 17. *Soobut Chu der v Pussuk Lait* (1838) 15 Cal 20. *Zeminda of Jarret g v Trust e of T rumalai* (1909) 3 Mad 49. I C 18. *Frederick Peacock v Madon Gopal* (1904) 9 Cal 428.
- (j) *Mattal v K rab id n* (1898) 25 Cal 179. 1 I A 170. *Raghun th Das v Sund r Das* (1914) 42 Cal 7. 41 I A 51. I C 304. *Ram Bhaj v Jan Das* (1914) 3 Lah 418. 60 I C 70. (23) A L 261.
- (k) *Krust agency v Official Assignee of Madras* (1903) 26 Mad 673. 68

attaching creditor acquires by virtue of the attachment a right to have the attached property kept in *custodia legis* for the satisfaction of his debt and an unlawful interference with that right constitutes an actionable wrong. Thus it is an actionable wrong if *A* cuts and carries away crops attached by *B* in execution of a decree against *C* and a suit will lie at *B*'s instance against *A* to recover from *A* damages which should not however exceed the value of the attached property (*l*)

**Effect of order of adjudication on attachment**—Where a judgment debtor has been adjudicated an insolvent the whole of his property vests in the Official Assignee. What is the effect of an order of adjudication on an attachment levied prior to the date of the adjudication order? Has the attaching creditor by reason of his prior attachment priority over the Official Assignee in respect of the property attached by him prior to the date of the adjudication order or is the Official Assignee entitled to claim the attached property by virtue of the adjudication order as part of the property of the insolvent? It has been held that whether the attachment is one before judgment (*m*) or in execution of a decree (*n*) the attaching creditor has no priority over the Official Assignee and the latter is entitled to the attached property for the benefit of the creditors of the insolvent including the attaching creditors. These decisions are based on the ground that an attaching creditor does not obtain a charge or lien on the attached property. Once the order of adjudication is made the attaching creditor and other creditors of the insolvent stand on the same footing and they are entitled to a rateable distribution out of the property of the insolvent in the hands of the Official Assignee. In execution of a decree obtained by *A* against *B* property belonging to *B* is attached. *B* is subsequently adjudicated an insolvent. As a result of adjudication the property vests in the Official Assignee for the benefit of *B*'s creditors. See Presidency Towns Insolvency Act 1909 s. 53 and Provincial Insolvency Act 1920 s. 51.

**Effect of winding up order on attachment**—The position of the liquidator of a registered company differs from that of the Official Assignee in that the property of the company does not vest in him. An attachment therefore made on the property of the company at the instance of a decree holder before the winding up of the company cannot be released at the instance of the liquidator (*o*).

## SALE

**65 [S 316]** Where immovable property is sold in execution of a decree and such sale has become absolute, the property shall be deemed to have vested in the purchaser from the time when the property is sold and not from the time when the sale becomes absolute.

Corresponding section of the Code of 1882—Section 316 of the Code of 1882 ran as follows—

When a sale of immovable property has become absolute in manner aforesaid the Court shall grant a certificate stating the property sold and the name of the person who at the time of sale is declared to be the purchaser. Such certificate shall bear the

- (l) *Sanlalal Iga v Kandasami* (190) 30 Mad 415  
 (m) *Krishna v v Official Assignee of Madras* (1903) 6 Mad 63  
 n) *Frederick Jeacock v Madan Gopal* (1900) 29 Cal 433 *Jitma d v Jamedani* (1905) 9 Bom 40 *Shri Chandra v M. Anand Lal*

- (191) 31 All 69 16 I C 153 *I. Jhankar Das v Su das Das* (1914) 41 I C 231 4 Cal 41 C 304 *Mukund v Sh. ref. I. d. v. Mohan* (1919) 41 All 5 I C 64  
 (o) *Amrita Lal v Anandul* (1916) 43 Cal 341 C 53

date of the confirmation of the sale and so far as regards the parties to the suit and persons claiming through or under them the title to the property sold shall vest in the purchaser from the date of such certificate and not before

Provided that the decree under which the sale took place was still subsisting at that date

The first part of section 316 now stands as O 21 r 94 with slight verbal alterations. The second part with certain substantial alterations to be presently noted stands as s 65. The proviso to s 316 has been omitted altogether.

Changes introduced in the section.—Under s 316 of the Code of 1882 the title to immovable property sold at an execution sale vested in the purchaser from the *date of the certificate of sale* that is the date on which the sale became absolute. Under the present section the title to such property where the sale has become absolute vests in the purchaser from the *time when the property is sold* and not from the time when the sale becomes absolute.

The proviso to s 316 has been omitted. It is therefore no longer necessary that the decree should be subsisting at the time of the confirmation of sale.

Vesting of property in auction purchaser.—In the case of a private sale of immovable property the property vests in the purchaser from the time when the deed of sale is executed. The reason is that a voluntary sale becomes absolute on execution and delivery of the deed by the vendor. In the case however of a Court sale, the property does not vest in the purchaser immediately on the sale thereof. The reason is that a compulsory sale does not become absolute until some time after the sale. A period of at least thirty days must expire from the date of sale before the sale can become absolute. During that period the sale is liable to be set aside at the instance of the judgment debtor on the ground of irregularity in publishing or conducting the sale or on deposit by him in Court of the amount specified in the sale proclamation together with a percentage on the purchase money by way of compensation to the purchaser [O 21 rr 89 90]. The application by the judgment debtor to set aside the sale in either of these two cases must be made within 30 days from the date of sale. Where no such application is made the Court must make an order confirming the sale *and it is upon such confirmation that the sale becomes absolute* [O 21 r 92]. After the sale has become absolute a certificate is granted by the Court to the purchaser which is called a certificate of sale [O 21 r 94]. Such certificate bears as date the day on which the sale became absolute. It is only when the sale becomes absolute that the property sold vests in the purchaser (p). But though the property does not vest in the purchaser until the sale has become absolute when it does vest in him it *shall be deemed to have vested on the sale becoming absolute from the time when it was sold*. The vesting of the property is thus made to relate back to the date of sale (q).

Successive purchasers at sales in execution of money decrees.—Under the Code of 1882 s 316 the property sold vested in the purchaser from the date of the certificate of sale and not before. This gave rise to some difficulty when the question arose as to which of two successive auction purchasers should have priority in cases where the later purchaser had the certificate of sale issued to him first. Had the question been determined with exclusive reference to the terms of that section the priority would have rested with the purchaser who first procured the certificate of sale. But this inequitable result was avoided and the difficulty was got over by holding that the first purchaser had by his prior purchase obtained an *equitable* interest in the property and that the subsequent purchaser must be deemed to have purchased the property *subject to such*

(p) *Fahnu v Furuff* (1905) 7 Bom L R. 963 | (q) See *Add'l Fahman v Fateh Khan* (1906) 28 I C 96 (5) A B 453 | 4 Luck 80 91 I C 1017 (20) A O 189

interest (r) No such difficulty can arise under this Code for it is provided by the present section that the property is to be deemed to have vested in the purchaser from the date of sale and not from the date of the certificate of sale

### Illustration

In execution of a money decree obtained by A against B certain immovable property belonging to B is sold and purchased by P1. The same property is subsequently purchased by P2 at a sale in execution of a money decree obtained by C against B. P2 obtains a certificate of sale first and is placed in possession of the property. Subsequently P1 obtains a certificate of sale and sues P2 for possession. Under the present section P1 is entitled to possession for the property is to be deemed to have vested in him from the date of sale and the sale to him was prior to the sale to P2. The same result was arrived at under the Code of 1882 by holding that P2 bought subject to P1's equitable interest and he could not therefore retain possession against P1 after P1's title was perfected by the issue of a certificate to him.

But where property is sold in execution of a decree to P1 and the sale is *et aside* on the ground of irregularity under O 21 r 90 and the same property is subsequently sold in execution of another decree and is purchased by P2, P2 is entitled to priority as against P1 even though the sale to P1 may subsequently be confirmed. The sale to P1 not having been confirmed until after the sale to P2, P1 is not entitled to priority over P2. Even under the Code of 1882 P1 would not be entitled to priority over P2 for the sale to him (P1) having been set aside it could not be said that P1 purchased subject to P1's interest in the property. P1 had no interest in the property when it was sold to P2 (s).

Successive purchasers at sales in execution of mortgage decrees—Priority between successive purchasers of the same mortgaged property in execution of mortgage decree against the same mortgagor is determined by the dates of the several purchases and not by the dates of the several mortgages (t).

Suit for possession by auction purchaser—It was held under the Code of 1889 that a purchaser of immovable property at a Court sale could not maintain a suit for possession thereof against a third person unless he had a certificate of sale issued to him before suit although the sale had become absolute. The reason given was that the transfer of property to a purchaser at a Court sale was not complete until a certificate of sale was issued to him. The decisions turned upon the language of s 259 which provided that the certificate shall be taken and deemed to be a valid transfer of such right title and interest as had passed from the judgment debtor to the purchaser. The line of reasoning adopted was that if a certificate was to be taken as a transfer the transaction must necessarily be incomplete until the certificate was issued. The said words were construed as controlling the operation of s 201 which provided that a sale became absolute when it was confirmed by the Court (u). But it was held that *as against the judgment debtor and his representatives* the purchaser's title became complete on the confirmation of the sale (v). Under the present section it seems that an auction purchaser can maintain a suit for possession even against a person not a party to the suit after the sale is confirmed by the Court though no certificate has been issued to him before the institution of the suit provided it is produced at or before the proving of the decree. The reason is that property under the present section vests in the purchaser

(r) *1 Ashrafi v. Farid* (1896) 10 Bom. 43  
(s) *1 Ashrafi v. Farid* (1896) 10 Bom. 43

(t) *1 Ashrafi v. Farid* (1896) 10 Bom. 43

(u) *1 Ashrafi v. Farid* (1896) 10 Bom. 43

(v) *1 Ashrafi v. Farid* (1896) 10 Bom. 43

(w) *1 Ashrafi v. Farid* (1896) 10 Bom. 43

(x) *1 Ashrafi v. Farid* (1896) 10 Bom. 43



date of the confirmation of the sale and so far as regards the parties to the suit and persons claiming through or under them the title to the property sold shall vest in the purchaser from the date of such certificate and not before

Provided that the decree under which the sale took place was still subsisting at that date

The first part of section 316 now stands as O 21 r 94 with slight verbal alterations. The second part with certain substantial alterations to be presently noted stands as s 65. The proviso to s 316 has been omitted altogether.

Changes introduced in the section.—Under s 316 of the Code of 1882 the title to immovable property sold at an execution sale vested in the purchaser from the *date of the certificate of sale* that is the date on which the sale became absolute. Under the present section the title to such property where the sale has become absolute vests in the purchaser from the *time when the property is sold* and not from the time when the sale becomes absolute.

The proviso to s 316 has been omitted. It is therefore no longer necessary that the decree should be subsisting at the time of the confirmation of sale.

Vesting of property in auction purchaser.—In the case of a private sale of immovable property the property vests in the purchaser from the time when the deed of sale is executed. The reason is that a voluntary sale becomes absolute on execution and delivery of the deed by the vendor. In the case however of a Court sale the property does not vest in the purchaser immediately on the sale thereof. The reason is that a compulsory sale does not become absolute until some time after the sale. A period of at least thirty days must elapse from the date of sale before the sale can become absolute. During that period the sale is liable to be set aside at the instance of the judgment debtor on the ground of irregularity in publishing or conducting the sale or on deposit by him in Court of the amount specified in the sale proclamation together with a percentage on the purchase money by way of compensation to the purchaser [O 21 rr 89 90]. The application by the judgment debtor to set aside the sale in either of these two cases must be made within 30 days from the date of sale. Where no such application is made the Court must make an order confirming the sale *and it is upon such confirmation that the sale becomes absolute* [O 21 r 92]. After the sale has become absolute a certificate is granted by the Court to the purchaser which is called a certificate of sale [O 21 r 94]. Such certificate bears as date the day on which the sale became absolute. It is only when the sale becomes absolute that the property sold vests in the purchaser (p). But though the property does not vest in the purchaser until the sale has become absolute when it does vest in him it *shall* be deemed to have vested on the sale becoming absolute *from the time when it was sold*. The vesting of the property is thus made to relate back to the date of sale (q).

Successive purchasers at sales in execution of money decrees.—Under the Code of 1882 s 316 the property sold vested in the purchaser from the date of the certificate of sale and not before. This gave rise to some difficulty when the question arose as to which of two successive auction purchasers should have priority in cases where the later purchaser had the certificate of sale issued to him first. Had the question been determined with exclusive reference to the terms of that section the priority would have rested with the purchaser who first procured the certificate of sale. But this inequitable result was avoided and the difficulty was got over by holding that the first purchaser had by his prior purchase obtained an *equitable* interest in the property and that the subsequent purchaser must be deemed to have purchased the property *subject to such*

(p) *Fulhu v. Jus* ff (19-5) 1 Bom. L. R. 963 [ (q) See *Abd. Rahman v. Fat. A. Ya. ain* (19 6) 88 I C 96 (A) A B 433 4 Luck. 89 91 I C 1047 (6) A O 189 ]

interest (r) No such difficulty can arise under this Code for it is provided by the present section that the property is to be deemed to have vested in the purchaser from the date of sale and not from the date of the certificate of sale

### Illustration

In execution of a money decree obtained by A against B certain immovable property belonging to B is sold and purchased by P1. The same property is subsequently purchased by P2 at a sale in execution of a money decree obtained by C against B. P2 obtains a certificate of sale first and is placed in possession of the property. Subsequently P1 obtains a certificate of sale and sues P2 for possession. Under the present section P1 is entitled to possession for the property is to be deemed to have vested in him from the date of sale and the sale to him was prior to the sale to P2. The same result was arrived at under the Code of 1882 by holding that P2 bought subject to P1's equitable interest and he could not therefore retain possession against P1 after P1's title was perfected by the issue of a certificate to him.

But where property is sold in execution of a decree to P1 and the sale is *set aside* on the ground of irregularity under O 21 r 90 and the same property is subsequently sold in execution of another decree and is purchased by P2 P2 is entitled to priority as against P1 even though the sale to P1 may subsequently be confirmed. The sale to P1 not having been confirmed until after the sale to P2 P1 is not entitled to priority over P2. Even under the Code of 1882 P1 would not be entitled to priority over P2 for the sale to him (P1) having been set aside it could not be said that P2 purchased subject to P1's interest in the property. P1 had no interest in the property when it was sold to P2 (s).

**Successive purchasers at sales in execution of mortgage decrees—** Priority between successive purchasers of the same mortgaged property in execution of mortgage decree against the same mortgagor is determined by the dates of the several purchases and not by the dates of the several mortgages (t).

**Suit for possession by auction purchaser—** It was held under the Code of 1850 that a purchaser of immovable property at a Court sale could not maintain a suit for possession thereof *against a third person* unless he had a certificate of sale issued to him before suit although the sale had become absolute. The reason given was that the transfer of property to a purchaser at a Court sale was not complete until a certificate of sale was issued to him. The decisions turned upon the language of s 259 which provided that the certificate shall be taken and deemed to be a valid transfer of such right title and interest as had passed from the judgment debtor to the purchaser. The line of reasoning adopted was that if a certificate was to be taken as a transfer the transaction must necessarily be incomplete until the certificate was issued. The said words were construed as controlling the operation of s 254 which provided that a sale became absolute when it was confirmed by the Court (u). But it was held that *as against the judgment debtor and his representatives* the purchaser's title became complete on the confirmation of the sale (v). Under the present section it seems that an auction purchaser can maintain a suit for possession even against a person not a party to the suit after the sale is confirmed by the Court though no certificate has been issued to him before the institution of the suit provided it is produced at or before the passing of the decree. The reason is that property under the present section vests in the purchaser

(r) *1882* 10 B. 453  
(s) *1882* 11 B. 11  
(t) *1882* 2 All 16  
(u) *1882* 4 All 4

(v) *1882* 11 B. 11  
(w) *1882* 11 B. 11  
(x) *1882* 11 B. 11  
(y) *1882* 11 B. 11  
(z) *1882* 11 B. 11

immediately the sale is confirmed by the Court and the vesting is not postponed until the grant of a certificate. In a case under the Code of 1859 where the equity of redemption of the judgment debtor was sold it was held that the purchaser was entitled to sue the mortgagee for redemption even before the issue of the certificate the reason given being that the suit was not one in ejectment on title, but one for redemption and therefore of an equitable nature and the purchaser was equitably entitled to redeem. The certificate in that case was produced at the hearing (w).

**Mesne profits**—Under the Code of 1882 the property sold vested in the purchaser from the date of the sale certificate and not before. Hence it was held that the purchaser was entitled to mesne profits from the date of the certificate and not from the date of sale (x). Under the present section the property is to be deemed to vest in the purchaser from the date of sale. The purchaser therefore is entitled to mesne profits from the date of sale (y).

**Title of auction purchaser**—Under the Code of 1882, property sold in execution of a decree vested in the purchaser so far as regards the parties to the suit and persons claiming through or under them. That is to say a purchaser at a Court sale was entitled to hold the property only against the judgment debtor and his representative but not against third parties. The words italicized above which occurred in s 316 of the Code of 1882 have been omitted in the present section. The omission however has not the effect of enlarging the purchaser's rights and a purchaser at a judicial sale will now as before get a good title only against persons bound by the decree but not against strangers (z).

**Sale when void and when voidable**—A sale in execution of a decree is void if the Court had no jurisdiction to sell the property. Thus a Court has no jurisdiction to sell property in execution of a decree if the notice required by O 21 r 22 is not served (a). Similarly a Court has no jurisdiction to sell the property of a person who was not a party to the suit in which the property was sold or properly represented on the record (b). Again the Court of first instance has no jurisdiction to sell property after an order is made by the appellate Court for stay of execution (c). In each of these cases the sale is a nullity and may be disregarded without any proceeding to set it aside (d).

But where a Court has jurisdiction to sell the property and there has been an irregularity in the course of execution proceedings the sale is not void but merely voidable. Thus where the notice required by O 21 r 22 is served upon a person who was not in fact the legal representative of the deceased judgment debtor but whom the Court wrongly held to be his legal representative the sale is voidable and not void (e). Similarly a sale is voidable and not void if there has been material irregularity or fraud in publishing or conducting the sale [O 21 r 90].

**Irregularities of procedure in obtaining decrees or in execution proceedings**—Provided that the Court has jurisdiction to sell a purchaser at a Court sale is not bound to inquire into the correctness of the decree or of the order for sale. To hold that a purchaser at a sale in execution is bound to inquire into such matters would throw a great impediment in the way of purchasers under executions. If the Court has jurisdiction a purchaser is no more bound to inquire into the correctness of an order for execution than he is as to the correctness of the judgment upon which the execution

(w) See *Krishany v Ganesh* (188 ) 6 Bom 199

(x) *Am Kazim v Darbars* (190 ) 4 All 47  
*Niam Lal v Nalle Lal* (1911) 33 All 63  
7 I C 6

(y) See *Ma Hava Bi v Sin Kho* (19 ) 5 Rang  
803 109 I C 151 ( ) 8 A R 6

(z) See *Um a Chander v Z h r Fatima* (1921)  
18 C I 164 178 17 I A 01

(a) *P ghunath v Su der D s* (1914) 41 I 4  
2 1 4 C I 7 4 I C 204

(b) *Kha aymal v Da m* (190 ) 3 C I 96  
313 315 3 I A 3 *Iatha Eras v Lal*

*S hab* (1891) 13 All 53 17 I A 150 *Ben*

*Eras d v M kkte ar* (1899) 1 All 318

*Pa had v M v Muhammad d* (1909) 36

1 A 169 31 All 572 3 I C 864

*Fajda sa v Lal hm a asamma* (1915)

38 Mad 1076 29 I C 314

(c) *Pam nathan v Aru achellam* (1915) 33 M d

766 1 C 90

(d) 3 Cal 26 31 *supra*

(e) *Mallary n v N h ri* (1901) Bom 337

318 7 I A 16

issues (f) Strangers to a suit are justified in believing that the Court has done that which by the direction of the Code it ought to do (g) Therefore when property sold in execution of a decree under the order of a competent Court is purchased by a stranger *bona fide* and for value the sale cannot be set aside on the ground that the judgment debtor had a cross decree of a higher amount and the Court therefore ought not to have directed the sale (h) or that the decree had been satisfied out of Court before the sale (i) or that the Court wrongly held that the defendant was served with the summons and on that finding passed an *ex parte* decree against him (j) or that though an attachment was subsisting at the date of the sale the decree holder's application for an order of sale had been dismissed for want of prosecution *before* sale (k) or that the property was not liable to attachment and sale within the meaning of s 60 (l) or that the execution of the decree was barred by limitation (m) or that the decree proceeded upon an erroneous view of the law (n) or that the decree was one which the Court ought not to have passed (o) See notes to s 60 Objection that property not liable to attachment and sale when to be raised on p 202 above notes to O 21 r 22 Consequence of omission to give notice and Notice to wrong person and notes to O 21 r 90 Material irregularity in publishing or conducting the sale

The above principles apply in favour of a third party purchasing at a Court sale They do not apply where the decree holder himself is the purchaser The reason is that where the decree holder himself is the purchaser he must be held to have had notice of all the facts relating to the suit and execution proceedings (p) Nor do they apply in favour of a party to the suit though he may not be a decree holder (q)

Effect of reversal of decree upon sale where decree reversed after confirmation of sale—There is a great distinction between decree holders who come in and purchase under their own decree which is afterwards reversed or modified and *bona fide* purchasers who come in and buy at a sale in execution of the decree to which they are no parties and at a time when that decree is a valid and subsisting decree and when the order for sale is a valid order A *bona fide* purchaser who is a stranger to the decree does not lose his title to the property by the subsequent reversal or modification of the decree But where the decree holder himself is the purchaser the sale may be set aside if the decree is subsequently reversed or modified Where the purchaser is a stranger the judgment debtor whose property is sold is entitled only to the sale proceeds of the property if the decree is subsequently reversed But where the purchaser is the decree holder he is bound to restore the property to the judgment debtor (r) A sale in execution of a decree at which a third party becomes the purchaser is upheld notwithstanding the subsequent reversal of the decree because otherwise there will be less inducement to intending

- (f) *Je a M'lon v J m'ken S gh* (188 ) 14 Cal 18 131 A 108 *Mol ara Mol n Glose v Allos J unar Al ter* (1888) 25 C 167 *avana v Lal a* (1896) 19 Mad 19 3  
(g) *Maliaryun v Narha* (1901) — Bom 337 347 7 I A 16 *Arash Nath v Ha* : C 1 (1911) 38 Cal 6 6.7 10 I C 61  
(h) *Fe a Malton v F m'ken Singh* (188 ) 14 Cal 18 131 A 106  
(i) *Methura M'ra Ghos v Alhoj Fu ar Miter* (1888) 1 Cal 557 *Ilappa v I et d* (1897) 21 Bom 463  
(j) 38 Cal 6 10 I C 361 s pra  
(k) *J oas is v Jerna om* (1 91) 17 Mad 5  
(l) *Dra l kath v T r* (190 ) 34 Cal 199 *med v Jas I m* (1907) 23 All 61 *I a d ra g v Arushay* (1907) 3 Bom 15  
(m) *S roli Churn Mahomed* (1865) 11 Cal 376  
(n) *Cirda re Lall v Kant so Lall* (1 5) 14

- Len L R 197 11 A 31  
(o) *Pa stia v Ch d Sm* (1900) 2 All 37 *K d ot ulah v Lubra Lega n* (1901) 3 All 25  
(p) *I l symal v Daim* (100 ) 5<sup>th</sup> Cal 96 315 — I A 23 *M a K ma i J pat eta* (1884) 10 Cal 20 *C napper haf v C pat* 94 (188 ) 11 I A 31  
(q) *Offi l Jecet v Chettiappa* (19 ) 43 Mad 67 91 I C 16 ( 6) A 31 78  
(r) *Zo l 484 n v M hammad Ashtar Al* (1888) 10 All 166 15 I A 17 *Muthada v op i C der* (1899) 26 Cal 34 *et l ed l v Srinath* (1900) 27 Cal 810 *I a vath v Haru Charan* (1911) 34 Cal 6 6 10 I C 361 *SA etai v l zoo* (1919) 43 Bom 3. 33 48 I C 130 *J uar Lal v H n f un Naid* (1916) 3 All 40 34 I C 303 (transfer purchaser) *IA J amad v Chamsal* (1916) 1 Lat L J 43 46 34 I C 747 (decree-holder purchaser) *Alpha H an n Qas m Al* (19.5) 23 All L J 916 69 I C 1019 ( 6) A 35

immediately the sale is confirmed by the Court and the vesting is not postponed until the grant of a certificate. In a case under the Code of 1859 where the equity of redemption of the judgment debtor was sold it was held that the purchaser was entitled to sue the mortgagee for redemption even before the issue of the certificate the reason given being that the suit was not one in ejectment on title but one for redemption and therefore of an equitable nature and the purchaser was equitably entitled to redeem. The certificate in that case was produced at the hearing (w).

**Mesne profits**—Under the Code of 1882 the property sold vested in the purchaser from the date of the sale certificate and not before. Hence it was held that the purchaser was entitled to mesne profits from the date of the certificate and not from the date of sale (x). Under the present section the property is to be deemed to vest in the purchaser from the date of sale. The purchaser therefore is entitled to mesne profits from the date of sale (y).

**Title of auction purchaser**—Under the Code of 1882 property sold in execution of a decree vested in the purchaser *so far as regards the parties to the suit and persons claiming through or under them*. That is to say a purchaser at a Court sale was entitled to hold the property only against the judgment debtor and his representative but not against third parties. The words italicized above which occurred in s. 316 of the Code of 1882, have been omitted in the present section. The omission however has not the effect of enlarging the purchaser's rights and a purchaser at a judicial sale will now as before get a good title only against persons bound by the decree but not against strangers (z).

**Sale when void and when voidable**—A sale in execution of a decree is void if the Court had no jurisdiction to sell the property. Thus a Court has no jurisdiction to sell property in execution of a decree if the notice required by O 21 r 22 is not served (a). Similarly a Court has no jurisdiction to sell the property of a person who was not a party to the suit in which the property was sold or properly represented on the record (b). Again the Court of first instance has no jurisdiction to sell property after an order is made by the appellate Court for stay of execution (c). In each of these cases the sale is a nullity and may be disregarded without any proceeding to set it aside (d).

But where a Court has jurisdiction to sell the property and there has been an irregularity in the course of execution proceedings the sale is not void but merely voidable. Thus where the notice required by O 21 r 22 is served upon a person who was not in fact the legal representative of the deceased judgment debtor but whom the Court wrongly held to be his legal representative the sale is voidable and not void (e). Similarly a sale is voidable and not void if there has been material irregularity or fraud in publishing or conducting the sale [O 21 r 90].

**Irregularities of procedure in obtaining decrees or in execution proceedings**—Provided that the Court has jurisdiction to sell a purchaser at a Court sale is not bound to inquire into the correctness of the decree or of the order for sale. To hold that a purchaser at a sale in execution is bound to inquire into such matters would throw a great impediment in the way of purchasers under executions. If the Court has jurisdiction a purchaser is no more bound to inquire into the correctness of an order for execution than he is as to the correctness of the judgment upon which the execution

(w) See *Krishna ji v Ganesh* (198) 6 Bom 133.

(x) *I. r. I. a. r. v D. b. s.* (190) 21 All 47.

(y) *Sh. m. Lal v. Vathe Lal* (1911) 33 All 63.

(z) See *Ma Hara El v. Sen Khe* (190) 5 R. J. 803 102 I. C. 151 (3) A. R. 6.

(a) *S. e. U. v. Cha. der v. Zahor Fatima* (1891) 18 Cal 164 178 17 I. A. 91.

(b) *Pogh. atha v. S. der Das* (1914) 41 I. A. 140 Cal 11 C 504.

(c) *Khai. aymal v. D. m.* (1901) Cal 96.

(d) 313 315 3 I. A. 3 R. dha. I. r. a. s. Lal.

*Shahab* (1891) 13 All 53 17 I. A. 150 *De. i.*

*I. r. a. d. v. M. khtenar* (1899) 21 All 316.

*I. r. a. d. v. a. v. Muhammad* (1909) 38

I. A. 165 31 All 572 31 C 864.

*Paydanna v. Lat. hm. ar. som. a.* (1915)

33 Mad 1076 9 I. C. 314.

(e) *Pamanath a. dr. chellam* (1915) 5 Mad

766 2 I. C. 90.

(d) 3 Cal 96 31 *sup. a.*

(e) *Malkary v. V. ar. h. r.* (1901) Bom 337

318 7 I. A. 216.

issues (f) Strangers to a suit are justified in believing that the Court has done that which by the direction of the Code it ought to do (g) Therefore when property sold in execution of a decree under the order of a competent Court is purchased by a stranger *bona fide* and for value the sale cannot be set aside on the ground that the judgment debtor had a cross decree of a higher amount and the Court therefore ought not to have directed the sale (h) or that the decree had been satisfied out of Court before the sale (i) or that the Court wrongly held that the defendant was served with the summons and on that finding passed an *ex parte* decree against him (j) or that though an attachment was subsisting at the date of the sale the decree holder's application for an order of sale had been dismissed for want of prosecution *before* sale (k) or that the property was not liable to attachment and sale within the meaning of s 60 (l) or that the execution of the decree was barred by limitation (m) or that the decree proceeded upon an erroneous view of the law (n) or that the decree was one which the Court ought not to have passed (o) See notes to s 60 Objection that property not liable to attachment and sale when to be raised on p 202 above notes to O 21 r 2. Consequence of omission to give notice and Notice to wrong person and notes to O 21 r 90 Material irregularity in publishing or conducting the sale

The above principles apply in favour of a third party purchasing at a Court sale. They do not apply where the decree holder himself is the purchaser. The reason is that where the decree holder himself is the purchaser he must be held to have had notice of all the facts relating to the suit and execution proceedings (p). Nor do they apply in favour of a party to the suit though he may not be a decree holder (q).

Effect of reversal of decree upon sale where decree reversed after confirmation of sale.—There is a great distinction between decree holders who come in and purchase under their own decree which is afterwards reversed or modified and *bona fide* purchasers who come in and buy at a sale in execution of the decree to which they are no parties and at a time when that decree is a valid and subsisting decree and when the order for sale is a valid order. A *bona fide* purchaser who is a stranger to the decree does not lose his title to the property by the subsequent reversal or modification of the decree. But where the decree holder himself is the purchaser the sale may be set aside if the decree is subsequently reversed or modified. Where the purchaser is a stranger the judgment debtor whose property is sold is entitled only to the sale proceeds of the property if the decree is subsequently reversed. But where the purchaser is the decree holder he is bound to restore the property to the judgment debtor (r). A sale in execution of a decree at which a third party becomes the purchaser is upheld notwithstanding the subsequent reversal of the decree because otherwise there will be less inducement to intending

- (f) *Pei a Malton v Jamshern Singh* (188) 14 Cal 18. 131 A 106 *Moth v M P* 1 G 1 v *Alloy Ju ar Miter* (1894) 15 C 157 *Wajana v Kal* (1896) 19 M d 19 3  
(g) *M Harjun v Narayan* (1901) Bom 337 347 7 I A 16 *Presh Nath v Ha* (1911) 38 Cal 6 6-7 101 C 61  
(h) *Pei a Malton v Jamshern Singh* (188) 14 Cal 18. 131 A 106  
(i) *Moth v Mohun Ghose v Alloy Kumar Mitr* (1888) 1 Cnt 557 *M Harjun v Ja* cha dru (189) 21 Bom 463  
(j) 38 Cal 6 101 C 361 s pra  
(k) *Jas mi v Jerna* (1891) 17 M J 54  
(l) *D v Nath v Turu* (1907) 34 Cal 190 *Ed v Jas Jam* (1907) 9 AU 61 *Id v A Nath* (1904) 3 Bom 15  
(m) *Srida Churn v Mohamed* (1885) 11 Cal 376  
(n) *G d et Lal v A too Lal* (185) 14

- Beng L R 187 1 I A 31  
(o) *Ka islla v Chandar S n* (1900) 2 All 377 *Kud at ullat v Fubra Beg m* (1901) 3 All 2  
(p) *El arajmal v Daim* (1905) 3 Cal 96 315 3 I A 23 *Mi na kuma v J pat* *ettami* (1884) 10 Cal 20 *Gungarpetah* v C p 13 gh (188) 11 I A 231  
(q) *Official Receiver v Chellappa* (193) 48 M 1 67 91 I C 16 (96) A M 78  
(r) *Z in ul Abd v Mammad Asghar Ali* (188) 10 AU 166 151 A 1 *Mukhoda v* *Opal C der* (199) 6 Cal 734 *Set* *Ummed* v *Drinath* (1900) 27 Cal 810 *Is esh Nath v Hari Charan* (1911) 34 Cal 6 6 101 C 361 *JA bai v Jaso* (1919) 43 Bom 35 38 48 I C 130 *J n Lal v Ha if-un Nasa* (1916) 33 AU 40 34 I C 303 [stranger purchaser] *KA mnan v CA mwalu* (1916) 11 Lat L J 43 46 34 I C 747 [decree holder purchaser] *Apha Haza n Qarim Ali* (193) 3 All L J 916 89 I C 1019 (6) A A 35

purchasers to buy at an execution sale and consequently less chance of property fetching proper value at such sales (s) See notes to s 144 Who may apply for restitution. But where property sold in execution of a decree is bought by the decree holder and it is subsequently re sold by him to a *bona fide* purchaser for value such purchaser acquires a good title though the decree may be subsequently reversed (t)

Effect of reversal of decree upon sale where decree reversed before confirmation of sale—On referring to s 315 of the Code of 1882 (p 213) it will be observed that it contained a proviso the effect whereof was stated to be that a sale could not be confirmed if at the time of application for confirmation the decree under which the sale was effected had ceased to be a subsisting decree (u) That proviso has not been reproduced in the present section Under the present section therefore a sale held in execution of a decree may be confirmed in any event where the purchaser is a third party though the decree has been reversed before confirmation of the sale See O 21 r 92 (1) and note the words the Court *shall* make an order confirming the sale

What passes at a Court sale—See notes to O 21 r 94

**66 [S 317]** (1) No suit shall be maintained against any person claiming title under a purchase certified by the Court in such manner as may be prescribed on the ground that the purchase was made on behalf of the plaintiff or on behalf of some one through whom the plaintiff claims

Suit against purchaser not maintainable on ground of purchase being on behalf of plaintiff

(2) Nothing in this section shall bar a suit to obtain a declaration that the name of any purchaser certified as aforesaid was inserted in the certificate fraudulently or without the consent of the real purchaser, or interfere with the right of a third person to proceed against that property, though ostensibly sold to the certified purchaser, on the ground that it is liable to satisfy a claim of such third person against the real owner

Changes introduced by the section—

- 1 The words no suit shall be maintained against any person claiming title under a purchase certified by the Court have been substituted for the words no suit shall be maintained a certified purchaser which occurred in the corresponding section (s 317) of the Code of 1882
- 2 The words on behalf of the plaintiff or on behalf of some one through whom the plaintiff claims have been substituted for the words on behalf of any other person or on behalf of some one through whom such other person claims See notes below Joint purchase
- 3 The latter part of sub section (2) is new See notes below under the head Suit by a third person for a declaration that the certified purchaser is merely a benamidar

(1) *M Doda v Gopal Chander* (1903) 6 Cal 14 37  
(4) *Shri I m l v Pajab P Ver* (190) 30  
Mal 9 M r t h u v Subba ju (1903)  
15 Mad L J 231

(1) *D nam v Das v Sa at Ch ander* (1903) 3 Cal 17  
*M l C t a d v Mukta* (1903) 10 All 83  
*P an Sukh v Ram Sahai* (1907) 9 All 501  
*B n Natar ja v Ramarany* (19) 45 Mad 86 860 861 3 I C 49 ( ) A 31 491

Benami purchases.—The object of the section is to put a stop to benami purchases at execution sales (1). If A under a secret understanding with B purchases property with his own money but in B's name the purchase is said to be benami. In such a case B is merely a benamidar or ostensible owner; he holds the property in trust for A and A may compel him to transfer the property to him (A). If however A's object in purchasing the property in B's name was to defraud his creditors and the object of the fraud is carried out the Court will not assist A in recovering possession of the property from B but if the object of the fraud is not carried out the Court will assist A in recovering possession of the property from B notwithstanding A's primary intention to effect a fraud. This is the law as applicable to benami purchases at a private sale (w). The law however is different as to benami purchases at a Court sale. If A purchases property in B's name at a Court sale and a certificate of sale is issued to B (O 21 r 94) B will be conclusively deemed to be the real purchaser as against A and no suit will lie under this section by A against B for possession of the property unless A can prove that B's name was inserted in the certificate fraudulently or without his consent [see sub-section (2)]. The same rule applies even if the claim made by the beneficial owner is not for the whole of the property of which the defendant is the certified purchaser. Thus if B is the certified purchaser of certain property part of which was purchased by him on his own account and part benami for A, A is not entitled to maintain a suit under this section for recovery of the part purchased by B benami for him (x). The mere fact however that the plaintiff has described the defendant as a benamidar does not make the transaction benami if it was not benami in fact; it is a mere misdescription and it is no ground for refusing the plaintiff a relief to which he is otherwise entitled (y).



**Whether section retrospective**—The High Court of Calcutta has held that this section does not apply if the sale was held and confirmed before January 1 1909 when the present Code came into force and that the section applicable is sec 317 of the Code of 1882 (d). But if the sale was held before but confirmed after that date the present section applies for the title of the execution purchaser cannot be said to have been perfect until the confirmation of the sale (e). It is submitted that even if the sale was confirmed before January 1 1909 this section would apply to the case and not sec 317 (f).

**Suits outside the section**—This section provides that no suit shall lie against the certified purchaser on the ground that the purchase was made on behalf of the plaintiff. In other words it is only in suits against the certified purchaser as defendant that such purchaser is to be conclusively deemed to be the real purchaser. But if the real owner is actually and honestly in possession and a suit is brought by the certified purchaser as plaintiff against the real owner for possession or for rents and profits of the property of which he is the certified purchaser the real owner may resist the suit on the ground that the certified purchaser was only a benamidar (g). And since the section only bars suits against the certified purchaser as defendant a suit by such purchaser as plaintiff for a declaration that he purchased the property on his own behalf and not benami for another is not barred under this section (h). On the same ground this section is no bar to a suit by the beneficial owner for possession against the judgment debtor pursuant to an agreement made between them after the sale of the property provided the certified purchaser is joined as a party to the suit and he does not claim the property (i). In fact the present section applies only when a suit is instituted by a person claiming to be the real purchaser as plaintiff against the certified purchaser as defendant on the allegation that the purchase was made on behalf of the plaintiff or on behalf of some one through whom the plaintiff claims. This point is now made clear by the substitution of the word plaintiff for the words any other person in sub section (1).

**Suit by a third person for a declaration that the certified purchaser is merely a benamidar**—Under the corresponding s 317 of the Code of 1882 the High Court of Calcutta held that the only suits barred under that section were suits brought by the beneficial owner as plaintiff against the certified purchaser as defendant and that suits brought by a third party as plaintiff against the certified purchaser as defendant for a declaration that the property though ostensibly sold to the certified purchaser is liable to satisfy a claim of such third party against the beneficial owner were not barred under that section (j). On the other hand the High Courts of Madras (k) and Allahabad (l) held that even suits brought by a third person as plaintiff were barred under that section. The present section gives effect to the Calcutta decisions by providing in sub section (2) that nothing in this section shall interfere with the right of a third person to proceed against that (sic) property though ostensibly sold to the certified purchaser on the ground that it is liable to satisfy a claim of such third person against the real owner.

(d) *Promotha Nath v Moh* (190) 47 Cal 1108 8 I C 37

(e) *Faiv Sa d r* (1908) 3 C W N 11 107 I C 67 (38) A C 334

(f) *M hammad Abd I J Isl v Msh mmad Obaid Ullah* (1909) 31 Bom L R 1393 typ 139 1396

(g) *Lokree v Kallipudda* (1775) 3 W R 38 1 A 154 J n M hammad v Ilah L R (1876) 1 All 290 *Gorinda v Lala Kish n* (1901) 3 Cal 30 *Lashin v J gho* (1903) 5 Bom L R 329 *Gh ud-din v Bishan Dial* (190) 7 All 413

(h) *Unco enanted Service B E v Abdul Bari* (1896) 18 All 461

(i) *Sa ad d v (anta)* (19) 7 C W N 98 I C 196 (3) A C 30

(j) *Kannal v Mo shir* (1886) 1 Cal 204 *S bha B di v H a Lal* (1831) 1 Cal 519

(k) *Pama Kurup v Sri levi* (1891) 16 Mad 990 But see *Kallants ada v Tirur* (1897) 0 M d 36

(l) *Delha a d Lo d n B nk v Partab Bhasi r* (1899) 1 All 29 *Fish n Lal v Garurud dhar ja Fras d* (1899) 1 All 238 *I am Narain v Moh san* (1904) 6 All 8 *Kl d Bakhsh v Aziz Alam* (1905) 7 All 194 *Sarja Fras d v Bi deshra* (1911) 33 All 3 9 I C 293



**Joint purchase**—The provisions of this section are designed to create some check on the practice of making what are called benami purchases at execution sales for the benefit of judgment debtors and in no way affect the title of persons otherwise beneficially interested in the purchase (s) It has accordingly been held that where one of several holders of a joint mortgage decree applies for execution of the decree under O 21 r 15 on behalf of all and the purchase money is set off against the entire amount of the debts the other decree holders are entitled to a declaration that the purchase was made on behalf of all the decree holders (t)

Where property is purchased at a Court sale by a member of a joint Hindu family in his name but *with family funds* the other members are entitled to sue him for a declaration that the purchase was made on behalf of the family though the certificate of sale is in his name The section does not apply to such a case This was decided by their Lordships of the Privy Council in *Bodh Singh v Gunesh Chunder* (u) a case under the Code of 1889 Their Lordships said [The provisions of the section] cannot be taken to affect the rights of members of a joint Hindu family who *by the operation of law* and not by virtue of any private agreement or undertaking [such as exists between a benamidar and the beneficial owner] are entitled to treat as part of their common property an acquisition however made by a member of the family in his sole name if made by the use of the family funds The same principle applies where the parties stand in the relation of partners and the purchase is made by one of the partners in his name with partner hip funds (v)

When property is purchased at a Court sale by two or more persons jointly the executing Court has no power to grant the certificate of sale to one of them only without the consent of the others If it does so the case is one within sub sec (-) and the other purchasers are entitled to maintain a suit against the certified purchaser for their share of the property (y)

If a joint Hindu family consists of A and his sons and A purchases property at a Court sale with joint family funds without the concurrence of his sons in the name of a third person are the sons entitled to recover their share of the property from the third person [certified purchaser]? The High Court of Madras (x) has held that they are the reason given being that the purchase cannot in such a case be said to have been made by the father on behalf of the sons and the sons are not therefore beneficial owners and the section does not apply On the other hand the Allahabad High Court has held that if a managing member makes a purchase in the name of a third person the purchase though made without the consent of his sons must be deemed to have been made on behalf of the sons and the sons are precluded by this section from maintaining the suit (y) The Allahabad High Court purports to follow the Privy Council ruling in *Sura Varma v Jagan Lal* (z) but that case as pointed out by the Madras High Court was a case under s 317 of the Code of 1889 which contained the words *on behalf of any other person* now altered into *on behalf of the plaintiff*

**Where beneficial owner is in possession with permission of certified purchaser**—The High Court of Madras has held that if after obtaining a certificate of sale the purchaser acknowledges that his purchase is benami and gives up possession

(s) *Ganesh v Jai Lal* (1915) 3 A.R. 54  
54 S. 5 5 S. 4 1 A. 1 18 30 I.C. 6  
(t) (191) 37 All. 54 4 I.A. 1 30 I.C. 6  
P. 4 A. 1 A. 2 J. 1910 9 A.R.

(u) (18) 41 Lenz L.R. 317

(v) *Arghav v T. Par* (1907) 29 A.R. 57 61  
1st A. A. 1 1st A. A. 1 1st A. A. 1 1st A. A. 1  
Form 600 9 I.C. 688 (6) A.L.

(w) *Ehlatam v D. Gesh* (19 A) 1 Cal. 9 81  
I.C. 10 2 (6) A.C. 719

(x) *V. Raju v P. A. A.* (19) 45 Mad. 86  
31 I.C. 49 (1) A. 1 491 A. 1 491  
1st A. 1 1st A. 1 (1883) 6 M.J. 135  
M. 1st A. 1 1st A. 1 (18) 0 Mad  
389

(y) *B. J. D. v. L. T. A.* (10) 43 All. 711  
63 I.C. 678 (1st A. 1 1st A. 1 1st A. 1 1st A. 1  
with a nam) 1st A. 1 1st A. 1 1st A. 1 1st A. 1  
(19) 50 All. 1 104 I.C. 130 (1) A  
A. 619

(z) (191) 41 I.A. 101 11 40 All. 159 1 0 40  
I.C. 983

or does some act which clearly indicates an intention to waive his right or restore the property to the beneficial owner such act may by reason of the antecedent relation between the parties operate as a valid transfer of the property from the purchaser to the beneficial owner. Thus if A is the manager of B's estate (and this is the antecedent relation between the parties) and the estate is sold in execution of a decree against B and is purchased by B in A's name a suit will lie at the instance of B against A for possession if after obtaining the certificate of sale A delivers possession of the property to B and then disturbs B in his possession. The reason given is that the permission to hold possession amounts to a transfer of title from the benamidar to the beneficial owner and the suit is thus based not on the ground that the purchase was benami but on a fresh title created by the transfer (a). The High Court of Allahabad has dissented from this view and held relying on the Privy Council case of *Lokee v Kallypudlo* (b) that the mere permission to hold possession cannot give or transfer a title from the benamidar to the real owner and that a suit like the above would be barred under this section (c). The Calcutta High Court has followed the Allahabad decision (d). However that may be if the certified purchaser or allows the beneficial owner to take possession the section does not enable him to sue the beneficial owner for possession, because possession has come into the hands of the person entitled to it (e).

**Suit for specific performance against certified purchaser**—In *Venkatappa v Jalayya* (f) a Full Bench of the Madras High Court held that this section does not debar a plaintiff from maintaining a suit for specific performance against the certified purchaser if the plaintiff's claim is based upon an agreement to convey the property entered into after the purchase. The decision in *Venkatappa's case* was approved by the Judicial Committee in *Ramatbais v Peria* (g). In *Ramatbais case* it was held that the present section does not debar a plaintiff from maintaining a suit for specific performance against the certified purchaser if the plaintiff's claim is based upon an agreement made after the purchase to transfer the property to the plaintiff in pursuance of an agreement made before it. The suit cannot in such a case be said to have been brought on the ground that the purchase was made on behalf of the plaintiff within the meaning of this section.

**Certified purchaser**—Where a purchaser who had not obtained a certificate was sued and afterwards applied for and obtained a certificate it was held that he was a certified purchaser within the meaning of this section (h).

**Successor in title of certified purchaser**—This section bars a suit not only against a certified purchaser but also against persons claiming title from him (i). Under the Code of 1882 there was a conflict of decisions as to whether s. 317 of that Code was a bar to suits against persons claiming title from the certified purchaser. On the one hand the High Courts of Madras, Allahabad and Calcutta held that the expression "certified purchaser" in s. 317 of that Code *did not include* a person claiming through or under the certified purchaser such as an heir or an assignee (j) and that that section therefore was no bar to a suit against such person. On the other hand the Bombay High Court held that the expression "certified purchaser" *include* his successor in title (k). The present section contains a legislative recognition of the view taken by the High Court of

- (a) *M. ppa v. S. ppa* (1898) 11 Mad. 34  
*h. n. v. n. ya a* (1894) 17 Mad. 1  
*h. kumb ling v. trap tra* (1899)  
 14 Mad. 436  
*Le h. t. ppa v. J. l. gya*  
 (1901) 4 Mad. 615 616 511 C 111  
 (f) (1895) 3 W. R. 34 1 A 154  
 (g) *H. n. Di. l. v. h. a. sud-d n* (1901) 3 All.  
 175 19160  
 (d) *H. n. h. v. p. p. p. d* (1900) 4 C. W. N.  
 11 583 C 719  
 (e) *M. h. mat. th. l. J. l. v. M. h. m. m. d*  
*O. h. d. l. h. h. (1909) 31 Bom. J. R. 1393*  
 (f) (1919) 4 Mad. 615 511 C 111 *Tab. m.*

- Doh. n. a* (1919) 24 C. W. N. 2 54  
 1 C. 6  
 (g) (1901) 4 I. A. 108 43 Mad. 613 56 I. C.  
 39  
*S. e. al. h. d. m. v. v. al. r* (1900) 0  
 1 C. m. L. R. 2 1 10 C. L. C. 11 (-) A. P. 75  
 (h) *Aldwell v. H. h. l. r. a* (1893) 5 All. 4  
*v. d. h. n. r. d. n. v. v. o. r. M. h. m. d*  
 (1915) 4 Mad. L. J. 124 I. C. 1  
 (j) *Theravall v. A. h. a* (1901) 1 All. 106  
*de v. h. a. p. d* (1899) 1 All. 106  
*D. h. a. d. v. r. e. n. d. o* (1900) 6 Cal. 9  
 (k) *H. n. v. l. a. m. h. d. r. a* (1900) 31 Bom. 61

Bombay (i) It is obvious that the section does not apply where the real owner seeks for a declaration of his title against a person who does not claim under a certified purchaser (m)

67 [S 327]

Power for Local Government to make rules as to sale of land in execution of decrees for payment of money

(1) The Local Government may, by notification in the local official Gazette, make rules for any local area imposing conditions in respect of the sale of any class of interests in land in execution of decrees for the payment of money, where such interests are so uncertain or undetermined as, in the opinion of the Local Government, to make it impossible to fix their value

(2) When on the date on which this Code came into operation in any local area, any special rules as to sale of land in execution of decrees were in force therein, the Local Government may, by notification in the local official Gazette, declare such rules to be in force, or may, by a like notification, modify the same

Every notification issued in the exercise of the powers conferred by this sub section shall set out the rules so continued or modified

Sub sec (-) was inserted in the section by the Code of Civil Procedure Amendment Act I of 1914 As to the result where no notification is issued as provided by sub sec (7) see the undermentioned cases (n)

DELEGATION TO COLLECTOR OF POWER TO EXECUTE DECREES AGAINST IMMOVABLE PROPERTY

68 [S 320 1st para]

Power to prescribe rules for transfer of land to Civil Court for execution of decrees

The Local Government may declare, by notification in the local official Gazette, that in any local area the execution of decrees in cases in which a Court has ordered any immovable property to be sold, or the execution of any particular kind of such decrees, or the execution of decrees ordering the sale of any particular kind of, or interest in, immovable property, shall be transferred to the Collector

(i) *Munji v Hoorb* (1911) 3 Lam 1 217  
8 I C

(m) *Binay Chandra v F. I. Ch. I. A.* (1918)  
55 Cal 10 6 108 I C 25 ( ) A C 418

( ) *A. I. Ch. I. I. A. v. Ch. (1913) P. I.*  
no 80 1 318 *P. A. v. An. Ch. d.* (1911)  
3 Lah L J 5 60 I C 893 (1) A L

3

Object of the section — The object of these provisions [i.e. provisions relating to the execution of decrees by Collectors] is well known. In different parts of India the effect of sales in execution of decrees was to transfer landed estates from the old families to modern speculators. A strong opinion was entertained by certain members of the Government of India that these results of the administration of civil justice were impolitic and inexpedient and it was suggested that some procedure might be devised by which the Chief Executive Officer of the district would be enabled to liquidate the debts of encumbered land holders without the immediate sale of their estates and so to preserve the old landed gentry of the country. The provisions of ss 320 to 325C [now ss 68 70 71 and 122 and schedule III] were inserted in the Code of Civil Procedure in order to give effect to these suggestions. (c) See notes to O 21 r 90 Waiver and appeal

**69** [New] The provisions set forth in the Third Schedule shall apply to all cases in which the execution of a decree has been transferred under the last preceding section

Provisions of  
Schedule to apply

Third

**70** [S 370, 2nd 3rd and 4th paras] (1) The Local Government may make rules consistent with the aforesaid provisions—

Rules of procedure

- (a) for the transmission of the decree from the Court to the Collector, and for regulating the procedure of the Collector and his subordinates in executing the same, and for retransmitting the decree from the Collector to the Court,
- (b) conferring upon the Collector or any gazetted subordinate of the Collector all or any of the powers which the Court might exercise in the execution of the decree if the execution thereof had not been transferred to the Collector,
- (c) providing for orders made by the Collector or any gazetted subordinate of the Collector, or orders made on appeal with respect to such orders, being subject to appeal to, and revision by, superior revenue authorities and may be as the orders made by the Court, or orders made on appeal with respect to such orders, would be subject to appeal to, and revision by appellate or revisional Courts under this Code or other law for the time being in force if the decree had not been transferred to the Collector

(2) A power conferred by rules made under sub section (1) upon the Collector or any gazetted subordinate of the Collector, or upon any appellate or revisional authority, shall not be exercisable by the Court or by any Court in exercise of any appellate or revisional jurisdiction which it has with respect to decrees or orders of the Court

**Jurisdiction of Civil Courts barred**  
Power of Local Government to make rules — A Local Government has power under this section to make a rule providing that no suit shall lie to set aside a sale held or confirmed by a Revenue Authority. Such a rule is not *ultra vires* (p)

Civil Courts are precluded from interfering in any matter declared by notification to be within the Collector's jurisdiction — Thus if it is declared by notification that a decree for the sale of a particular kind of property e.g. ancestral property should be transferred to the Collector for execution a sale of the property if made by a Civil Court is void. Such a notification ousts the jurisdiction of the Court so far as regards the execution of the decree (q). For the same reason if the execution of a decree is transferred to the Collector the Court transferring the decree has no power to postpone the sale (r) or to give leave to the decree holder to bid under O 21 r 72 (s) or to re sell the property where a re sale is necessary (t). The Collector alone has that power. Similarly where a decree is transferred for execution to the Collector and the decree is subsequently adjusted the application under O 21 r 2 [Code of 1882 s 208] for recording the adjustment should be made to the Collector (u). But where a decree has been sent to the Collector for execution under this section he holds the money which may be realized in execution of such decree at the disposal of the Court which sent the decree to him for execution and he is not competent to distribute such money in contravention of an order of the Court indicating the mode of distribution (v).

It is to be noted that sub section (2) does not take away the jurisdiction of and Court other than the Court referred to in it. The Court there referred to is the Court mentioned in the previous portion of the section namely the Court to which an application was made for execution and which as such Court transmitted the decree for execution (v).

Where a suit would lie to set aside an order made by a Court executing a decree the fact that such order has been made by the Collector does not deprive the Civil Courts of the jurisdiction to entertain a suit to set aside such order (x).

**Suit to set aside orders of Collector** — A suit will lie to set aside an order made by the Collector if the order is *ultra vires*. Thus no rule has been made by the Government of Bombay under this section empowering the Collector to set aside a sale under O 21 r 89 [Code of 1882 s 310A] on a deposit by the judgment debtor of the amount specified in that rule nor is there any rule empowering him to set aside a sale under O 21 r 90 [Code of 1882 s 311] on the ground of material irregularity in

- (p) *Fa / i* 5111 x 5 *Ira* (19 0) 4 All 311 C 801 CA nd K sh a v  
M n i Jal (19 0) 1 Yu k 9 97 I C 1036 (6) A O 61  
(q) *S khleo v Nro t h i m* (184) 4 All 38  
*Ari h n Das v I Gopal* (19 4) 50 All 8 7 (4) A A 5 9  
(r) *Daw i v gh v Jw i h i ho e* (1900) All 104 111  
(s) *Shri v v Jajaderappa* (1918) 4 I m 6 1 46 I C 6 3

- (t) *Dhat ad S ngah v Han n I* (19 1) 46 All 56 83 I C 768 (4) A A 01  
(u) *M ha m i v I jay S h* (1894) 18 All 4 AA *I ha d v a dr m* (1911) 3 Iam 16 1 I C 57  
(v) *Tajera v D khand n* (1894) 16 All 1  
(w) *V am E i ry Lal v P p I sho e* (1893) 9 All 379 34 83  
(x) *S i m B h v L i v P p I shore* (1893) 11 All 379

publishing or conducting the sale (y) Nor has any rule been made by the Local Government of the N W P under this section empowering the Collector to set aside a sale under O 21 r 89 [Code of 1882 s 310A] ( ) though there is a rule empowering him to set aside a sale under O 21 r 90 [Code of 1882 s 311] Again no rule made by any of the Local Governments empowers the Collector to set aside a sale on the ground of fraud (a) The Collector has no jurisdiction to set aside a sale after it has been confirmed and the decree retransmitted to the Civil Court (b) If in any of these cases the Collector arrogates to himself the power which he has not and sets aside the sale the order is *ultra vires* and it is competent to the auction purchaser to bring a regular suit in a Civil Court for a declaration that the sale was valid and that the order of the Collector setting aside the sale was invalid (c)

**Suit to set aside sale held by Collector**—A suit will lie to set aside a sale held by the Collector if the sale was brought about by the fraud of the decree holder the auction purchaser and persons who had brought pre-emption suits and who had all conspired to deprive the plaintiff of the property for O 21 r 90 applies only to fraud in publishing and conducting a sale (d)

**Appeal**—No appeal lies to the High Court from an order passed by the Collector in an execution proceeding transferred to him under this section The reason is that this section specially provides that an appeal shall lie from the order of the Collector to such authorities as the local Government may by rules prescribe (e)

**Revision**—An order made by the Collector in the course of execution proceedings under this section sanctioning the prosecution of a party to the suit under s 476 of the Code of Criminal Procedure is an order made by him as a Revenue Court and is not therefore subject to revision by the High Court (f)

**71 [S 320, 5th para]** In executing a decree transferred to the Collector under section 68 the Collector and his subordinates shall be deemed to be acting judicially

Collector deemed to be  
acting judicially

Shall be deemed to be acting judicially —The effect of this provision is that the Collector and his subordinates are entitled to the benefit of the provisions of the Judicial Officers Protection Act XVIII of 1850 which are as follows —

No Judge Magistrate Justice of the Peace Collector or other person acting judicially shall be liable to be sued in any Civil Court for any act done or ordered to be done by him in the discharge of his judicial duty whether or not within the limits of his jurisdiction provided that he at the time in good faith believed himself to have jurisdiction to do or order the act complained of and no officer of any Court or other person bound to execute the lawful warrants or orders of any such Judge Magistrate Justice of the Peace Collector or other person acting judicially shall be liable to be sued in any Civil Court for the execution of any warrant or order which he would be bound to execute if within the jurisdiction of the person issuing the same

But though the Collector is deemed to be acting judicially he is not a Court (d)

- (y) *Id v Ctr Ltd* (1907) 31 B m 707  
*Na vana J f ilha* (1907) 31 B m 31  
*C p t v Is* (1911) 15 B m 3  
*I t mth v Moll* (1901) 15 B m 691  
 (z) *Sho I d v Mula m t* (1903) 5 All 167  
 ( ) *Salk (ha dh rs v tharna t n Jrad*  
 (1901) 6 All 101 t 1 104  
 (b) *N t A h e v I t qh* (1906) 43  
 All 6 95 I t 5 4 ( ) 4 A 5 5

- ( ) *Muth f av Pa kahul* (1907) 19 B m 16  
*V th ru Da v J mna* (1903) 2 All 355  
 (d) *Rhazur Da v A q Jrad* (1907) 47  
 All 1 88 I t 1031 ( ) A A 116  
 (e) *Manchory v Thakur das* (1901) 1 m L R.  
 8  
 (f) *Emperor v A h e Lal* (1911) 2 All 91  
*A C 18 All L J 1807 34 I t 419* See  
*also Emperor v Bham* (1915) 3 All  
 334 71 I t 87



Where Court may authorize Collector to stay public sale of land

The Court may authorize the Collector —These words are not imperative but leave a discretion to the Civil Court. That discretion can only be exercised upon materials placed before the Court. It is therefore open to the decree holder to place those materials in the shape of evidence before the Civil Court and to satisfy the Court as well by evidence as by argument that the proposal of the Collector is not feasible or practicable. The Court should not decline to receive the evidence offered by the decree holder (a).

A temporary alienation of land belonging to a judgment debtor who is a member of an agricultural tribe does not come within the purview of s. 16 of the Punjab Alienation of Land Act 13 of 1900 which prohibits a sale out and out (1)

Provisions of sections 69 to 71 to apply.—Reading this section with para 2 of schedule III [Code of 1892 s 392] referred to in s 69 it is clear that the provisions of this section cannot be applied to a decree which directs the sale of land in pursuance of a contract specifically affecting the same (j). Similarly reading this section with para 11 sub para (1) of schedule III [Code of 1892 s 324] it follows that where a judgment debtor executes a mortgage of his property while the property is in the management of a Collector under this section with an undertaking to put the mortgagee in possession the mortgagee is not entitled to claim possession (k). Likewise reading this section with the same paragraph no Court can use any process of execution against any immovable property in the management of a Collector under this section. Therefore the period during which the property is in the management of the Collector under this section should be excluded from the period of limitation applicable to the decree of which execution is refused by the Court by reason of the property having been in the Collector's management (l) see sch III para 11 sub para (3).

(2) II I I P I e Kals I ra ai P y (1483)  
 9 C 1 23 4 5 6 P m I nan (19 11)  
 1 1 1 1 54 I C 603 [1 1]

(h) K. A. Lal, *Imperial* (1970) All II  
C 31 *Wool of the* 1 1 1 1  
1973) 6 All II C 32

(i)  $S_a^t = \nabla I_a + I_{\text{New}}(1990) + I_{\text{Lab}}(1990)$

(9)  $FA \eta a \quad Ir \quad I \backslash \quad I \quad I \quad (1 \ 80)^\circ \text{ All}$

(k) <sup>86</sup>Seth J. Levy, J. S. Law (1990) 17 C 1  
43 [R. C.]  
(l) <sup>87</sup>Levy, J. S. Law (1990) 17 C 1

93

## DISTRIBUTION OF ASSETS

- 73 [S 295]** (1) Where assets are held by a Court and more persons than one have, before the receipt of such assets, made application to the Court for the execution of decrees for the payment of money passed against the same judgment debtor and have not obtained satisfaction thereof the assets, after deducting the costs of realization, shall be rateably distributed among all such persons

Proceeds of execution  
sale to be rateably distri-  
buted among decree holders

Provided as follows —

- (a) where any property is sold subject to a mortgage or charge the mortgagee or incumbrancer shall not be entitled to share in any surplus arising from such sale
- (b) where any property liable to be sold in execution of a decree is subject to mortgage or charge, the Court may, with the consent of the mortgagee or incumbrancer, order that the property be sold free from the mortgage or charge, giving to the mortgagee or incumbrancer the same interest in the proceeds of the sale as he had in the property sold,
- (c) where any immovable property is sold in execution of a decree ordering its sale for the discharge of an incumbrance thereon, the proceeds of sale shall be applied—
  - first, in defraying the expenses of the sale,
  - secondly, in discharging the amount due under the decree
  - thirdly, in discharging the interest and principal moneys due on subsequent incumbrances (if any) and
  - fourthly, rateably among the holders of decrees for the payment of money against the judgment debtor, who have, prior to the sale of the property applied to the Court which passed the decree ordering such sale for execution of such decrees, and have not obtained satisfaction thereof

(2) Where all or any of the assets liable to be rateably distributed under this section are paid to a person not entitled to receive the same, any person so entitled may sue such person to compel him to refund the assets

(3) Nothing in this section affects any right of the Government

Changes introduced by the section—The present section differs from the corresponding s 29, C P C 1882 in the following respects —

- 1 The words where assets are held by a Court have been substituted for the words whenever assets are realized by sale or otherwise in execution of a decree This it is submitted introduces an important alteration though the High Court of Bombay has held otherwise See notes Assets held by a Court on p 233 below
- 2 The words before the receipts of such assets have been substituted for the words prior to the realization See notes Before the receipt of the assets on p 231 below
- 3 The word passed has been added after the word money See notes Same judgment debtor on p 240 below
- 4 The words interest in in cl (b) have been substituted for the words right against to bring the wording of that clause into line with the Transfer of Property Act 1882 s 96 This is a mere verbal alteration

Rateable distribution—The object of this section is to provide a cheap and expeditious remedy for the execution of money decrees held against the same judgment debtor by adjusting the claims of rival decree holders without the necessity for separate proceedings (m) Under the Code of 1859 (s 20) the creditor who first attached property has a prior claim to have his decree satisfied out of the sale proceeds to the exclusion of other creditors but now all judgment creditors who apply to the Court prior to the receipt of the sale proceeds by the Court are entitled to share rateably (n) In *Bithal Das v Vaid Kishore* (o) Strachey C J said The object of the section is two fold The first object is to prevent unnecessary multiplicity of execution proceedings to obviate in a case where there are many decree holder each competent to execute his decree by attachment and sale of a particular property the necessity of each and every one separately attaching and separately selling that property The other object is to secure an equitable administration of the property by placing all the decree holders in the position I have described upon the same footing and making the property rateably divisible among them instead of allowing one to exclude all the others merely because he happened to be first who had attached and sold the property 4 obtains a decree against B in Court X for Rs 4 000 and applies to that Court for execution of his decree by attachment and sale of certain property belonging to B and the property is thereupon attached C then obtains a decree also against B in Court Y for Rs 2 000 and applies to that Court for execution of his decree by attachment and sale of the same property attached in execution of A's decree The property is then sold by the Court in execution of A's decree for Rs 3 000 C is entitled to share rateably in the net sale proceeds that is to say if the net sale proceeds amount to Rs 3 000 A will be paid Rs 2 000 and C will be paid Rs 1 000 It is not necessary to entitle C to participate in the assets that he should have given notice to A of the application made by him for execution of his decree (p)

(m) See *Hoon Arva v Jawadon Issa* (18 9) 4 C. 1 29

(n) *Kommachi v. Paller* (1897) 6 Mad 10 111

(o) (1901) 3 All 106

(p) C. 13 *Lal v. Jig & Kishore* (190 ) 7 All

**Conditions for rateable distribution**—To entitle a decree holder to participate in the assets of a judgment debtor the following conditions must be present —

- 1 The decree holder claiming to share in the rateable distribution should have applied for execution of his decree to the Court by which the assets are held
- 2 Such application should have been made prior to the receipt of the assets by the Court
- 3 The assets of which a rateable distribution is claimed must be assets held by the Court
- 4 The attaching creditor as well as the decree holder claiming to participate in the assets should be holders of decrees for the payment of money
- 5 Such decrees should have been obtained against the same judgment debtor

No rateable distribution can be claimed under the section unless all the conditions enumerated above are fulfilled. We proceed to examine those conditions.

**Court to which application for execution should be made**—Those decree holders alone are entitled to rateable distribution who have applied for execution of their decrees in the form prescribed by O 21 r 11 [Code of 1882 s 23o] to the Court by which the assets are held (q) An application to the Court which passed the decree to issue a precept of attachment to the Court by which the assets are held is not sufficient (r) Nor is an application to a Court in anticipation that the decree will be transferred to it for execution (s)

The point to be considered under this head is whether where property of the same judgment debtor is attached in execution of decrees of more Courts than one and the property is sold by the Court of the highest grade the holders of decrees of inferior Courts are bound in order that they may be entitled to rateable distribution to have their decrees transferred to the Court of the highest grade and make a fresh application for execution to that Court. *A* obtains a decree against *B* in the Court of a Subordinate Judge of the First Class. In execution of the decree *B*'s property is attached by that Court. *C* then obtains a decree against *B* in the Court of a Subordinate Judge of the Second Class and applies to that Court for execution of his decree by attachment and sale of the same property. The property is then sold by the First Class Subordinate Judge in execution of *A*'s decree and the sale proceeds are received by that Court. Here the Court of the Subordinate Judge of the First Class is the Court by which the assets are held. Is *C* entitled to rateable distribution? No according to the High Court of Bombay, he not having applied to the Court of the Subordinate Judge of the First Class for execution of the decree that being the Court by which the assets are held (1). Yes according to the Calcutta (2), Pangoon (3) and Madras High Courts (4) the reason given being that under s. 63 the Court of the Subordinate Judge of the First Class is the Court to determine all claims relating to the attached property and such claims include claims for rateable distribution.

2 Before the receipt of the assets.—The application for execution must be made *before the receipt* of the assets by the Court. The corresponding 29a of the Code of 1892 commenced as follows:—

Whenever a *debt* is *realized by sale or otherwise in execution of a decree* and more persons than one have *prior to the realization* applied to the Court by which such assets are held

[illegible]

The present section begins as follows —

Where assets are *held by a Court* and more persons than one have *before the receipt of such assets* made application to the Court

The word *realization* was rather obscure. Indeed it called for several decisions in which the Courts had to define its precise meaning. The word *receipt* which is now substituted for *realization* is not likely to require any judicial interpretation. Cases of the character noted below which turned upon the word *realization* are not likely to arise under the present section so clear is the meaning of the word *receipt*.

*A* and *C* held each a money decree against the same judgment debtor. In December 1897 *A* attached by a prohibitory order funds of the judgment debtor in the hands of *D* [O 21 r 40 Code of 1882 s 26b]. In January 1893 *B* attached the same funds in execution of his decree. In February 1893 *D* paid the funds into Court. On the same day but after payment was made into Court *C* applied to attach the funds as property in the custody of the Court [O 21 r 52 Code of 1882 s 272]. It was held under s 29 of the Code of 1882 that the funds should be rateably distributed between *A* and *B* and that *C* was not entitled to participate therein as his application was made subsequent to the *realization* of the assets by the Court (*x*). The decision would be the same under the present section for it is quite clear that *C*'s application was made after the receipt of the assets by the Court.

It was held under s 29 of the Code of 1882 that where property is sold in execution of a decree the sale proceeds are deemed to be *realized* not when the 20 per cent is deposited by the purchaser into Court under s 306 [now O 21 r 84] but when the balance of the purchase money is paid (*y*). Hence a decree holder who applied for execution before the entire amount due from the purchaser had been paid into Court was held entitled to share in the rateable distribution though the application was made after deposit of the 20 per cent. But it was held that a decree holder who applied for execution after the entire amount of the purchase money had been paid into Court was not entitled to share in the rateable distribution though his application was made before the sale was confirmed by the Court under s 312 [now O 21 r 92] and the decision was put on the ground that the point of time when assets are *realized* is when the sale proceeds are paid into Court and not when the sale becomes absolute (*z*). The result is the same under the present section as will be seen by substituting the word *received* for the word *realized* (*a*).

The High Court of Madras has held that where immovable property is sold in execution of a decree in separate parcels the sale proceeds are not deemed to be *realized* until the entire amount of the purchase money in respect of all the parcels is paid into Court (*b*). This decision was followed by the Calcutta High Court (*c*) but in a later case that Court held that where immovable property is sold in separate parcels the sale proceeds are deemed to be *realized on the several dates* on which they are received by the Court (*d*). As regards movables the Lahore Court has held that if the property consists exclusively of movables and they are sold in separate lots on different dates the sale proceeds are deemed to be *realized on the several dates* on which they are received by the Officer of the Court and not on the date on which the last payment is received. Thus if some of the movables are sold and the price thereof is received on January 5 and the rest are sold and the price thereof is received on January 10 a decree holder who applies

( ) *Srinasa v Seetharamayyar* (1896) 19 Mad

(y) *Hafez v D Modar* (1891) 18 C 14

( ) *11 Ara* 14 v 1 r 4 (1882) 6 Bon 16

(a) *11 A* 14 v 1 r 4 (1882) 6 Bon 16

Cal 1 J 10 1 C 57 ( ) *d* *a*

14 v 1 r 4 (1882) 6 Bon 16

5587 I C 783 ( ) A C 966

(b) *Ismail Khan v D Bama* (1903) 6

31 d 19

( ) *Baend v Nath* 31 r 1 d Co (1911) 33

Cal 1 J 7 1 6 I C 167

(d) *C* 1 d 14 v 1 r 4 (1882) 6 Bon 16

W 57 8 I C 83 ( ) A C 966

for rateable distribution on January 7 is entitled to rateable distribution of the sale proceeds realized on January 10 but not of those realized on January 9 (e)

Where property is sold in execution by a person appointed by the Court under O 21 r 6 the receipt of purchase money by such person is for the purposes of this section equivalent to receipt of assets by the Court. The material date therefore is not the date on which the Court receives the amount of the purchase money from such person but the date on which such person receives the purchase money from the purchaser (f)

When property which is attached in execution of decrees of several Courts is sold by a Court of inferior grade and the sale proceeds are transferred to the Court of highest grade for rateable distribution the date of receipt of assets is the date when the sale proceeds are received by the latter Court (g)

Sale by Collector—Where the sale is held by the Collector the application for execution must be made before the sale proceeds are received by him though he may send the sale proceeds to the Court under Sch III cl 9 at a later date (h)

3 Assets held by a Court—Far more important than the change effected by the word receipt is the change introduced by the omission of the words when ever as ets are realized by *sale or otherwise* in execution of a decree and the substitution therefor of the words where assets are *held* by a Court. The latter words coupled with the word realization which occurs later on in the section include it is submitted several kinds of assets which were held not liable to rateable distribution under s 230 of the Code of 1882

Assets available for rateable distribution—The only kinds of assets that were held to be available for rateable distribution under s 230 were —

(a) as ets realized by sale in execution of a decree that is sale proceeds of property sold in execution of a decree (i) and

(b) assets realized otherwise in execution of a decree. These words were held to mean assets realized from the property of the judgment debtor by such modes as those prescribed by s 291 [O 21 r 69] s 305 [O 21 r 83] and s 322 [Sch III paras 2 and 7] (j). This was explained in later decisions as meaning assets realized in one of the modes *expressly* prescribed by the sections of the Code (k). The following were held to be assets of this class —

(i) debts attached under s 268 [now O 21 r 46] and paid into Court by the garnishee (l)

(ii) rents of property under attachment realized by a receiver appointed under s 503 [now s 51 cl (d)] at the instance of the decree holder (m). [The appointment of a receiver by the Court in such a case is a process of execution.]

(iii) money in the custody of a public officer attached under s 27— [now O 21 r 5] and paid into Court by that officer (n)

|                                       |                               |                                     |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| (e) Su 33 p 1 4 45 I C 104            | g h v I rag Das (1918) 1 R n  | Lon 5 4 t pal D s v Ch (1 6)        |
| (f) Gale 35 I C n 0                   | v f erf (1917) 44 C 1 49      | 8 AU 6 I ub dhapt ya v 1 suf (1 5)  |
| (g) God 1 1 319 101 I C 411 ( ) 4 B 4 | ribas v D clappa (19 ) 9 I 11 | 8 31 d 34                           |
| (A) D u t ay 1001 5 I C 1             | I n h k (19 0 ) lion L 1      | (k) See I x 1 b f I (1 4) 13 Cal    |
| ( ) I ros 8 9                         | y v reem th (1 31) 1 Cal      | (1311) 1 Cal 802 81 1 loudhapriya v |
| (j) I h d d s v v j h rth (1 ) 6      |                               | 1 f (190 ) 3 Mad 344 w 1            |
|                                       |                               | (l) Nor by Corind (1 2 ) 16 L m 91  |
|                                       |                               | (m) I n k v Palad or 1 (1 22) 6 Cal |
|                                       |                               | ( ) M al v v la (1901) 25 1 m 11    |

- (iv) money realized in execution of a decree held by the judgment debtor against another where such decree is attached and realized under O 21 r 33 [Code of 1882 s 273] (o)
- (v) money paid under O 21 r 69 to the officer conducting the sale to stop the sale (p)
- (vi) money raised by the judgment debtor by private alienation under O 21 r 83 and paid into Court (q)
- (vii) the 20 per cent deposit paid by a defaulting execution purchaser which has not under O 21 r 86 been forfeited to Government (r)

**Assets not available for rateable distribution**—Assets not realized by sale or otherwise in execution of a decree were not liable to rateable distribution under s 290. The following are instances of assets held not to be realized by sale or otherwise in execution of a decree within the meaning of s 295 and therefore not subject to rateable distribution under that section—

### *Cases under s 295 of the Code of 1882*

**A—*Pursholamdas v Surajbharthi* (1882) 6 Bom 588**—Moneys paid by a judgment debtor under arrest under s 236 of the old Code [now s 35 proviso 4] to the officer arresting him in order to secure his release were held to be assets not subject to rateable distribution. Sir Charles Sargent CJ said Section 295 must be read as if the words from the property of the judgment debtor were inserted after the word realized. The provisions contained in sections 291 [O XXI r 83] 305 [O XXI r 69] and 312 [now Sch III paras 2 and 3 the latter para corresponding with s 393 of the old Code] are all modes of realizing assets from such property otherwise than by sale and are sufficient to account for the introduction of that expression into section 295. The effect of the above decision is that to constitute a realization with the meaning of s 295 it must be either a realization by a sale in execution under the process of the Court or it must be a realization in one of the other modes expressly prescribed by the sections of the Code.

The correctness of the reasoning in *Pursholamdas* case seems to have been doubted in *Manilal v Nanabhai* (s) where Sir Lawrence Jenkins CJ said *It is a facie* the word realized implies that property has been converted into or obtained in cash or some other form available for immediate distribution and there is nothing in the word itself which requires that that process should take place as the result of any ulterior proceeding in the course of execution. But it was the leading case under the old section and it was followed in cases B C D and E below.

**B—*Gopal Das v Chunni* (1886) 8 All 67** following case A—Money paid into Court by the judgment debtor under s 25 of the old Code [now O XXI r 55 (a)] for payment of the amount due to the decree holder at whose instance the property was attached was held to be an asset not available for rateable distribution the reason given being that the money was not realized from the property of the judgment-debtor.

(o) *Ima v Anna* (1904) 31 Mad 509  
 (p) *Pursholamdas v Surajbharthi* (1882) 6 Bom 588  
 (q) *Pursholamdas v Surajbharthi* (1882) 6 Bom 588  
 (s) *Manilal v Nanabhai* (1886) 8 All 67

(r) *Sree Mahadevi Prasad v Panna of Kalash* (1918) 41 Mad 616 47 I C 538  
 (1918) 49 Mad 60 97 I C 86 (188)  
 A 34 87  
 ( ) (1903) 28 Bom 261 71

C—*Sew Buz v Shib Chunder* (1886) 13 Cal 225 following case A—A obtained a decree for money against B B's property was attached in execution of the decree C then obtained a decree for money against B and applied for attachment of B's said property a warrant of attachment was issued but the property was not actually attached B then filed his petition in insolvency and a vesting order was made The Official Assignee then paid into Court the amount of A's decree and the property was released from attachment C then applied for rateable distribution under s 290 of the amount paid into Court Held that C was not entitled to rateable distribution Trevelyan J said I do not think that in this case the money was realized out of the property of the judgment debtor I think that by sale or otherwise means by sale or other process of execution provided for in the Civil Procedure Code

D—*Prosonomays v Srcenauth* (1894) 21 Cal 809—In this case Sale J said that the rule deducible from cases A and C was that to constitute a realization within the meaning of section 295 it must be either a realization by a sale in execution under the process of the Court or it must be a realization in one of the other modes expressly prescribed by the sections of the Code

E—*Vidudhapriya v Yusuf* (1900) 28 Mad 380 following cases A B C and D—Moneys realized by a judgment debtor by a private sale of his property attached in execution of a decree against him and paid by him into Court under s 275 of the old Code (now O XVI r 50 (a)) for payment of the amount due to the decree holder at whose instance the property was attached were held to be assets not available for rateable distribution the reason given being that though there was a realization of assets the realization was not in one of the modes expressly prescribed by the sections of the Code

Note—The only distinction between cases B and F is that in case F the judgment debtor obtained the money by sale of the attached property while in case B he obtained it without any sale

It is submitted that the assets in cases A B C and F should under the present section be treated as assets available for rateable distribution The test under the present section is—

- (1) whether the moneys of which rateable distribution is claimed are assets held by the Court and
- (2) whether they have been realized or obtained in execution The scope of the new section is wider than that of the old one (1) See below notes under case F

### *Cases under the present section*

In the following cases which were all decided under the present section it was held that the moneys held by the Court were not assets available for rateable distribution within the meaning of the section —

F—*Sorabji v Kala* (1911) 36 Bom 150 12 I C 911—Money paid into Court by a judgment debtor under O XVI r 50 (a) [Code of 1882 s 275] for payment of the amount due to the decree holder at whose instance the property was attached has been held not subject to rateable distribution under this section (This is the same as case B above) Sir Baillie Scott C J said In the



reference to the costs of realization we have an indication that the legislature contemplated that the assets referred to should be assets held in the process of execution. If we were to hold that money paid into Court under Order XVI Rule 50 was assets held by the Court within the meaning of section 73 we should be only nullifying the provisions of Rule 55 for there will be no inducement to any judgment debtor to procure a payment into Court of the amount claimed by his attaching creditor if his money could at once be absorbed by rateable distribution amongst a number of other creditors. This assumes that the word realized means realized by sale or other process of execution expressly prescribed by the sections of the Code as was held in cases A C D and E. It is submitted with respect that the words sale or otherwise which occurred in s 290 of the Code of 1882 having been omitted in the present section the interpretation put upon those words in cases A C D and E can no longer govern cases arising under the present Code. All that is necessary under the present Code is that (1) there should be assets held by the Court and (2) that such assets should have been realized or obtained in execution proceedings [see the observations of Sir Lawrence Jenkins cited in case A above]. It cannot possibly be said that moneys paid into Court by a judgment debtor under stress of execution under O 21 r 55 (a) are not assets obtained in execution proceedings. It is indeed difficult to see how this view of the section nullifies the provisions of O 21 r 50 for money paid into Court under r 50 may be held to be assets subject to rateable distribution and yet full effect may be given to r 50. There is no reason why because a particular payment may operate to release the person (see case G) or property of a judgment debtor from attachment that payment should be applied for the benefit exclusively of the decree holder at whose instance the person or property of the judgment debtor was attached. Moreover the object of O 21 r 55 is not to afford any inducement to a judgment debtor as supposed by the Court in *Sorabji v Kala*. All that O 21 r 50 says is that the circumstances mentioned in cls (a) (b) and (c) of that rule shall have the effect indicated in the rule. As to the argument based on the costs of realization it cannot possibly be said that no costs were incurred in obtaining the moneys from the judgment debtor. The decision in *Sorabji v Kala* has been disapproved by the High Court of Madras (u). It has also been disapproved by Pratt J in a later Bombay case—*Nathmal v Vaniram* (v). As to the first of the two grounds on which the decision in *Sorabji v Kala* was based namely that the money was not realized in process of execution Pratt J said that it followed the cases decided on the words sale or otherwise which were held to mean sale or other process of execution expressly provided for in the Code but that it was too restrictive a construction under the amended section (w). As to the second ground namely that to allow rateable distribution of money paid into Court under O 21 r 50 would be to nullify the provision of r 50 the learned Judge said I also venture to doubt the correctness of the second reason. Order XVI rule 50 operates effectively where there is one decree holder. If there are a number of decree holders there is no scope for the rule for the judgment debtor has no motive for paying off one judgment-creditor when the same property is liable to be re-attached

( ) *Talagum v Lakshmi* (1910) 41 Mad 616 618 47 I C 74 P (para v 1 F L Mission (19 6) 423 I 34 9 I C 476  
( 6) 431 3)

(r) (1919) 11 m I F 97 98 9 31 C 99

(u) *Se Har Sah v Fajr Jahan* (1913) 40 Cal 611 6 13 I C 839

by the others. To allow one decree holder to be paid off in full when the property is insufficient to discharge other judgment debts might possibly be undue preference and defeat the object of the section which is equal distribution of all the monies received in execution. Again why should a judgment creditor whose attachment has been removed under Order XXI r 55 be in a better position than a judgment creditor who has taken the trouble of bringing the property to sale. Lastly if the money paid under Order XXI rule 50 to remove an attachment is not available for rateable distribution then a *fortiori* money paid to stop a sale under Order XXI rule 69 would also not be so available. But even under the old section it was assumed by Sir Charles Sargent in *Purshottamdas case* [case A p 231] that money paid to stop a sale is available for rateable distribution. So that the interpretation put upon the section in *Sorabji v Kala* makes the new section more restrictive than the old one and this is not what the Legislature intended. The decision in *Sorabji v Kala* has also been dissented from by the Calcutta High Court in *Noor Mahomed v Bilasram* (x). In that case Rankin J said: "The money paid with whatever motive if paid to the Court is paid upon terms of the Code whatever they may be. These terms as I read section 73 have been laid down so that distinctions in the form in which execution has been had in the precise extent to which execution has been allowed to run in the exact source or genesis of the fund in Court are now no part of the definition of assets that are subject to distribution rateably. The object of the new Code in using larger language can only be to avoid anomaly. To introduce a distinction on the strength of the voluntariness of the payment or the purpose of the debtor is I think to cut down the language and intention of the Code upon a principle which is inapplicable to the subject matter and which if applicable is very difficult to apply. The same view has been taken in later decisions of the same Court (y). In a later Bombay case (z) Mirza J refused to follow the opinion of Scott C.J. in *Sorabji v Kala* on the ground that it was obiter."

In the Madras case above referred to (a) it was held that moneys paid into Court under Order 21 r 83 (2) were assets liable to be distributed rateably within the meaning of this section. In the course of the judgment however the learned judges went to the length of observing that the assets referred to in the present section need not be as yet obtained in execution proceedings. This indeed is an extreme view and it was dissented from by Pratt J the learned judge holding that the reference to the costs of realization and the position of the section in the Code at the end of Part II on Execution led irresistibly to the conclusion that the asset to be available for rateable distribution must have been obtained in execution (b). The view taken by Pratt J is it is submitted correct. In a recent Calcutta case Rankin J took much the same view as Pratt J (c). The learned Judge said: "If for example a defendant is made to pay into Court the amount of the plaintiff's claim as a condition of getting an adjournment it does not follow from my reading

(x) (1904) 47 Cal 515 59 I C 459.  
 (y) (A) *Lal v Todarm* II (1911) 5 C W N 169 13 01 C 539 (1) A C 19 *Hare* N B J 19 35 Cal I J 37 01 C 541 (1) A C 749 [in new vol. 111 of Court are a set.]  
 (z) *I d. J. v. C. (1906) 33 Bom L R 23* 93 J C 8 (1) A J 94

(a) *Thayum v. J. A. A. (1915) 41 Mad 616 61 4 I C 534*  
 (b) *Na. A. v. M. (1919) 21 Bom 1* R 9 5 9 99 53 I C 592  
 (c) *Noor Mahomed v. Bilasram* (1920) 4 Cal 515 50 59 I C 458. See also *Idem v. Hare v. A. (1913) 33 Mad 221* 224 23 I C 39

of section 73 that other creditors could claim to share. Nor could they under O 21 r 5<sup>7</sup> where funds in Court are themselves the subject matter of the execution.

G—*Hys Umersey v H & A Graham & Co* (1917) 19 Bom L R 274 39 I C 673—Money paid by a judgment debtor under arrest under section 50 proviso 4 to the officer arresting him in order to secure his release is not an asset subject to rateable distribution. [This case is the same as case A] Macleod J said: It appears that the section was only intended to apply to assets realized by the sale of property attached. This view of the section it is submitted is not correct. If this view were correct money paid to stop a sale under O 21 r 69 and money raised by private alienation under O 21 r 83 would not be assets subject to rateable distribution. But even under the old section it was assumed by Sir Charles Sargent in case A that such monies were available for rateable distribution. It cannot possibly be said that the present section is more restricted in its scope than the old section. See also the observations of Rankin J in *Noor Mahomed's case* cited in case F above.

H—*Nathmal v Maniram* (1919) 21 Bom I R 37a 53 I C 390—I obtained a decree for money against B and in execution of the decree took out a warrant for attachment of the movable property of B under O 21 r 43. The bailiff entered B's shop and showed the warrant to B and pointed out that if the money were not paid he would seize and keep in his custody the movable property in his shop. B then paid the decretal amount and costs of execution and sheriff's poundage. Upon these facts Pratt J expressed the opinion that the money having been paid under stress of the warrant (d) and the warrant being a process of execution the money was an asset available for rateable distribution within the meaning of the present section. The learned Judge however felt bound by the decision of the Appellate Court in *Soraj's v Kala* [case I] and held that the money was not subject to rateable distribution.

I—*Ghisulal v Tolarmull* (1921) 26 C W N 169 70 I C 539—In a money suit by A against B B's property was attached before judgment and then released on C standing security for the amount of the claim. The suit was ultimately decreed and A applied for execution whereupon C deposited the amount of the decree in Court. On that very day just before the deposit was made D another decree holder applied for execution of his decree. It was held that the moneys deposited by the surty were assets held by the Court within the meaning of this section and D was entitled to rateable distribution.

J—For other cases see—

O 21 r 52 notes Priority

O 21 r 72 notes Amount due on the decree

O 21 r 83 notes Rateable distribution

O 21 r 89 notes 'For payment to the decree holder—rateable distribution

O 34 r 2 notes Deposit in Court



in the Madras case was a decree for the payment of money within the meaning of this section they would hold that it was not. In any event the Madras decision cannot be sustained under this Code see O 21 r 20.

- (iii) A decree directing the payment under s 90 of the Transfer of Property Act [now O 34 r 6] of the balance of the mortgage debt remaining due after payment to the mortgagee of the nett proceeds of the sale of the mortgaged property is a decree for the payment of money within the meaning of this section (l).
- (iv) A decree directing the payment of money by a person does not cease to be a decree for the payment of money so far as that person is concerned merely because it directs as against another person the realization of the money claim from mortgaged property. Thus a decree against A, B and C which so far as A and B are concerned is a decree for the enforcement of a mortgage by sale of their property but which does not direct the sale of any specific property belonging to C is as regards C a decree for the payment of money (m).
- (v) A judgment entered up under s 86 of the Insolvent Debtors Act is a money decree (n).

**5 Same judgment debtor**—The provisions of this section do not apply unless the judgment debtor is the same. Where the holder of a decree against two or more persons applies for a rateable distribution of the assets realized from property belonging to one of such persons the application is one for the execution of the decree against the same judgment debtor.

#### Illustration

X obtains a decree against A and attaches A's property in execution of the decree. Y who holds a decree against A and B applies for execution of his decree by attachment and sale of A's property attached in execution of X's decree. Y is entitled under this section to share in the proceeds of the sale of A's property. It is immaterial that X's decree against B alone and that the decree might have been separately executed against B. *Shumthoo Naik v Luckynath* (1883) 9 Cal 970. *Grant v Subramanian* (1899) — Mad 741. *D'Almeida and London Bank v Union Bank and Mercantile Bank* (1899) 10 All 30.

Similarly where the holder of a decree against one person applies for a rateable distribution of the assets of that person realized from property belonging to that person and another such application is an application for the execution of a decree against the same judgment debtor.

#### Illustrations

A obtains a decree against A, B and C and attaches in execution of the decree certain property belonging to A, B and C jointly. X holds a decree against A alone. X is entitled under the provisions of this section to a proportionate distribution of the assets realized by the sale of the joint property so far as they represent the share of A in that property. Similarly if X held a decree against A and B he would be entitled to a rateable distribution of the assets so far as they represented the share of A and B in the property. *Gonesh v Shiva* (1903) 30 Cal 593. *Chait Lal v Bir Bihadur* (1900) 27 All 108. *Pimmanathan v Subramania* (1903) 26 Mad 179. *Chhotailal v Valibhai* (1900) 29 Bom 525. These were decisions under s 90 of the Code of 1882. They have been followed under the present Code in *Hussain Sahel v Ilaya* (1911) 28 Bom 11.

(l) *Mallikarjuna v Lakshmi* (1907) 11 All 14.

(m) *D'Almeida and London Bank v Union Bank Ltd*

(n) *Sectore v K* (1899) 10 All 33.

(o) *Iyer Bhagwan Lal* (1894) 8 Bom 11.

78 93 I C 22 (26) A B 150 and *C P M A Chettyar v A R S I Chettyar* (1907) 5 Pan 57 107 I C 169 (28) A R 98 In *Balmer Laurie & Co v Jadunath* (1915) 42 Cal 1 27 I C 644 it was doubted whether the earlier decisions were affected by the introduction in the present section of the word passed which did not occur in the Code of 1882 *Balmer Laurie & Co v Jadunath* (1915) 42 Cal 1 27 I C 644

*Decree against legal representative of judgment debtor*—The High Courts of Bombay and Madras have held that if a decree is obtained by X against B and by Y after B's death against B's legal representative the judgment debtor is not the same and the present section does not apply (a). A different opinion has been expressed by the High Court of Calcutta (p).

Clauses (a) (b) and (c).—The first paragraph of this section and clauses (a) and (b) have reference to sales in execution of simple money decrees. Clause (a) declares the incompetence of a mortgagor or incumbrancer as such to share in any surplus proceeds when property is sold subject to his mortgage or charge. But the alternative is afforded to him by clause (b) of consenting to the property being sold free of his mortgage or charge in which case the Court may give him the same right against the sale proceeds as he had against the property. Clause (c) has reference to a sale in execution enforcing an incumbrance but in distributing the sale proceeds the discharge of subsequent (and not prior) incumbrances is alone taken into account (g) but no payment can be made to a subsequent incumbrancer if the mortgagor challenges its existence or validity (r). In cases coming under clause (c) the application for execution must be made prior to the sale of the property (s). Compare O 34 r 13.

*Claims for rateable distribution of assets*—These claims are claims enforceable under an attachment within the meaning of s 64. See notes to s 64. Explanation to the section.

*Attachment before judgment*—A decree holder who has caused property to be attached before judgment is not entitled to share in a rateable distribution of the sale proceeds of that property unless he makes after judgment a fresh application for execution under O 21 r 11 [Code of 1892 s 235] O 38 r 11 [Code of 1882 s 490] does not touch the point (f).

Sub sec (2) *Suit for refund*—The scheme of this section is to enable the Court as a matter of administration to distribute the assets according to what seems at the time to be the rights of parties without this distribution importing a conclusive adjudication as to the rights which may be subsequently readjusted in a suit brought under the penultimate paragraph of the section (u). Such a suit is virtually a suit for money had and received and the period of limitation is three years from the date of the receipt of the assets by the defendant (v). The suit being one for money had and received it would be premature if it were brought before the moneys were actually paid to the defendant. A mere order for the payment of money under the section is not sufficient to found the action (w).

*Suit by subsequent mortgagee to recover balance of money realized by sale under a prior mortgage*—X mortgages his property to A. He then mortgages the same property

- (c) *Gonnd v Moh ray* (1901) Bom 494  
Smt Sa v Janiunath (1910) 33 M d  
485 51 C 917  
(p) *H t v Tara Ira anna Mukhe j* (188 ) 11  
C 1 715 8  
(g) *J oaf v Df dhry* (1883) 5 All 566 See  
Iso M itf Kishan (1890) 1 All 546  
(r) *L chm v M ithu* (19 ) 4J All 636 101  
I C 0 ( 7) A 4 46  
(t) *Datt t j P d k* (19 0) Bom L R  
1001 1003 58 I C 93

- (f) *P H j v Jord n* (1888) 1 Lom 400  
Ar P H m v H jv She k Uee a (1910)  
34 Mad I C 68  
(u) *Sh nl Sa p v M j M t* (1901) 23 All  
313 3 41 4 03  
(v) *3 All 313 s j I m v r v Bri B Le*  
*Isf* (191 ) 39 All 3 333 9 I C 53  
*B 12 th v I af s* (1916) 39 M d 6  
26 I C 19 5 e Limitation Act rt 6  
(w) *H rt v T I sa a Mukherj* (188 ) 11  
Cal 18

to *B*. Subsequently he executes a further charge on the property in favour of *A*. *A* sues *X* on the first mortgage joining *B* as a defendant and obtains a decree on the mortgage. The property is sold in execution of the decree and a balance of Rs 12 000 which remains after satisfying *A*'s decree is deposited in Court. *A* then obtains a decree for sale on the further charge and in execution of the decree draws out the balance deposited in Court. *B* is not joined as a party to this suit nor is any notice given to him that *A* was drawing out of Court the balance of Rs 12 000. *B* then sues *A* to recover the amount drawn out by *A* that is Rs 12 000. Such a suit is not one under sub sec (2) and the period of limitation applicable to the suit is 12 years under art 132 of the Limitation Act. The suit is really one to enforce payment of money charged upon immovable property within the meaning of that article (x).

**Declaratory suit**—Is a decree holder claiming under this section entitled to file a suit for a declaration that another decree holder is not entitled to rateable distribution and for an injunction restraining him from receiving payment before distribution of the assets by the Court or is he bound to wait until actual distribution is made and then sue for a refund? In a Madras case (y) Sadasiva Ayyar J expressed the opinion that he is entitled to sue for a declaration.

**Inquiry as to the validity of decree**—There is a conflict of opinion whether on a claimant's objection that a decree obtained by another claimant is collusive that is obtained by the latter in collusion with the judgment debtor the Court has power to inquire into the validity of the decree. The High Court of Calcutta (z) has held that it has. On the other hand the High Courts of Madras (a) and Bombay (b) have held that it has not. The latter view it is submitted is correct. If a Court executing a decree has no power to go behind the decree [see notes to s 38] much less has a Court acting under the provisions of this section (c).

**Rights of Government not affected**—A judgment debt due to the Crown is entitled to precedence in execution (d).

**Attorneys lien**—The section does not apply to a solicitor's common law lien for costs. That lien is not affected by the attachment of the decree (e).

**Rights created by this section not affected by insolvency**—An order made under this section for rateable distribution is not affected by the insolvency of the judgment debtor subsequent to the making of the order. But the order will be confined in its operation to the assets of the judgment-debtor realized up to the date of the order of adjudication. Assets realized after the date of the order of adjudication will vest in the Official Assignee (f).

**Appeal**—An order made under this section is not appealable unless all the conditions enumerated in s 47 are present (g). One of those conditions is that the question decided by the Court should be one which arose between the parties to the suit that is between the judgment debtor on the one hand and the decree holder on the

(x) *Barhamdeo v Tara Chaud* (1914) 41 Cal 454 411 A 45 11 C 961

(y) *Ve Katarama v The South Indian Bank Limited* (19 0) 43 Mad 331 39 85 I C 45

(z) *In re S. S. Das* (1885) 11 Cal 4. *Panchand v S. S. Das* (191) 18 Cal L.J. 58 161 C 795. *Jay Lal v J. S. Lal* (1913) 19 C W N 903. 1 C 407. *In Math v Nath v Umesh Chaud* (1897) 1 Cal W N 633. *Maclean C.J.*, doubted the correctness of *In re S. S. Das*.

(a) *S. S. Das v Arumachalam* (1917) 40 Mad 841 35 I C 117

(b) *Dattatraya v Parshotam* (1922) 46 Bom 63

6 I C 600 (—) A D 31 [F B]

(c) *Re Shankar S. Das v Mayo Lal* (1901) 4 I A 203 33 All 313 followed in *Bibi Lema v R. S. S. S. S.* (19 6) 51 at 445 99 I C 79 (—) A F 497

(d) *Secretary of State v Bombay Land & C. Co* (1886) 5 R H C 3

(e) *Tyagi v Jetha* (19 7) 81 Dom 835 105 I C 393 (27) A D 517

(f) *Hosatam v Durrani* (1900) 27 Cal 331. *Official Receiver of Tanjore v Venkatarama* (1922) 4 Mad L.J. 361 63 I C 512, (2—) A.M. 31

(g) *Musammatt v Musammatt* (19 0) 5 Pat. L.J. 415 57 I C 4 I (1) A I 401

other (h) Hence an order made under this section determining a question between two rival decree holders in which the judgment debtor had no interest does not fall within s 47 and no second appeal lies from such order (i) But if the question determined by the order arose not only between rival decree holders but also between the judgment debtor on the one hand and the decree holders on the other the order would be within s 47 and would therefore be appealable (j)

REVISION — As to revision see the undermentioned cases (l)

## RESISTANCE TO EXECUTION

74 [S 330] Where the Court is satisfied that the holder of a decree for the possession of immovable property or that the purchaser of immovable property sold in execution of a decree has been resisted or obstructed in obtaining possession of the property by the judgment debtor or some person on his behalf and that such resistance or obstruction was without any just cause, the Court may, at the instance of the decree holder or purchaser, order the judgment debtor or such other person to be detained in the civil prison for a term which may extend to thirty days and may further direct that the decree holder or purchaser be put into possession of the property

See O 21 rr 97 103

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>(h) <i>Jagdish v Krishna Nath</i> (1909) 38 Cal 130<br/>11 C 783 <i>Doodakadas v Jadab</i> (19 4) 51<br/>Cal 61 at p. 67 (per W. J. J.)<br/>at pp. 71 773 (per Blaker) 11 C 81 C<br/>31 (-4) A C 201</p> <p>(i) <i>Balme Lawrence &amp; Co v Jadhav</i> (1914) 4-<br/>Cal 1 7 I C 644 <i>Varada v Venka</i><br/><i>t ratnam</i> (19 ) 40 31 d L J 43 67<br/>I C 546 ( ) A M 99</p> <p>(j) <i>Sorabji v Kaia</i> (191 ) 36 Bom 156 1-<br/>I C 911 <i>Rajah of A rotnagar v</i></p> | <p><i>Venkata Reddi</i> (1916) 39 Mad 570 -9<br/>I C 31</p> <p>(k) (19 4) 51 Cal 701 8 I C 781 (-4) A C<br/>401 [allowed] <i>Hars v Bindra</i> (19- )<br/>35 Cal L J 37 70 I C 541 (-1) A C<br/>749 [refused] <i>A rpaia v Pa ia</i> (19- )<br/>48 Mad L J 459 87 I C 390 (-5) A<br/>3f 587 [allowed] <i>Muzammal v Muzam</i><br/><i>mat</i> (19 0) 51 at L J 415 5 I C 41<br/>( 1) A P 401 [refused] <i>S A S Chettyar</i><br/><i>v S A I A Firm</i> (19 3) 6 Rang<br/>58 (-8) A R 163 [allowed]</p> |
|--|---|



## PART IV

## Suits in Particular Cases

## SUITS BY OR AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT OR PUBLIC OFFICERS IN THEIR OFFICIAL CAPACITY

**79 [S 416]** (1) Suits by or against the Government shall be instituted by or against the Secretary of State for India in Council

Suits by or against Government

(2) Nothing in this section shall be deemed to limit or otherwise affect any information exhibited by the Advocate General in exercise of the power declared by section 111 of the East India Company Act, 1813

Sub sec (2) is new

As to procedure in suits by or against Government see O 27

Scope of the section—This section does not enlarge or in any way affect the extent of the claims or liabilities enforceable by or against the Secretary of State for India in Council which must always depend on the provisions of the Government of India Act 1858 s 6 [now Government of India Act 1915 s 32] It gives no cause of action but only declares the mode of procedure when a cause of action has arisen (a) That section enacts that the Secretary of State in Council shall and may sue and be sued as well in India as in England by the name of the Secretary of State in Council as a body corporate and all persons and bodies politic shall and may have and take the same suits remedies and proceedings legal and equitable against the Secretary of State in Council of India as they could have done against the said Company that is the East India Company (1)

The Secretary of State is not a proper party to a suit by an owner of land under s 4<sup>o</sup> of the Specific Relief Act 1 of 1877 against a member of the public who claims to use such land as a public road and thereby endangers the title of the owner (c)

Act of State—The Secretary of State can only be sued in respect of those matters for which the East India Company could have been sued or matters for which private individual or trading corporations could have been sued or in regard to the matters for which there is express statutory provision No suit would lie against the East India Company in respect of acts of State or acts of Sovereignty and therefore no suit in respect of such acts lies against the Secretary of State in Council (1)

(a) *Jeha gir v Secretary of State* (1903) 2 Bom 189

(b) *See Dorn v Secretary of State* (1936) 14 C L 8 = 1 Secretary of State v Home (1913) 40 I A 46 15 40 Cal 321 151 C

(c) *Ch. J. H. v. J. m. F. (1888) 13 Cal 460*

(d) *I. & O. v. Secretary of State* (1911) 5 Bom 11 C App 1 approved in 40 I A 42 51 s pr *J. v. Secretary of State* (1903) = Bom 189 (damages for

defamation) *Saichan v Secretary of State* (1904) = 3 Bom 314 *East v. Secretary of State* (1916) 39 Mal 21 31 I C = 1 *Met. v. Secretary of State* (1911) 3 Cal 9 13 I C 30 *Secretary of State v. Cockcroft* (1916) 39 Mal 351 = 1 C 3 [Damages for injury to person] *see also Mackay v The East India Co* (1843) 2 Morley's Digest 20 *Secretary of State v. Harri* (1915) 38 Mad 3 10 v Secretary of State (1914) 38 Mal 466

other (A) Hence an order made under this section determining a question between rival decree holders in which the judgment debtor had no interest does not fall within s 47 and no second appeal lies from such order (2) But if the question determined by the order arose not only between rival decree holders but also between the judgment debtor on the one hand and the decree holders on the other the order would be within s 47 and would therefore be appealable (3)

Revision — As to revision see the undermentioned cases (4)

## RESISTANCE TO EXECUTION

74 [S 330] Where the Court is satisfied that the holder of a decree for the possession of

Resistance to execution

immovable property or that the purchaser of immovable property sold in execution of a decree has been resisted or obstructed in obtaining possession of the property by the judgment debtor or some person on his behalf and that such resistance or obstruction was without any just cause, the Court may, at the instance of the decree holder or purchaser, order the judgment debtor or such other person to be detained in the civil prison for a term which may extend to thirty days and may further direct that the decree holder or purchaser be put into possession of the property

See O 21 rr 97 103

- (A) *Jagdish v K. p. Nath* (1909) 36 Cal 130  
11 C 83 *Dwarkanath v Jagad* (1904) 51  
Cal 61 at p. 67 [per Walsmley J]  
at pp 71 773 [per Mukerji J] 31 C  
31 (4) A C 201
- (B) *Balm v Lawrence & Co v Jagdish* (1914) 4-  
Cal 1 71 C 644 *Varada v Venka*  
*ta Inam* (19 ) 4- M d L J 43 67  
1 C 546 ( ) A M 99
- (C) *Sorabji v Kala* (191 ) 36 Bom 156 12  
1 C 911 *Rajah of Jharkhand v*

- Venkata Reddi* (1916) 39 Mad 570 9  
1 C 31
- (K) (1904) 51 Cal 761 78 1 C 731 (4) A C  
801 [allowed] *Hari v Surendra* (19 )  
3 Cal L J 37, 01 C 641 (1) A C  
749 [refused] *Karpaga v Vania* (1905)  
48 Mad L J 459 571 C 390 (25) A  
M 587 [allowed] *Musammam v Musam*  
*mat* (190) 51 at L J 415 571 C 41  
(21) A P 401 [refused] *S. A. S. C. / Hyar*  
*v S. A. R. A. Firm* (1928) 8 Rang  
8 (8) A R 163 [allowed]

## PART III

### Incidental Proceedings

#### COMMISSIONS

Power of Court to issue commissions

**75** [Nen] Subject to such conditions and limitations as may be prescribed, the Court may issue a commission—

- (a) to examine any person,
- (b) to make a local investigation,
- (c) to examine or adjust accounts, or
- (d) to make a partition

The general powers of Courts in regard to commissions have been summarised in this section. The detailed provisions are set forth in O 26

Commission to another Court

**76** [S 395] (1) A commission for the examination of any person may be issued to any Court (not being a High Court) situate in a province other than the province in which the Court of issue is situate and having jurisdiction in the place in which the person to be examined resides

(2) Every Court receiving a commission for the examination of any person under sub section (1) shall examine him or cause him to be examined pursuant thereto, and the commission, when it has been duly executed shall be returned together with the evidence taken under it to the Court from which it was issued unless the order for issuing the commission has otherwise directed, in which case the commission shall be returned in terms of such order

See O 26 r 4

Letter of request

**77** [Nen] In lieu of issuing a commission the Court may issue a letter of request to examine a witness residing at any place not within British India

78 [S 391 ] The provisions as to the execution and return of commissions for the examination of witnesses shall apply to commissions issued by—

Commission  
foreign Courts issued by

- (a) Courts situate beyond the limits of British India and established or continued by the authority of His Majesty or of the Governor General in Council or
  - (b) Courts situate in any part of the British Empire other than British India, or
  - (c) Courts of any foreign country for the time being in alliance with His Majesty
-

## PART IV

## Suits in Particular Cases

## SUITS BY OR AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT OF PUBLIC OFFICERS IN THEIR OFFICIAL CAPACITY

79 [S 416] (1) Suits by or against the Government shall be instituted by or against the Secretary of State for India in Council

(2) Nothing in this section shall be deemed to limit or otherwise affect any information exhibited by the Advocate General in exercise of the power declared by section 111 of the East India Company Act, 1817

Sub sec (2) is new

As to procedure in suits by or against Government see O 27

Scope of the section—This section does not enlarge or in any way affect the extent of the claims or liabilities enforceable by or against the Secretary of State for India in Council which must always depend on the provisions of the Government of India Act 1858 s 65 [now Government of India Act 1915 s 32]. It gives no cause of action but only declares the mode of procedure when a cause of action has arisen (a) That section enacts that the Secretary of State in Council shall and may sue and be sued as well in India as in England by the name of the Secretary of State in Council as a body corporate and all persons and bodies politic shall and may have and take the same suits remedies and proceedings legal and equitable against the Secretary of State in Council of India as they could have done against the said Company that is the East India Company (1)

The Secretary of State is not a proper party to a suit by an owner of land under s 40 of the Specific Relief Act 1 of 1877 against a member of the public who claims to use such land as a public road and thereby endangers the title of the owner (c)

Act of State—The Secretary of State can only be sued in respect of those matters for which the East India Company could have been sued or matters for which private individuals or trading corporations could have been sued or in regard to those matters for which there is express statutory provision. No suit would lie against the East India Company in respect of acts of State or acts of Sovereignty and therefore no suit in respect of such acts lies against the Secretary of State in Council (d)

- (a) *Jeha Jir v Secretary of State* (1903)  
 11 M 149  
 (b) *S. P. v Secretary of State* (1938)  
 14 C L 50  
 (c) *Chun L. v. J. M. K. v. Secretary of State* (1911)  
 40 I A 48 51  
 40 C L 301 14 I C 1  
 (d) *Chun L. v. J. M. K. v. Secretary of State* (1911)  
 40 I A 48 51  
 40 C L 301 14 I C 1

- (e) *Jeha Jir v Secretary of State* (1903)  
 11 M 149  
 (f) *S. P. v Secretary of State* (1938)  
 14 C L 50  
 (g) *Chun L. v. J. M. K. v. Secretary of State* (1911)  
 40 I A 48 51  
 40 C L 301 14 I C 1  
 (h) *Chun L. v. J. M. K. v. Secretary of State* (1911)  
 40 I A 48 51  
 40 C L 301 14 I C 1

**Jurisdiction**—A suit against the Secretary of State for India can only be brought in the Court within the local limits of whose jurisdiction the cause of action arose. The words dwell or reside or carry on business or personally work for gain which occur in ss 16, 19 and 20 of the Code and cl 12 of the Letters Patent do not apply to the Secretary of State in Council (e)

**Information exhibited by Advocate General**—The power of the Advocate General to exhibit information in the nature of actions at law or bill in equity was expressly declared by s 111 of the East India Company Act 1813 [3 Geo 3 c 15] and kept alive by s 2 of the Government of India Act 1833 [3 & 4 Will 4 c 85] and again by s 1 of the Government of India Act 1853 [16 & 17 Vict c 9] and by s 29 of the Government of India Act 1858 [21 & 22 Vict c 106] now merged in s 114 of the Government of India Act 1910 [5 and 6 Geo 5 c 61]. As the Governor General in Council was precluded by s 22 of the Indian Councils Act 1861 [24 & 25 Vict c 67] from legislative interference with the provisions of any of the enactments above quoted it was thought that s 416 of the Code of 1852 [now sub section (1) of the present section] in so far as it excluded information exhibited by the Advocate General did not comprehend a full and accurate statement of the law on the subject. Accordingly sub section (2) was added to show that the power exists and is not affected by the section.

**Appeals**—The rule laid down in this section applies also to appeals (f)

**80 [S 424]** No suit shall be instituted against the Secretary of State for India in Council, or against a public officer in respect of any act purporting to be done by such public officer in his official capacity, until the expiration of two months next after notice in writing has been, in the case of the Secretary of State in Council delivered to, or left at the office of a Secretary to the Local Government or the Collector of the district, and, in the case of a public officer, delivered to him or left at his office, stating the cause of action, the name, description and place of residence of the plaintiff and the relief which he claims, and the plaint shall contain a statement that such notice has been so delivered or left.

**Changes in the section**—This section corresponds with s 404 of the Code of 1859. The words any act have been substituted for the words an act and the words by such public officer for the words by him. See notes below.

**Notice to Secretary of State**

**Provisions of this section imperative**—The section is a matter of civil procedure and cannot be said to be subject to section 60 of the Government of India Act see note. Scope of section under section 79. The section is explicit and mandatory and admits of no implications or exceptions (g). The language of this section is imperative and absolutely debars a Court from entertaining a suit instituted without compliance with its provisions. If the provisions of the section are not complied with the plaint must be rejected under O 7 r 11 (d) (h).

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>(e) <i>Dona Nargis v Secretary of State</i> (1889) 14 Cal 58. <i>Rodricks v Secretary of State</i> (1913) 40 (a) 309 151 C 95.</p> <p>(f) <i>Cited r H a v a d</i> (1978) 9 Lal 667 119 I C 477 (49) A L 10.</p> | <p>(g) <i>Bhagchand v Secretary of State</i> (19 ) 1 1 333 51 Bom 104 I C 27.</p> <p>(h) <i>B h a v Secretary of State</i> (190 ) 2, 48 137.</p> |
|---|--|

**Object of notice**—The object of the notice required by this section is to give the Secretary of State or the public officer an opportunity to reconsider his legal position and to make amends or settle the claim if so advised without litigation (1)

Notice must be given after accrual of cause of action — A notice given before the cause of action has arisen is invalid (3)

Devolution of defendant's interest upon Government pending suit—No notice is necessary if the defendant's interest devolves upon Government during the suit e.g. a private railway company is taken over by Government for then the suit has already been instituted (1). But if the suit was instituted in a Court which has no jurisdiction to try a suit against Government and the devolution occurs after the plaint has been returned for presentation in the proper Court notice is necessary (1).

Sufficiency of notice — A notice under this section is sufficient if it substantially fulfils its object in informing the parties concerned generally of the nature of the suit intended to be filed (m). Hence a notice is not invalid merely because it is given to only two out of three plaintiffs (n). It is essential however that the notice should state the names and descriptions and places of residence of all the plaintiffs. Hence where a suit was brought by sixty three plaintiffs but the notice contained the names and descriptions and places of residence of only two of them it was held that the notice was insufficient (o).

Waiver of notice — It is competent to the Secretary of State to waive notice and he may be estopped by his conduct from pleading the want of notice at a late stage of the trial. Thus, here the Secretary of State took objection to the sufficiency of notice in his written statement but raised no issue on the point when issues were settled and took no objection during the trial. The Court held that another defendant was not competent to raise this issue at a later stage as the Secretary of State had waived notice (p).

Notice to Secretary of State.—Where a suit is to be instituted against the Secretary of State for India and Council notwithstanding this section must be given in all cases in which the act in respect of which the suit is to be brought purports to be done by him in his official capacity or not. The word in respect of any act purporting to be done by such public officer in his official capacity refer to the public officer and not to the Secretary of State. The substitution of the word by such public officer for the words by him which occurred in the corresponding s 424 of the Code of 1884 makes the point just clear.

Notice to public officer—Act purporting to be done in official capacity—The present section corresponds with s. 41 of the Code of 1880, except that the word any has been substituted for the word an and the words such public officer have been substituted for the word him. According to the concise Oxford Dictionary to purport in this context means to be intended to seem. Applying this meaning the words any act purporting to be done by such public officer in his official capacity mean any act intended to seem to be done by him in his official capacity (9). If the act was one

(7) *serfry* f *stide* v *Prum* I (1901) 1  
*Mai* v *st* *ab* *ad* *ev* *f* *prum* (1951)  
 (L 499 *Ma* *ad* *ev* *f* *prum* of  
 (190) Cal. L. J 189 *er* *f* *ry*  
*f* *st* *id* v (ad m) *er* *f* *ry* (1916) 40 *prum*

(f) K O N V S Cr T Fe f Si te(19%) + Ca!

860 10 1 1 200 1 ) A 1 1

(4) C I I Fly v MAA 10 (1978) 441 L J  
6401 C 31 (6) 44, 49

(f) If  $\text{hat} \leq v \leq \frac{1}{2}$ ,  $\frac{1}{2} \leq \frac{1}{2} \leq \frac{1}{2}$  (12-3)

| (m) | J | P | g    | t | J | f | tot (1903) | 1 om |
|-----|---|---|------|---|---|---|------------|------|
|     |   |   | 1.00 |   |   |   |            |      |

(a) *Secretary of State*  $\neq$  *mal(1001) + M*

(1) *Journal of the Society of State* (1913) 40  
(2) *Journal of the Society of State* (1913) 40

(p) Ma ad a Secret y f Sta a (1907) 5  
tak. f 144 f Aola Nath v Secretary of  
tre (191) 40 (al 203 16 I C 849  
M Lad F f f) er d (193) 4 41  
M 21 84 f 3 (m) A A 11

(g) *Fossil Fuel Tax Act* (1919) 41 Stat. 27  
60 Stat. 25 per Walli C.J.

such as is ordinarily done by the officer in the course of his official duties and he considered himself to be acting as a public officer and desired other persons to consider that he was so acting the act clearly purports to be done in his official capacity within the ordinary meaning of the term purport (r)

Notice to the Secretary of State must be given in all cases *whatever the character of the suit* may be (s) but notice to a public officer is to be given in those cases only where the suit is in respect of an act purporting to be done by such public officer in his official capacity. It follows that notice to a public officer is not necessary where the act done by him is *not within his sphere of duties*. Thus where a public officer took possession of property which he had no authority to seize and was sued for trespass it was held that the suit was not against him in his official capacity but as a private individual and therefore no notice was necessary (t). So also when an investigating police officer assaulted a witness (u) or a sub-overseer was assaulted by his superior officer and the suit was for damages the act complained of was not an act purporting to be done by the defendant in his official capacity and therefore no notice was necessary (v). No notice is necessary when the suit is not in respect of an act done by the public officer although he is made a defendant as when a Collector is made a party defendant for the protection of the title of a minor (w) or when the suit is against the Official Trustee for the determination of the rights of beneficiaries to trust funds in his hands (x) or when the Official Assignee as representing the estate of an insolvent is made a party in a suit for declaration of title and no act of the Official Assignee is complained of except an objection to the entry of plaintiff's name on the record or rights (y).

The decisions are conflicting as to whether notice is necessary under this section when a public officer acts *mala fide* that is maliciously or dishonestly it being held in some cases that it is not (z) while in others that it is (a) necessary. The former proceed on the ground that an act done *mala fide* by a public officer cannot be said to be an act purporting to be done by such public officer in his official capacity. The latter proceed on the ground that the section makes no distinction between acts done *bona fide* and acts done *mala fide* and that notice is necessary in every case where a public officer purports to act in his official capacity. Thus a suit against a police officer for having searched the house of the plaintiff dragged him to the thana and detained and kept him in confinement for several hours maliciously and without cause could be filed according to the former view without notice because the officer having a *total ill will* and in *bad faith* could not be said to have acted in his capacity as a public officer (b). Similarly in a suit against a District Magistrate and two officers of Police for conspiracy and malicious arrest and search it was held that the suit was one in which the public officer was sued in respect

(r) *Abd l F* (1904) 48 Cal 411 84 SOI C (4) A A 8 1

(s) *Secretary of State* (1914) 3 Mad 113 181 C 94

(t) *Goada v. Nal* (1909) 38 Cal 3 111 514

(u) *Datt v. A. L. 35* (1919) Bom 83 (S) A L 35 (E B)

(v) *Mumta Hu* (1910) All I 301 51 C 46

(w) *Ana th am n v. Pa a a* (1898) 11 All 31

(x) *Shalab adde Frou* (1891) Cal 490

(y) *Da oda* (1913) Bom I 38 31 C 40 (3) A B 33

(z) *Shalab adde Frou* (1891) Cal 490

(a) *Shalab adde Frou* (1891) Cal 490

(b) *Shalab adde Frou* (1891) Cal 490

(a) *Jore d. v. P. d. v. P. d.* (1904) 8 Bom 41

(a) *Jore d. v. P. d. v. P. d.* (1904) 8 Bom 41

(a) *Jore d. v. P. d. v. P. d.* (1904) 8 Bom 41

(a) *Jore d. v. P. d. v. P. d.* (1904) 8 Bom 41

(a) *Jore d. v. P. d. v. P. d.* (1904) 8 Bom 41

(a) *Jore d. v. P. d. v. P. d.* (1904) 8 Bom 41

(a) *Jore d. v. P. d. v. P. d.* (1904) 8 Bom 41

(a) *Jore d. v. P. d. v. P. d.* (1904) 8 Bom 41

(a) *Jore d. v. P. d. v. P. d.* (1904) 8 Bom 41

(a) *Jore d. v. P. d. v. P. d.* (1904) 8 Bom 41

(a) *Jore d. v. P. d. v. P. d.* (1904) 8 Bom 41





such as is ordinarily done by the officer in the course of his official duties and he considered himself to be acting as a public officer and directed other persons to consider that he was so acting the act clearly purporting to be done in his official capacity within the ordinary meaning of the term purport (r)

Notice to the Secretary of State must be given in all cases whether the character of the suit may be (a) but notice to a public officer is to be given in the cases only where the notice in respect of any act purporting to be done by such public officer in his official capacity. It follows that notice to a public officer is not necessary where the act done by him is not within his sphere of duty. Thus where a public officer took possession of property which he had no authority to seize and was sued for trespass it was held that the suit was not against him in his official capacity but as a private individual and therefore no notice was necessary (b). So also when an investigating police officer assaulted a witness (c) or a sub-overseer was assaulted by his superior officer and the suit was for damages the act complained of was not an act purporting to be done by the defendant in his official capacity and therefore no notice was necessary (d). No notice is necessary when the suit is not in respect of an act done by the public officer although he is made a defendant as when a Collector is made a party defendant for the protection of the title of a minor (e) or when the suit is against the Official Trustee for the determination of the rights of such persons to trust funds in his hands (f) or when the Official Assignee representing the estate of an insolvent is made a party in a suit for declaration of title and an act of the Official Assignee is complained of except an objection to the entry of plaintiff's name on the record of rights (g).

The decisions are conflicting as to whether it is necessary under this section when a public officer acts *in his official capacity* that he is acting in his official capacity. In some cases it is held that it is not (1) but in others that it is (2) and (3) the former proceeds on the ground that an act done *in his official capacity* is a public officer cannot be an act purporting to be done by such public officer *in his official capacity*. The latter proceeds on the ground that the section makes a distinction between acts done *in his official capacity* and acts done *in his private capacity* and that notice is not necessary in the latter case where a public officer purports to act in his *official capacity*. Thus a suit against a police officer for having searched the house of the plaintiff dragged him to the station and detained and kept him in confinement for several hours *in his official capacity* with out notice *in his official capacity* could not be said to have acted *in his official capacity* of the officer (2). Similarly in a suit against a District Magistrate and two officers of the police for a search and seizure it was held that the suit was in which the public officer was sued in respect

- [illegible]

of an act done in bad faith and therefore no notice under this section was required (c). On the other hand in *Jogendranath Roy v Price* (d) where the plaintiff sued a District Magistrate for damages for illegal and malicious arrest under a warrant it was held that though the act was said to have been done maliciously notice was necessary under this section. The Court said The section does not seem to us to warrant the drawing of a distinction between acts of this kind done inadvertently or otherwise. Following the above decision the High Court of Allahabad in a suit against a Police Officer to recover certain books seized by him in a search said that if he seized the books which was denied he did so in his capacity of Police Officer and that notice was necessary under this section (e). In a case decided by a Full Bench of the Madras High Court (f) A sued B and attached before judgment certain wood belonging to B. Thereafter the village munsif sold the wood for arrears of revenue due from B though there was no necessity to sell the whole and after retaining the amount due for arrears of revenue handed over the balance of the sale proceeds to B although he had knowledge of the attachment. Thereupon A brought a suit against the village munsif for damages alleging that the munsif had colluded with B and paid the balance to him. The Court found that the munsif was aware of the attachment and that he dishonestly and fraudulently paid over the balance of the sale proceeds to B. On the question of notice under this section the Full Bench held that the munsif was entitled to notice under this section although he acted *ma'a fide* in the discharge of his duties. The latest decisions of all the High Courts are in favour of the view that notice is necessary even if the act is done *mala fide*. In this connection it is well to recall the dictum of Privy Council in *Bhagchand v Secretary of State* (g) that the section admits of no implications or exceptions.

**Suits on contracts and torts**—The High Court of Bombay had held in a series of cases that the requirement of notice was limited to suits on tort and that no notice was necessary in suits founded on contract (h). This distinction for which there is no justification in the terms of the section has been swept away by the Privy Council judgment in *Bhagchand v Secretary of State* (i) which describes the section as imposing a statutory and unqualified obligation upon the Court and as applicable to all forms of action and all kinds of relief.

**Declaratory suits**—The section applies to suits for a declaration (j).

**Suits for injunction**—There was a conflict of decisions as to whether the section applied to suits where the relief claimed was a perpetual injunction. This is settled by the Privy Council judgment in *Bhagchand v Secretary of State* (k) approving Calcutta, Madras and Allahabad decisions (l) that the section and the corresponding section 424 of the previous Codes should be strictly complied with and that they are applicable to all forms of action and all kinds of relief. The Privy Council overruled Bombay decisions that no notice was necessary in a suit for an injunction against a public officer or even against the Secretary of State when the act to be restrained might occasion serious or

(c) *Puri Mohan Das v West* (1906) 16 C L W N 143.

(d) (189) 4 C L 284.

(e) *Khaliwarji v Abdul Latif* (1907) 9 All

(f) *Koradi v Subbiah* (1915) 41 Mad 9.

(g) (19) 54 I A 334 1 Bom 104 I C

37 ( ) A P L 16.

(h) *Pym v Hume* (1896) 20 F 11 69 (Civil Rev v TA C to mind Commisr of Poona (1910) 35 I m 553 7 I C 69 *Jha v Vana* (1892) 12 Lam 313 *Cole v Goss* (1892) 14 I m 325

(i) (197) 4 I A 334 51 I m 104 I C

37 ( ) A P L 16.

(j) *Chhapal v Collector of Kaira* (1911) 35

Bom 4 7 I C 923 *Bhagchand v Sec-*

*y of State* (197) 51 I A 334 51 Bom

104 I C 7 (7) A I C 176.

(k) (19) 51 A 334 51 Bom 104 I C

37 ( ) A I C 16.

(l) *Serv v Subbiah* (1915) 41 Mad 9.

72 *Bankim v v Oma Chand*

(194) 0 Cal 97 75 I C 13 (191)

A 14 5 C 10 v f t e v *Kalekhan*

(1914) 3 Mad 113 14 I C 917 *Kodi*

*Subbiah* (1919) 41 Mad 9.

46 I C 86 *Bankim v Serv v State*

(1907) 5 All 14 *Abdullah v Abdul*

*Amma* (1944) 48 All 891 80 I C

(191) 5 A 11 *Iranacham v Jha*

(19) 103 I A 39 99 I C 101 (197) A M

166 *ma t e t k n* to have been over

ruled by the Privy Council in *Bhagchand v Sec-*

irreparable damage (m) In delivering the judgment of the Board Viscount Sumner said  
To argue a the appellants did that the plaintiffs had a right urgently calling for a  
remedy while s 80 is a mere procedure is fallacious for s 80 imposes a statutory and  
unqualified obligation upon the Court So too the contention that the act purporting  
to be done by the Collector in his official capacity in respect of which the suit was  
begun was threatened enforcement of payment is fallacious also since the illegality  
if any is in the order for recovery of the tax If that was valid there was nothing to be  
restrained Hence though the act to be restrained is something apprehended in the  
future the act alone in respect of which the suit lies if at all is the order already  
completed and issued In a Bombay case it was left open whether if with notice of a  
suit the intended defendant proceeded to act in such a way as to anticipate a hostile order  
of the Court in the intended suit the Court could restore the status quo ante on an  
interlocutory application before the trial (n)

By what name public officer to be sued —The suits referred to in this section are suits against the public officer personally in respect of acts done in his official capacity. The public officer cannot be sued by his official name unless he is a corporation sole (c)

*Death of complainant after notice but before suit*—Notice is given by A under this section to the Secretary of State of a proposed suit. A dies before the institution of the suit. The notice by A does not enure for the benefit of his legal representative and he must give a fresh notice under this section before instituting the suit (p).

**Amendment of plaint**—Where notice of a proposed suit is once given it is not necessary to give a fresh notice of two months if the plaint has to be amended owing to discovery of facts not within the plaintiff's knowledge at the time of the institution of the suit (g) But no amendment will be allowed if the effect of the amendment is to convert the suit into another of a different character e.g. a suit based on negligence into one based on nuisance In such a case a fresh suit must be brought after giving fresh notice as required by this section (r)

**Notice to Collector**—A collector is entitled to notice under this section of a suit for damages in respect of an act done by him in his official capacity as agent of the Court of Wards but he is not entitled to such notice if he is sued or joined as a party not by reason of any act purporting to be done by him in his official capacity but merely for the protection of a minor's title (s)

Notice to Cantonment Committee.—A Cantonment Committee constituted under the Indian Cantonments Act 1889 is a public officer within the meaning of this section. (t)

**Notice to Official Assignee.**—The Official Assignee is a public officer and he is entitled to notice under this section before a suit is filed against him in respect of any act purporting to be done by him in his official capacity (u). The same rule applies to a Receiver appointed under the Provincial Insolvency Act 1920 (v). But no notice is necessary when the Official Assignee or Receiver is made a party to a suit to realize a charge on the property of the insolvent which has vested in him and no act or omission

(m) Secret ry of State v Gay an (1911) 3 Lom  
38 10 1 C 639 App lat Official  
Atengene (191) 37 Bom 43 17 I C 8 6  
S c e l a y f State v L 1 M Ha ul (1916)  
40 Bom 3 3 1 I C 535  
( ) v t n v S c r y of State (19 7) 29 Bom  
Lk 13 7 10 1 L 7 6 ( ) AL 649  
(o) Sh ruff of L b v Halmay (19 ) 51 Bom  
749 104 L C 655 ( ) A B 5 1  
61 t L J 18 611 C 990 ( ) A P 3  
(n) D hehu Secret ry of State (190 ) 3 Ah  
18

(q) *Eva v Secretary of State* (1903) 30 Cal 36  
 (r) *Melnerny v Secretary of State* (1911) 39  
     Cal 37 13 Cal 30  
 (s) *Anantharaman v Iam am* (1888) 11 Mad  
     317 *Bhav v Na* (1889) 13 Bom 343  
 (t) *Cecil Gaj v The Cantonment Commis-*  
*of Poona* (1910) 31 Bom 583 71 C. 69  
 (u) *Josiah v Kemp* (1907) 6 Bom 809  
 (v) *De Siva v Gorind* (1904) 41 Bom 89 A  
     IC All 291 31st Cal v Davis (1904)  
     47 All 291 84 IC Lal & A A A (L.)

**Notice to Official Trustee**—By s. 16 of the Official Trustees Act 2 of 1913 it is enacted that nothing in s. 80 of the Code shall apply to any suit against the Official Trustee in which no relief is claimed against him personally.

Notice to Administrator General—By s 41 of the Administrator General's Act 3 of 1913 it is enacted that nothing in s 80 of the Code shall apply to any suit against the Administrator General in which no relief is claimed against him personally.

Notice to common manager appointed under sec 95 of the Bengal Tenancy Act 8 of 1885—Such a manager is a public officer within the meaning of this section and he is entitled to notice under this section ( )

**Limitation**—In computing the period of limitation prescribed for a suit under this section, the period of the notice should be excluded (a)

Place of suling—See note to s. 79 above Jurisdiction

**81** [Ss 427, 428] In a suit instituted against a public officer in respect of any act purporting to be done by him in his official capacity—

(a) the defendant shall not be liable to arrest nor his property to attachment otherwise than in execution of a decree and.

(b) where the Court is satisfied that the defendant cannot absent himself from his duty without detriment to the public service it shall exempt him from appearing in person

Otherwise than in execution of a decree —The object of law (a) is to exempt a defendant who is a public officer from the arrest and his property from attachment. Sec. 102, Cr. P.

82 [S. 429] (1) Where the decree is against the Secretary of State for India in Council or against a public officer in respect of any such act

as aforesaid, a time shall be specified in the decree within which it shall be satisfied and if the decree is not satisfied within the time so specified the Court shall report the case for the orders of the Local Government.

(2) Execution shall not be issued on any such decree unless it remains unsatisfied for the period of three months computed from the date of such report.

(w) I p p e e d e I h I ( I J ) 45 A H 8 1  
0 1 1 4 3 ( I A A 1

( ) N e l l e o e I t e n g e ( 191 ) 1 o m  
13 17 1 1 8 6

(y) I h w k I e e r r o r y o f c l a t ( 10 ) 5 8  
I A 3 4 5 1 1 m I A 1 C 1

(g) P i u d e D & N y n (1912)  
C W V 12 631 747  
(h) H i t A t B 1 ( ) York  
H i t v s o f 3 5 Lail  
(10) I P n 1 1 3 4 6

## SUITS BY ALIENS AND BY OR AGAINST FOREIGN AND NATIVE RULES

**83 [S 430]** (1) Alien enemies residing in British India with the permission of the Governor General in Council, and alien friends, may

When alien may sue  
sue in the Courts of British India, as if they were subjects of His Majesty

(2) No alien enemy residing in British India without such permission, or residing in a foreign country, shall sue in any of such Courts

*Explanation*—Every person residing in a foreign country the Government of which is at war with the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and carrying on business in that country without a license in that behalf under the hand of one of His Majesty's Secretaries of State or of a Secretary to the Government of India shall, for the purpose of sub-section (2), be deemed to be an alien enemy residing in a foreign country

*Alien enemy*—Is to who are alien enemies see the undermentioned cases (b)

*Alien enemy residing in British India with permission of Government of India*—I filed a petition in the Allahabad High Court for judicial separation against her husband. The parties were Germans and the petition was filed while England was at war with Germany. At the time of filing the petition I was residing in Lucknow apparently with the permission of the Government of India while her husband was in Germany. After filing the petition I applied for an order directing the summons together with a copy of the petition to be sent to the Probate Divorce and Admiralty Division of the High Court in England for transmission to the Foreign Office for service upon the respondent. The Court granted the application (c)

*Limitation*—Where the right of alien enemies to sue is suspended by an order of the Government the period during which the right is suspended is not to be excluded from the time prescribed by the Limitation Act for the suit (d)

When foreign States may sue  
**84 [S 431]** (1) A foreign State may sue in any Court of British India

Provided that such State has been recognised by His Majesty or by the Governor General in Council

Provided, also that the object of the suit is to enforce a private right vested in the head of such State or in any officer of such State in his public capacity

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>(b) <i>Ja</i> <i>Dr fo t</i> <i>C</i> <i>I I I I M</i><br/> <i>Ltd</i> <i>[190]</i> <i>A C 4 4 1</i> <i>0</i> <i>D</i> <i>le t</i><br/> <i>P J Ltd</i> <i>(6 t</i> <i>t I I 2</i> <i>I I I</i><br/> <i>C Ltd</i> <i>(111)</i> <i>A C 38</i> <i>H J 31</i><br/> <i>Abd I J</i> <i>11 (19 0)</i> <i>Lal</i> <i>6</i> <i>I C 3 4</i></p> | <p>(c) <i>A J t</i> <i>J</i> <i>I I (11)</i> <i>33</i> <i>Al</i> <i>37</i> <i>39</i><br/> <i>I C 6</i><br/>         (d) <i>De t h A</i> <i>at I e t</i> <i>L v</i> <i>H ra</i> <i>Lall</i> <i>(1912)</i><br/> <i>at C I</i> <i>6 4 I C</i></p> |
|--|--|

(2) Every Court shall take judicial notice of the fact that a foreign State has or has not been recognized by His Majesty or by the Governor General in Council

Sub section (1) proviso (2)—The second proviso to the corresponding s 431 C 1 C 188, ran as follows —

I provided that the object of the suit is to enforce the private rights of the head or of the subjects of the foreign State

The language of that proviso was liable to be construed as conferring upon the head of a foreign State a general power to litigate in respect of the private rights of his subjects. Such however was not the object and the language has accordingly been modified to make it clear that the object of litigation by a foreign State must be the enforcement of a private right vested in the head of the State or in an officer of the State as such.

Private right vested in the head of a State—That is those private rights of a State that must be enforced through a Court of Justice as distinguished from its political rights (c)

Foreign State as plaintiff—A suit by a foreign State must be brought in the name by which it has been recognized by His Majesty (f)

85 [S 432] (1) Persons specially appointed by order of the Government at the request of any Sovereign Prince or Ruling Chief, whether in subordinate alliance with the British Government or otherwise, and whether residing within or without British

India or at the request of any person competent, in the opinion of the Government, to act on behalf of such Prince or Chief, to prosecute or defend any suit on his behalf shall be deemed to be the recognized agents by whom appearances, acts and applications under this Code may be made or done on behalf of such Prince or Chief

(2) An appointment under this section may be made for the purpose of a specified suit or of several specified suits, or for the purpose of all such suits as it may from time to time be necessary to prosecute or defend on behalf of the Prince or Chief

(3) A person appointed under this section may authorize or appoint persons to make appearances and applications and do acts in any such suit or suits as if he were himself a party thereto

Recognized agents specially appointed under this section—This section is an enabling section. It enables a Sovereign Prince or Ruling Chief to prosecute or defend suits through recognized agents *specially* appointed in that behalf it does not prevent the institution of a suit by a Sovereign Prince in his own name or through a recognized agent appointed under O 3 r 2 [Code of 1882 s 37] (g)

A plaint in a suit instituted on behalf of a Ruling Chief is signed by A B At the time of signing the plaint A B was not *specially* appointed to sue on behalf of the Chief under this section. The plaint is nevertheless good if A B is subsequently appointed to sue on behalf of the Chief and if the appointment is made before the expiration of the period of limitation prescribed for the suit (h)

A Political Agent not specially appointed under this section cannot sue on behalf of a Prince (i)

Discovery —A foreign State is not exempt from giving discovery (j)

**86 [S 433]** (1) Any such Prince or Chief, and any ambassador or envoy of a foreign State, may, with the consent of the Governor-General in Council, certified by the signature of a Secretary to the Government of India, but not without such consent, be sued in any competent Court

(2) Such consent may be given with respect to a specified suit or to several specified suits, or with respect to all suits of any specified class or classes, and may specify, in the case of any suit or class of suits, the Court in which the Prince, Chief, ambassador or envoy may be sued, but it shall not be given unless it appears to the Government that the Prince, Chief, ambassador or envoy—

- (a) has instituted a suit in the Court against the person desiring to sue him, or
- (b) by himself or another trades within the local limits of the jurisdiction of the Court, or
- (c) is in possession of immovable property situate within those limits and is to be sued with reference to such property or for money charged thereon

(3) No such Prince, Chief, ambassador or envoy shall be arrested under this Code, and, except with the consent of the Governor-General in Council certified as aforesaid, no decree shall be executed against the property of any such Prince, Chief, ambassador or envoy

(g) *Maharaja of Bhartpur v Kachera* (1897) 19 All 510 *Beer Chunder v Ishan Chunder* (1884) 10 Cal. 138 See also *Rameshchand v Maharaja Birendra* (1904) 29 C.W.N. 87 801 C 100, (5) A C 613  
(h) *Maharaja of Rewah v Swami Saran* (1903)

25 All 635

(i) *Fenkatrav v Madhatrav* (188 ) 11 Bom 53  
(j) *United States of America v Wagner* (1887) 4 Ch App 580 *Republic of Peru v Wagnel n* (1875) L R 20 Eq 140



(4) The Governor General in Council may, by notification in the Gazette of India, authorize a Local Government and any Secretary to that Government to exercise, with respect to any Prince, Chief, ambassador or envoy named in the notification, the functions assigned by the foregoing subsections to the Governor General in Council and a Secretary to the Government of India, respectively

(5) A person may, as a tenant of immovable property, sue, without such consent as is mentioned in this section, a Prince, Chief, ambassador or envoy from whom he holds or claims to hold the property

Consent shall not be given unless it appears to the Government that — The words it appears to the Government that have been added in sub section (2) to make it clear that the decision of the Government is final and not open to question by the Court The contrary was assumed in the undermentioned cases (k)

Consent must be obtained before institution of suit—This section provides that a Sovereign Prince or Ruling Chief may be sued in any competent Court with the consent of the Governor General in Council. Such consent must be obtained before the institution of the suit consent given after the institution of the suit is not a sufficient consent under this section. If the consent is not obtained before the institution of the suit the proper course is to dismiss the suit or perhaps allow the plaintiff to withdraw it with liberty to bring a fresh suit under O 23 r 1 [Code of 1882 s 373] (l)

Waiver of objection to want of consent —As stated in the notes to s 21 where a Court has no jurisdiction at all to entertain a suit the objection to its jurisdiction may be taken at any stage of the suit even though the defendant may have at one time waived the objection for a defect in the jurisdiction cannot be cured by waiver but if the case is one of irregular exercise of jurisdiction the defect may be cured by waiver on the part of the defendant If a suit is entertained against a Sovereign Prince without the consent of the Governor General in Council the case is one of irregular exercise of jurisdiction and if the defendant does not object until the suit is ripe for hearing he will be deemed to have waived the objection to jurisdiction. This was decided by the High Court of Bombay after an exhaustive review of the authorities on the subject (m) This view has been dissented from by the High Court of Madras on the ground that the recognition of cases of waiver as excepted from the ordinary provisions of International law as understood in England, cannot be imported into the clear language of the Indian Code (n) The Patna High Court has gone to the length of holding that applications for adjournment made on behalf of a Ruling Chief amount to a waiver of his privilege and disentitle him from objecting to the jurisdiction of the Court (o)

The fact that a Sovereign Prince chooses to waive his privilege in one suit does not preclude him from pleading it in another suit (p)

- (k) *Beer Chunder v Paj Coomar Nobodeep Chunder* (1883) 9 Cal 535 *Maharaja of Jajpur v Lalji Sahas* (1907) 29 All 3 U  
(l) *Cha dulal v Awad bin Umar* (189 ) 21 Bom 351 355 56 See also *Maharaja S v Arisendra v Maharaja Mani dra* (1912) 17 CWN 124 2 I C 889  
(m) *Chandul l v Aw d bin Uma* (189 ) 21 Bom 3 1 As to what amounts to a

- submission to jurisdiction see *Might v Suit n of Johore* (1893) 1 Q B 149  
(n) *Naraya d v The Chin Sircar* (1916) 39 Mad 661 30 I C 511  
(o) *JI Haraj Bahodu v Sira Sa an* (19 1) 6 1st L J 185 61 I C 989 (21) A.P 3  
(p) *Beer Chunder v Paj Coomar Nobodeep Chunder* (1883) 9 Cal 35

**Suit against person who subsequently becomes a Ruling Chief**—Where a person attains the rank of a Ruling Chief after the institution of a suit against him, the suit cannot be continued against him without the consent of the Governor General in Council (q)

**Immovable property**—Where a Ruling Chief and a private individual are co sharers in the profits of land within British India a suit by the latter against the Ruling Chief for his share of the profits under s. 165 of the Agra Tenancy Act [UP Act 2 of 1901] cannot be instituted in a Court of British India without the consent of the Governor General in Council (r)

**Money charged on immovable property**—Unless maintenance has been made a charge upon immovable property a mere claim for maintenance is not a claim for money charged on immovable property within the meaning of sub section (2) cl. (c) (s)

**Suit against Ruling Chief in his private capacity**—The provisions of this section apply whether the suit is brought against a Ruling Chief in his Sovereign capacity or in his private capacity e.g. as a trustee of a temple in British India (t)

**Sovereign Prince**—The Maharaja of Hill Tipperah is a Sovereign Prince within the meaning of this section in that the Tipperah State governs itself without dependence on any foreign power. It makes and administers its own laws and the Maharaja admittedly exercises the power of life and limb within his own territory. Its acknowledgment of the British Government as the paramount power and the nazar paid on the recognition by that Government of succeeding Maharajshs do not take away from it the status of a Sovereign State (u)

**Ruling Chief**—The Desai of Patadi is a Ruling Chief within the meaning of this section (v). The Kurundwad Jahageerdars are also Ruling Chiefs (w). The Maharaja of Benares is also a Ruling Chief (x)

**Sub section (4)**—For notifications issued under this sub section, see General Statutory Rules and Orders Vol I pp 625 633

**Limitation**—In computing the period of limitation the plaintiff is not entitled to deduct the time spent in obtaining a certificate under this section (y). Sec 13 of the Indian Limitation Act 1909 provides that in computing the period of limitation prescribed for a suit the time during which the defendant has been absent from British India shall be excluded. The Calcutta High Court has held that the time must be excluded even if the defendant was carrying on business in British India through an authorised agent during his absence (z). The High Court of Bombay however has held that sec 13 of the Limitation Act must be read with secs 85 86 and 87 of the Code so far as a Sovereign Prince or a Ruling Chief is concerned and that such a Prince or Chief can be held to reside in British India within the meaning of sec 13 of the Limitation Act in so far as he actually carries on business through his representatives in British India (a)

(g) *Maharaj Bahadur v Sita Sa* (1921) 6 Pat L J 185 61 I C 939 (1) A P 3

(r) *Kalyan Lal v H H the Maharaja of Benares* (194) 40 All 355 78 I C 55J (24) A A 4 2

(s) *Beer Chunder v Raj Coomarp Nobadarp Chunder* (1883) 9 Cal. 53

(t) *Narayan v The Cochim Sircar* (1913) 38 Mad 635 11 I C 930 affirmed (1916) 39 Mad 661 30 I C 511

(u) *Beer Chunder v Raj Coomarp Nobadarp Chunder* (1883) 9 Cal. 53

(v) *Kumbha v H mut S of* (1884) 8 Bom 415

(w) *Krishnay v Secretary of State* (1913) 1 Bom. L R 376 51 I C 3

(x) *Panha ya Lal v H H the Maharaja of Benares* (124) 40 All 355 300 8 I C 559 (4) A A 4

(y) *Shrimant Savaji Maharaj v Madhav Rao* (1909) 53 Bom L. 115 I C 369 (23) A B 11

(z) *Peorua Chunder v Sassoon* (1898) 25 Cal. 496

(a) *Shrimant Savaji Maharaj v Madhav Rao* (1909) 53 Bom L. 115 I C 369 (23) A B 11

87 [S 434] A Sovereign Prince or Ruling Chief may sue, and shall be sued, in the name of his State

Style of Princes and Chiefs as parties to suit

Provided that in giving the consent referred to in the foregoing section the Governor-General in Council or the Local Government, as the case may be, may direct that any such Prince or Chief shall be sued in the name of an agent or in any other name

### INTERPLEADER

88 [S 470, R S C, O 57, rr 12] Where two or more persons claim, adversely to one another the same debt, sum of money or other property, movable or immovable, from another person, who claims no interest therein other than for charges or costs and who is ready to pay or deliver it to the rightful claimant, such other person may institute a suit of interpleader against all the claimants for the purpose of obtaining a decision as to the person to whom the payment or delivery shall be made and of obtaining indemnity for himself

Where interpleader suit may be instituted

Provided that where any suit is pending in which the rights of all parties can properly be decided, no such suit of interpleader shall be instituted

See O 35 below

Changes in the section —This section corresponds with s 470 of the Code of 1832 except in the following particulars —

- (1) The words, the same debt sum of money or other property movable or immovable have been substituted for the words, the same payment or property
- (2) The words who claims no interest therein other than for charges or costs have been borrowed from R.S.C O 57 r 2 and have been substituted for the words whose only interest therein is that of a mere stakeholder

What is an interpleader suit.—An interpleader suit is one in which the real dispute is between the defendants only and the defendants *interplead* that is to say plead against each other instead of pleading against the plaintiff as in an ordinary suit. In every interpleader suit there must be some debt or sum of money or other property in dispute between the defendants only and the plaintiff must be a person who claims no interest therein other than for charges or costs and who is ready to pay or deliver it

to such of the defendants as may be declared by the Court to be entitled to it. Thus suppose certain property is claimed by *A* as well as by *B* and *X* is in possession of that property and claims no interest in the property himself and is ready and willing to deliver it to such party as may be declared by the Court to be the rightful owner of it. *X* as plaintiff may institute an interpleader suit against *A* and *B* as defendants. In such a case *X* will as a rule be dismissed from the suit at the first hearing after the rules are provided for and *A* and *B* will be left to interplead and to fight the matter out between themselves as if one of them was plaintiff and the other was defendant (O 35 r 4). But before the plaintiff is dismissed from the suit he must deposit the property in dispute in Court (O 35 r 2).

Who claims no interest other than for charges or costs.—These rules indicate that the plaintiff in an interpleader suit must be in a real position of impasse. A railway company which claims no interest in goods in its possession other than a lien on the goods for wharfage demurrage and freight may institute an interpleader suit where the goods are claimed by two persons adversely to each other (b).

*A* holds in his hands a sum of Rs 5 000 which is claimed by *B* and *C* adversely to each other. *A* institutes an interpleader suit against *B* and *C*. It is found at the trial that *A* had entered into an agreement with *B* before the institution of the suit that if *A* succeeded in the suit he should accept from *A* Rs 4 000 only in full satisfaction of his claim. Here *A* has by virtue of the agreement an interest in the subject-matter of the suit and he is not therefore entitled to institute an interpleader suit. The suit is dismissed (c).

A party who has taken an indemnity from one of the claimants is not entitled to institute an interpleader suit (d).

A suit is not necessarily an interpleader suit and subject to the provisions of this section merely because one of the reliefs claimed by the plaintiff requires the defendant to interplead together concerning certain claims. The Court must lay regard to the prayers of the plaintiff to determine the exact nature of the suit (e).

(b) *Bombay and Baroda Rly Co v Sassoon* (1894) 18 Bom 31; *Allenborough v St Katharine's Docks* (1878) 3 Q F D 450.  
(c) *Murretta v South American Co* (1893) 6 L J Q B 396.

(d) *Hari Karmalar v J. & S.* 46 991 C 985 (1907).  
(e) *Juggannath v Tulsi Kher* 69

## PART V

### Special Proceedings

#### ARBITRATION

**89** [*New*] (1) Save in so far as is otherwise provided by the Indian Arbitration Act, 1899, or by any other law for the time

Arbitration

being in force, all references to arbitration whether by an order in a suit or otherwise, and all proceedings thereunder, shall be governed by the provisions contained in the second Schedule

(2) The provisions of the second Schedule shall not affect any arbitration pending at the commencement of this Code, but shall apply to any arbitration after that date under any agreement or reference made before the commencement of this Code

**Arbitration**—The provisions of the Code of 1882 relating to arbitration have been transferred with certain modifications to a separate Schedule [Sch II] in the hope that at no distant date they may be transferred into a comprehensive Arbitration Act

**Indian Arbitration Act 9 of 1899—Application of the Act.**—The Act came into force on the first day of July 1899. It relates to arbitration by agreement without the intervention of a Court of Justice that is to say to private arbitrations only. Sec. 3 of the Act provides that sections 523 to 526 of the Code of 1882 [now paras 17, 19 and 20 of Sch. II] shall not apply to any submission or arbitration to which the Act applies. The question then arises to what cases does the Act apply? Sec. 2 of the Act provides that the Act shall apply only in cases where if the subject matter submitted to arbitration were the subject of a suit the suit could whether with leave or otherwise be instituted in a Presidency town. The terms of that section show that two conditions must be present before the provisions of the Arbitration Act can be applied to an agreement to refer matters in dispute to arbitration namely (1) that there should not be a suit pending in respect of those matters (2) and (3) that the case must be one in respect of which if either party wanted to bring a suit the suit could be instituted in a Presidency town. It is only to such cases that the Arbitration Act applies. In other cases the provisions of paras 17, 19 and 20 of Sch. II apply

Sec. 2 of the Arbitration Act empowers the Local Government with the previous sanction of the Governor General in Council, to declare the Act applicable to local areas other than Presidency towns as if they were Presidency towns

Any other law for the time being in force —See notes to O 23 r 3  
Submission and award.

Suit on an award —As to the form of a suit on an award see Sch. I App A form No 10 See also notes to Sch. II para 20 This paragraph is no bar to a regular suit to enforce an award.

In this connection may be noted the provisions of s 30 of the Specific Relief Act of 1877 by which it is enacted that the provisions of Chapter II of the Act relating to the specific performance of contracts shall *mutatis mutandis* apply to awards See Pollock and Mulla's Indian Contract and Specific Relief Acts notes to s 30 of the latter Act

## SPECIAL CASE

**90 [New]** Where any persons agree in writing to state a case for the opinion of the Court, then the Court shall try and determine the same in the manner prescribed

Power to state case for opinion of Court.

See O 36 below

Re opening of case —It is settled practice that where a special case is stated by consent it can only be re opened by mutual consent (g)

## SUITS RELATING TO PUBLIC MATTERS

**91 [New]** (1) In the case of a public nuisance the Advocate-General, or two or more persons having obtained the consent in writing of

Public nuisances

the Advocate General, may institute a suit, though no special damage has been caused, for a declaration and injunction or for such other relief as may be appropriate to the circumstances of the case

(2) Nothing in this section shall be deemed to limit or otherwise affect any right of suit which may exist independently of its provisions

This section is new It creates a right of action where there was none before

Remedies for a public nuisance —Nuisances are of two kinds—(1) public and (2) private

A public nuisance is an act or illegal omission which causes any common injury danger or annoyance to the public or to the people in general who dwell or occupy property in the vicinity or which must necessarily cause injury obstruction, danger or annoyance to persons who may have occasion to use any public right [Indian Penal Code s 268]

Where a person commits a public nuisance—

- (a) he is liable to criminal prosecution under the Indian Penal Code
- (b) he may be proceeded against under this section

- (c) he is liable to damages in a suit at the instance of a private individual who suffers *special damage* by reason of the nuisance that i., damage beyond what is suffered by him in common with other persons affected by the nuisance (A).

These remedies it is conceived, are concurrent. The institution of a criminal prosecution does not bar a suit under this section (i) nor does the institution of a suit under this section bar a criminal prosecution, though cases may occur where the Advocate-General may in the exercise of his discretion, refuse his consent under this section where a criminal prosecution is pending in respect of the same act or omission.

Illustrations—A keeps his horses and waggons standing for an unreasonable time in the highway

- (a) This is a public nuisance for which a criminal prosecution may be instituted against A

(b) Further a suit may be instituted against A under the present section by the Advocate General, or by two or more persons with the consent in writing of the Advocate General, though no special damage has been caused for an order requiring A to abate the nuisance and for an injunction restraining him from continuing the nuisance. If the nuisance is repeated or continued, notwithstanding the injunction, he is liable for contempt where the decree granting the injunction is passed by a High Court (j) or he may be proceeded against under O 21 r 32 below or he may be punished with imprisonment or fine or both under s. 291 of the Penal Code.

(c) If the horses and waggons are kept standing opposite a man's house so that the access of customers is obstructed, the house is darkened, and the people in it are annoyed by bad smells a suit may be brought against A by the occupiers for damages, the damage so caused being sufficiently *special* to entitle them to maintain the action (k) The mere fact that a suit has been instituted under this section against A by the Advocate General at the relation of the occupiers or by the occupiers themselves as plaintiffs with the consent of the Advocate-General will not preclude the occupiers from maintaining a *private action* against A for the *special damage* caused to them. *Quære* whether they can claim damages for the special damage in a suit brought under this section? It is conceived they cannot. It is submitted that the words such other relief as may be appropriate do not include such damages. In England, however persons who have suffered special damage from a public nuisance may join the Attorney General as a co plaintiff in a suit brought by the Attorney General at their relation and the Attorney General may claim an injunction, and the persons specially damaged by the nuisance may claim damages (l) The present section does not warrant such a procedure in India The suit contemplated by this section is a suit of a public nature, exclusively brought to vindicate a *public right*. The section finds its place in the Part headed *Special Proceedings* under the division *Suits relating to public matters* and this affords a sufficient indication of the object of the section.

Nature of proceedings under this section.—Proceedings for a public nuisance in England were formerly commenced by an *Information* filed by the Attorney General

- (h) *Hubert v Crozes* (1794) 1 Esp 148 *Winterbottom v Lord Derby* (1867) L. R. 2 Ex 316 *Saiku v Ibrahim* (1878) 2 Bom 457 *Bhawan Singh v Harottam Singh* (1900) 31 All 444 2 IC 36 *Muhammad Ezz v Muhammad Askari* (19 4) 65 All 470 85 I C 304 (24) A.A. 599 *Masilal v Ish Ardas* (19 5) 27 Bom L. R. 421 87 I C 934 (25) A B 567 *Ardeshtir v Aimo* (1929) 53 Bom. 187 117 LC

- 513 (29) A B 94  
(i) *Compare Attorney General v Proprietor of the Bradford Canal* (1866) L. R. Eq 71  
(j) *See Kacheppa v Sacha Deri* (1903) 26 Mad 494  
(k) *Benjamin v Storr* (1874) L. R. 9 C P 400 *Poorobasul Pal v Bhobun Chunder Dey* (1874) 21 W R. 408  
(l) *See for instance Attorney General v Logan* [1891] 2 Q B 100

in the High Court of Chancery They are now instituted by action in the High Court of Justice [See R S C O 1 r 1] The action may be brought like the Information—

- (1) by the Attorney General acting *ex officio* of
- (2) by the Attorney General at the relation of a private individual

Under the present section a suit for a public nuisance may be instituted—

- (1) by the Advocate General acting *ex officio* or
- (2) by the Advocate General at the instance of relators or
- (3) by two or more persons having obtained the consent in writing of the Advocate General.

*Difference between suit by Advocate General acting ex officio and suit by him at the relation of private individuals*—Except for the purposes of costs there is no difference between an *ex officio* suit and a suit at the relation of private individuals In both cases the Sovereign as *parens patriae* sues by the Advocate General (m) When the Attorney General proceeds at the relation of a private person or a corporation he takes the proceeding as representing the Crown and the Crown through the Attorney General is really a party to the litigation. It is quite true that when the proceeding is taken at the relation of a subject the practice is to insert his name in the proceedings as the relator and to make him responsible for the costs but I do not think that this practice in any sense makes the relator a party to the proceedings although he is responsible for the costs any more than (to take a converse case) an infant who brings an action is responsible for the costs of it If I am right it would seem that the practice of making the relator directly responsible for the costs of the action had its origin not in the protection of the defendant but of the Crown (n) When once the matter is in the hands of the Attorney General it becomes substantially a public proceeding in which the Attorney General if there be no relator becomes as prosecutor responsible for the costs while if a relator is introduced the responsibility for costs is upon the latter (o)

*Relator's interest in the suit*—A relator need not have a personal interest in the matter except as one of the public he need not in fact be himself damaged at all (p)

*Interest of persons suing with consent of Advocate General*—Persons suing for a public nuisance with the consent of the Advocate General under the section need not have any personal interest in the matter of the suit except as members of the public They are entitled to sue under this section though to use the words of the section no special damage has been caused [to them] In the other words they need not have a cause of action in themselves

*Injunction*—The following are some of the leading principles by which the Courts are guided in granting injunctions—

- 1 The injury complained of must be either irreparable or continuous (q) The remedy by way of injunction is therefore not appropriate for damage which is in its nature temporary and intermittent (r) or is accidental and occasional (s) or for an interference with legal rights which is trifling in amount and effect (t)
- 2 Apprehension of future mischief from something in itself lawful and capable of being done without creating a nuisance is no ground for an

(m) *Attorney General v. Cokerham Local Board* (1874) L. R. 10 Q. B. 170 per Jessel M. R.

(n) *Attorney General v. Logan* (1891) 2 Q. B. 100 106 per Vaughan Williams J.

(o) *Ib.* p. 103 per Willes J.

(p) *Ib.*

(q) *Attorney General v. Cambridge Gas Consumers Co* (1869) L. R. 4 Ch. 71 81

(r) *Attorney General v. Sheffield Gas Consumers Co* (1853) 3 D. M. G. 304 *Attorney-General v. Lambidge & Co. Consumers Co* (1869) L. R. 4 Ch. 71

(s) *Cooke v. Roberts* (1861) L. R. 5 Eq. 168

(t) *Gaw v. Fynney* (1811) L. R. 8 8 Ch. Cr. *Land and Urban District Council v. Woods* [1892] 2 Ch. 95



injunction (u) There must, if no actual damage is proved be proof of imminent danger and there must also be proof that the apprehended damage will if it comes be very substantial (v)

- 3 Though no substantial damage is proved, the Court may grant an injunction if the defendants claim the right to continue doing that which the Court has held they are not entitled to do (w)
- 4 Where an illegal act is committed which in its nature tends to the injury of the public an injunction will be granted to restrain the act without proof of actual injury to the public (x)
- 5 Where the plaintiff has proved his right to an injunction against a nuisance it is no part of the duty of the Court to enquire in what way the defendant can best remove it the plaintiff is entitled to an injunction at once and it is the duty of the defendant to find his own way out of the difficulty whatever inconvenience or expense it may put him to But where the difficulty of removing the nuisance is considerable the Court may suspend the operation of the injunction for a time (y)
- 6 No length of time can legalize a public nuisance Though twelve years user may bind the right of an individual yet the public have a right to demand the suppression of a nuisance apart from the length of time for which it may have continued (z)
- 7 A public nuisance is not excused on the ground that it causes some convenience or advantage [Indian Penal Code s 268]

**Declaration**—A suit may be instituted under this section by two or more Mahomedans for a declaration that they are entitled to carry *fabuts* in procession along a public road for immersion in the sea against persons who obstruct them in doing so and for an injunction restraining interference in the exercise of this right (a)

**Other relief**—The removal of a public nuisance e.g. encroachment on a public street may be directed by the Court under this part of the section (b)

**Sub section (2)**—The Code of Criminal Procedure contains provisions for the removal of a public nuisance by summary proceedings before a Magistrate (c) The High Court of Calcutta has held that where special damage is caused to a private individual by a public nuisance he has a right of suit against the person causing the nuisance for a removal of the nuisance and a Civil Court may pass a decree to that effect notwithstanding that an order for the like purpose might be made by a Magistrate (d) This right is saved by sub section (2)

**Instances of public nuisance**—Public or common nuisance affect the King's subjects at large or some considerable portion of them such as the inhabitants of a town and the person therein offending is liable to criminal prosecution. A private nuisance affects only one person out of a determinate number of persons and is the ground of

(u) *Attorney General v. Corporation of Manchester* (1893) Ch 87 (a leading case on injunctions in *quia et melius*)

(v) *Fletcher v. Bealey* (1884) 3 Ch 688 at p 698

(w) *Attorney General v. Action Local Board* (1885) 1 Ch D 21

(x) *Attorney General v. Shrewsbury Bridge Co* (1885) 1 C D 750

(y) *Attorney General v. Colney Lunatic Asylum* (1888) 1 R 4 Ch 146

(z) *Municipal Commissioner of the City of Calcutta v. Mahomed Ali* (1871) 7 B L R 449; *Weld v. Hornby* (1806) 7 East 195 199

(a) *See Sultu v. Ibrahim* (1878) 2 Bom 457; *Kanda am v. Subroya* (1909) 3 Mad 48 11 C 718

(b) *Mandal v. Ishwarbha* (1905) 27 Bom L R 41 871 C 934 ( ) A B 367

(c) As to conditional orders by Magistrates for the removal of nuisances see ss 133 to 143 of the Criminal Procedure Code As to the power of a Magistrate to issue orders in urgent cases where a speedy remedy is desirable see s 144 of the same Code

(d) *Raj Kumar Singh v. Sahabzada* (1885) 3 Cal 20 See also *J. M. Ranchod v. Jodha Chella* (1893) 1 B H C., A C. 1 which appears to be imperfectly reported

civil proceedings only (e) Building over any part of a public street is a public nuisance for such act must necessarily cause obstruction to persons who may have occasion to use their public right over the part encroached upon. The public is entitled to the full width of the public street however wide it may be and whoever appropriates any part of the street by building over it infringes the right of the public *quoad* the part built over (f) An obstruction is not the less a nuisance because it is on a part of the street not commonly used or otherwise leaves room enough for the ordinary amount of traffic (g) On the other hand the High Court of Calcutta has held that as regards tidal navigable rivers a slight encroachment does not necessarily constitute a public nuisance. It seems to us rather the Court said that there must be some evidence that such encroachment causes one of the results specified in section 268 [of the Indian Penal Code] (h)

Acts which merely offend the sentiments of a class do not amount to a public nuisance In India it must often happen that acts are done by the followers of one creed which must be offensive to the sentiments of those who follow other creeds. Upon this principle it has been held that the placing of a Mahomedan symbol in the neighbourhood of a Hindu temple is not a public nuisance though likely to cause annoyance to Hindus (i) Similarly it is not a public nuisance to expose on the verandah of a house meat cut up for a dinner though it may annoy the feelings of Jains frequenting a temple close by the house (j) But wilfully slaughtering cattle in a public street so that the groans and blood of the animals could be heard and seen by the passers by is a public nuisance for it must necessarily cause annoyance to every one of the passers by Hindu European Mahomedan or other who was not utterly devoid not merely of refinement but also of all proper feelings (k)

## 92 [S 539] (1) In the case of any alleged breach of any express or constructive trust created

Public charities

for public purposes of a charitable or religious nature, or where the direction of the Court is deemed necessary for the administration of any such trust, the Advocate General, or two or more persons having an interest in the trust and having obtained the consent in writing of the Advocate General, may institute a suit, whether contentious or not, in the principal Civil Court of original jurisdiction or in any other Court empowered in that behalf by the Local Government within the local limits of whose jurisdiction the whole or any part of the subject-matter of the trust is situate to obtain a decree—

- (a) removing any trustee,
- (b) appointing a new trustee,
- (c) vesting any property in a trustee,
- (d) directing accounts and inquiries,

(e) Pollock on Torts 11th ed p 405  
(f) *Queen Empress v Appa Chell* (1897) 0 Mad 433

(g) *Turner v Farnwood Highway Board* (18 0) L. R. 9 Eq 418

(h) *J. G. D. v Queen Empress* (1893) 0 Cal 655 dissenting from dicta to the contrary

in *U. S. Chandra K. R. n the matter of* (1887) 14 Cal 656

(i) *M. P. M. a. v. Queen Empress* (1884) Mad 590

(j) *Queen Empress v D. J. M.* (1883) 1 Bom 43

(k) *Queen Empress v Zakhiuddin* (1888) 10 All 44

- (e) declaring what proportion of the trust property or of the interest therein shall be allocated to any particular object of the trust,
- (f) authorizing the whole or any part of the trust-property to be let, sold, mortgaged or exchanged,
- (g) settling a scheme, or
- (h) granting such further or other relief as the nature of the case may require

(2) Save as provided by the Religious Endowments Act, 1863, no suit claiming any of the reliefs specified in sub-section (1) shall be instituted in respect of any such trust as is therein referred to except in conformity with the provisions of that sub section

Changes introduced by the section—This section corresponds with s 539 of the Code of 1882 except in the following particulars

- 1 The words 'public purposes of a charitable or religious nature' have been substituted for the words 'public charitable or religious purposes' to remove the misconception that 'public' is merely co ordinate with 'charitable or religious'
- 2 The words 'whether contentious or not' have been added to give effect to a Calcutta decision See note below 'Whether contentious or not'
- 3 The words 'in the principal Civil Court of original jurisdiction,' have been substituted for the words 'in the High Court or the District Court'
- 4 The words 'or any other Court empowered in that behalf by the Local Government' have been added in order to invest *Courts subordinate to District Courts* with power to try cases under this section
- 5 Clause (a) is new It is intended to supersede a Madras decision and to give effect to the Calcutta Bombay and Allahabad decisions cited in note below Clause (a) removing any trustee
- 6 Clause (d) is also new It gives legislative recognition to a Bombay decision cited in note below Clause (d) directing accounts and inquiries
- 7 Sub section (2) is new It is intended to give effect to the view of the section taken by the Bombay High Court that this section is mandatory and to supersede the decision to the contrary of the other High Courts See note below Sub section (2) this section is mandatory

Romilly's Act—The present section has been borrowed in part from 52 Geo 3 c. 101 called Romilly's Act As to the applicability of decisions under that statute to cases under the present section see the undermentioned case (1)

Object of the section—The real object of the special provisions of this section seems to us to be clear Persons interested in any trust were if they could all join, always competent to maintain a suit against any trustee for his removal for breach

(1) *P. Vasam, Naickan v. Karadappa Naickan* (1894) 17 Mad 46

of trust but where the joining of all of them was inconvenient or impracticable it was considered desirable that some of them might sue without joining the others provided they obtained the consent of the Advocate General or of the Collector of the District and this condition was imposed to prevent an indefinite number of reckless and harassing suits being brought against trustees by different persons interested in the trust (m)

**Representative suit and res judicata**—The suit contemplated by this section is a representative suit that is a suit which is prosecuted by individuals not for their own interests but as representatives of the general public (n) A decree in a suit under this section will therefore operate as res judicata under s 11 Explanation VI of the Code (o)

**Jurisdiction**—Where the trustees and the trust fund are within the jurisdiction of a Court but the charity is to be founded in a territory outside the jurisdiction the Court has jurisdiction to pass a decree declaring the trusts upon which the fund is to be held, but it cannot go further in the way of settling a scheme and it will leave it to the Court of the place in which the charity is to be carried out to settle the scheme (p) Nor can a Court apply the *cy pres* doctrine *extra territorium* (q)

**Who may sue under this section**—A suit under this section may be brought—

- (1) by the Advocate General and outside the Presidency towns by the Collector or such officer as the Local Government may appoint in that behalf [see s 93] or
- (2) by two or more persons having an interest in the trust and having obtained the consent in writing of the Advocate General

**Interest in the trust**—When a suit under this section is not instituted by the Advocate General it must be brought by at least two persons and such persons must have an interest in the trust S 539 of the Code of 1877 contained the words a direct interest Those words seem to have been taken from the judgment of Lord Eldon in *In re the Bedford Charity* (r) Those words also occurred in s 539 of the Code of 1882 That section was amended by s 41 of Act 7 of 1888 and the words an interest were substituted for the words a direct interest It must have appeared to the Legislature that the limitation of a direct interest was not expedient in India and hence the section must have been amended (s) The effect of the amendment has been to widen the class of persons who are entitled to institute a suit under this section (t) Thus persons entitled to worship in a temple have such an interest in the trust as to enable them to institute a suit under this section against the trustees of the temple (u) Similarly persons residing in a village whose business it was to conduct pilgrims to a shrine and perform the worship of the idol on their behalf were held to have a sufficient interest to entitle them to sue the shevals or ministers of the idol under this section (v) Likewise worshippers at a mosque have an interest

- (m) *S Jedu Paja v Govt Moh n Das* (189) 4 Cal 418 4 *Bud ee Das v Choo i I I* (1908) 33 Cal 89 804 *D Cru v D S Iva* (1909) 3 Mad 131 13 11 C 99
- (n) *Ana d P o v I amias* (19 1) 43 I A 19 16 45 Cal 493 49 498 6 IC 737 (21) A PC 13 *Gopu v Pajammat* (19) 43 Mad L J 448 6 IC 15 ( ) 4 M 394
- (o) *Abdur Jalim v Mahomed Barfat Ali* (19 8) 53 I A 98 55 Cal 519 108 IC 361 ( ) 8 A 1 C 16 *Dingla v Ja seti* (1901) 34 Bom 61 pe Da ar J at pp 6 31 per Lesman J at pp 6 63 IC 91
- (p) *Advocate G eral v Pu jaba* (1894) 18 Bom 551 61 See also *Famlat v K s'a*

- cl d* (19 4) 51 I A 818 51 Cal 361 3 373 83 IC 531 ( ) 4 A PC 95
- (q) *Ka j v Advocate G eral* (1916) 18 Bom L R 60
- ( ) (1819) L Swans 18
- (s) *I a d i n tha v Swam natha* (19 4) 51 I A 3 33 47 Mad 884 891 8 IC 804 ( ) 4 IC 1
- (t) *S' lajmandu v Umeshanunda* (1905) Cal L J 460 40
- (u) *S' jatur v Govt Moh n* (1897) 4 Cal 418 *J galk v Lakhmandas* (1899) 3 Bom 63 *Ch naman v Dhondo* (1888) 1 Bom 61 6 63 *Ram Churn v P otah* (190 ) Cal L J 445
- (v) *Manohar v Lakhmiram* (1888) 12 Bom 47

within the meaning of this section in the trusts of the mosque (w) If the persons suing have an interest in the trust it is not necessary that they should have been personally affected by any act done by the person sued (x) But the interest must be an existing interest and not a mere contingency the mere possibility of succession to the managership of trust properties in respect of which the suit is brought is not sufficient to give a right to sue (y) It has been held by a Full Bench of the Madras High Court that the interest contemplated by this section must be a present and substantial interest and not sentimental or remote Thus public Hindu temples are *prima facie* taken to be dedicated for the use of all Hindus resorting to them But the bare possibility however remote that a Hindu of another place might desire to visit a temple does not give him an interest in the trust sufficient to entitle him to sue under this section Hence where a suit was brought under this section by a Hindu residing in Madras and another residing in Tellicherry in respect of a temple situated in Tellicherry and it appeared that the former had gone to worship in the temple on one or two occasions in the past and might go there to worship in the future if business took him to Tellicherry it was held that though he had a right as a Hindu to worship in the temple he had not such an interest in the trust as to entitle him to sue under this section (z) A different view has been taken by the Lahore High Court (a) It has been held by the Judicial Committee that *descendants of the founder* of a public Hindu *chattram* although only in the female line are persons having an interest in the trust and consequently they are entitled to maintain a suit under this section even though they might never themselves make use of the *chattram* (b)

**Consent of Advocate General**—The consent in writing required by this section must be a specific permission given to two or more persons *by name* a permission given to one applicant by name and another is not a sufficient compliance with the terms of this section (c) The High Court of Bombay has held that a suit under this section brought by only one plaintiff with the consent of the Advocate General is bad at its institution and the plaint cannot be amended by the addition of a second plaintiff though the Advocate General may consent to the amendment the reason given being that the section nowhere speaks of the consent of the Advocate General to an amendment of the plaint and that a suit which was bad at its inception is not bettered by its amendment (d) On the other hand, it has been held by the High Court of Madras that persons interested may be added as parties to the suit with the consent of the Advocate General under O 1 r 10 It has thus been held by that Court that if a suit is brought by A alone under this section (e) or by A and B of whom B has no interest in the trust (f) the plaint may be amended by adding C a person interested as a party plaintiff in either case with the consent of the Advocate General Similarly it has been held by that Court that if a suit be brought by A and B and neither of them has any interest in the trust the plaint may be amended by adding the Advocate General as a plaintiff on his application (g)

The consent in writing required by this section is a condition precedent to the institution of the suit to which such consent relates If therefore no valid consent is given before the institution of the suit the suit must be dismissed, or the plaintiff

- (w) *J ualra v Aib r Hus n* (1899) All 18  
183 184 *Badya dila v Swam i*  
(19 4) 51 I A 88 4 M d 884 8 J  
82 IC 804 ( 3) A PC 21  
(x) *S g am v Srinavasa* (19 ) 50 Mad 7 6  
10 IC 0, ( 27) A M 46  
(y) *Mohi ddi v S y dadd n* (1893) 0 Cal 810  
(z) *Ram ch dra v Pa am hwaron* (1919) 4  
Mad 360 50 IC 693 referred to seems  
with approval *Badyanatha v Swam  
n tha* (19 4) 51 I A 25 948 47 Mad 884  
891 8 IC 804 ( 4) A PC 1  
(a) *Vari j v K rpat* (19 4) 5 Lah 455 8 I  
( 111 ( ) A L 189

- (b) *Badyanatha v Sw m n tha* (19 4) 51 I A  
82 47 M d, 694 8 IC 804 ( 4) A PC  
1 affirming (19 1) 41 Mad 1 J 0  
63 IC 631 ( 1) A M 563  
(c) *Gop l Des Fa o Des* (1903) 6 All 16  
(d) *Darces v Ja nudi* (1906) 30 Bom 603  
(e) *Lamanyangar v Krish y j ga* (188 )  
10 Mad 183  
(f) *Jellam v St S v bramania* (19 0) 43  
Mad 7 0 56 IC 450  
(g) *A bai r a v The Advocate Ge eral* (19 0)  
43 Mad 0 5 IC 546

may be allowed to withdraw the suit with liberty to bring a fresh suit. The defect cannot be rectified after the institution of the suit (h). And where such consent is given the suit must be confined to the matters included in the consent. It is not competent to the Court to grant reliefs other than those included in the terms of the consent (i). Further where a suit is brought under this section no amendment should be permitted without the sanction of the Advocate General. Where a plaint in a suit brought under this section is amended without the consent of the Advocate General *et* where a new party is added as a defendant and possession of the trust property is claimed from him the Court must dismiss the suit (j). It is an invariable practice in the Bombay Presidency for the Advocate General to endorse his consent upon the plaint (k).

The Advocate General in giving his consent has to exercise his judgment in the matter and see not only whether the persons suing are persons who have an interest in the trust but also whether the trust is a public trust of the character defined in the section and whether there are *prima facie* grounds for thinking that there has been a breach of trust (l). Where the sanction given by the Advocate General is so worded as to indicate that the Advocate General has not exercised his judgment it is *not a defect fatal to the suit* but a mere irregularity falling within the scope of s. 99 hence the decree in the suit will not be interfered with in appeal unless the irregularity is shown to have affected the decision of the suit on the merits (m).

When an order is made against the trustee of a charity under s. 5 (u) of the Charitable and Religious Trusts Act 1920 and the trustee without reasonable excuse fails to comply with it he shall be deemed to have committed a breach of trust affording ground for a suit under s. 92 of the Code and such suit may so far as it is based on such failure be instituted without the previous consent of the Advocate General.

**Public purposes**—This section relates to those charities only in which the public are interested. A trust for a public Hindu temple is a trust for a public purpose of a religious nature within the meaning of this section (n). A *mutt* that is otherwise private does not become public simply because some persons are fed when *gurupuja* is performed and a water *pandal* is maintained in the *mutt* during the hot season (o). But where a number of the public had always used a temple to which a dharmashala was attached and the surplus funds not required for the service of the temple were to be applied to feeding travellers and maintaining a *adarat* it was held that the intention of the founder was to devote the property to public purposes of a religious and charitable nature (p). A trust is not the less a trust for a public purpose because the main object of the trust is the support of *fakirs* of a particular sect and the propagation of the tenets of that sect (q).

**Any alleged breach of trust**—These words are not equivalent to any alleged breach of any admitted trust. It is not therefore a condition precedent to the applicability of the section that the trust alleged by the plaintiffs is admitted by the defendants (r).

Where the direction of the Court is deemed necessary for the administration of any such trust.—To bring a suit within this section there must

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>(h) <i>Tricunda s v</i> 11 Jt (189) 16 Bom 86 <i>Copel De v I anno Dei</i> (1904) 6 All 18</p> <p>(i) <i>Sajad H ss v C Hector of Kaira</i> (1897) 1 B m 7 <i>h am ul H q v M ham m d</i> (1910) 1 L no 144 p 30 51 IC 611</p> <p>(j) <i>Abd I Pehman</i> Cass m (191) 36 Bom 168 11 IC 76</p> <p>(k) <i>Sulem n v Sha kh Ismail</i> (1915) 39 Bom 50 30 IC 1</p> | <p>(l) <i>Saj i P pa v Gorr Mot n Das</i> (1897) 4 Cal 418 49</p> <p>(m) (1897) 4 C 1 419 49 <i>p a</i></p> <p>(n) <i>Ma h r v L Alm am</i> (1899) 1 Bom 47</p> <p>(o) <i>S th ppaygar v Periasami</i> (1891) 14 Mad 16</p> <p>(p) <i>Jit ikshora v L kshmandas</i> (1899) 23 Bom 69</p> <p>(q) <i>Mah m v D rahan</i> (191) 34 All 462 14 IC 698</p> <p>(r) <i>Jaf r Khan v D d Sha h</i> (1911) 13 Bom L R 49 53 9 IC 358</p> |
|--|---|

either be a breach of trust or the directions of the Court must be necessary for the administration of the trust. The directions referred to in this section are such as are necessary for the carrying out of the trust and as are given to a trustee either the existing trustee where there is one or the new trustee where one is to be appointed. The nature of the reliefs (specified in the section) shows what is meant by the words deemed necessary for the administration of any such trust. (a) The mere appointment of a Mutawalli is not a direction within the meaning of this section. (t)

Whether contentious or not.—These words are new. They are intended to give effect to a decision of the Calcutta High Court under s. 539 of the Code of 1882 that the section was not confined to non contentious proceedings and that it applied to contentious suits also. (u) and to the opinion to the same effect of Best and Weir JJ. in an earlier Madras case. (v)

Who may be sued under this section.—It is not necessary that the defendant should be either a de jure or de facto trustee otherwise no suit can be brought under this section in a case in which all trustees are dead or refuse to act. (w) Thus a suit may be brought under this section against persons in possession of the trust property who claim adversely to the trust that is claim to be the owners of the property. (x) or against persons who deny the validity of the trust. (y) But a suit against one who is merely a servant for misappropriation of the trust property does not fall under this section. (z) See notes below Trustee and Suits for possession of trust property.

Order for security for costs against defendant trustee.—Section 10 of the Charitable and Religious Trusts Act 1920 provides that if in any suit instituted under the present section the Court trying such suit may if on the application of the plaintiff and after hearing the defendant and making such inquiry as it thinks fit it is satisfied that such an order is necessary in the public interest direct the defendant either to furnish security for any expenditure incurred or likely to be incurred by the plaintiff in instituting and maintaining such suit or to deposit from any money in his hands as trustee of the trust to which the suit relates such sum as such Court considers sufficient to meet such expenditure in whole or in part and that when any money has been so deposited the Court may make over to the plaintiff the whole or any part of such sum for the conduct of the suit but that before making over any sum to the plaintiff the Court shall take security from the plaintiff for the refund of the same in the event of such refund being subsequently ordered by the Court.

Clause (a) removing any trustee.—This clause is new. Though this clause did not occur in the corresponding s. 539 of the Code of 1882 it was held by the High Courts of Calcutta Bombay and Allahabad (a) following an earlier decision of the Madras High Court (b) that a suit for the removal of a trustee of a public trust and for the appointment of a new trustee came under that section though the removal of a trustee was not one of the reliefs specified in that section. Such a relief it was said was either covered by the words such further or other relief as the

(a) *Per Woodroffe J. in Bud e Das v Chooia* L I (1906) 33 Cal 89 at p. 809. But see *Amritram v Tamja* (1908) 10 Bom L R 8.

(t) *Abdul Alim Abed v Abir Jan B di* (1909) 55 Cal 1 84 110 I C 416 (A C 368).

(u) *Moh udd n v Sayyidudd n* (1893) 20 Cal 810.

(v) *S bhoja v Krishna* (1891) 14 Mad 186.

(w) *Tenka to ara i Ja v S bha Foo* (1903) 46 M d 300 315 31 I C 991 (A M 376).

(x) *Pagh ba v Kr ha* (1899) 11 AH 19 [F B] 11 d h S gh v Vadhar (1900) 2 Cal L J 431 *Chintaman v Dhanda* (1891)

15 Bom 61 *Jafurkhan v Daud h h* (1911) 13 Bom L R 49 9 I C 358 *Deo S n v D i* (10 4) 3 Pat 84 80 I C 940 (4) A 1 6.

(y) (1903) 45 Mad 300 3 I C 991 (23) A M 3 6 s p a [trust created by a will in possession and denial of validity of the trust].

(z) *Baldeo v Cop H* (1903) 1 AH L J 310 (3) A 4.

(a) *S f i r i Ja v Gov r Moh n Das* (1907) 24 Cal 419 *S jai v Collector of K ra* (1899) 1 Bom 49 *H eni Begam v Coll et r of Moradabad* (1898) 0 All 46 *Chidari Lal v R m Lal* (1899) 1 All 00 (b) *S bhoja v Krishna* (1891) 14 Mad 186.

nature of the case may require or it was implied in the clause providing for the appointment of new trustees. On the other hand, the Madras High Court held in a later case that such a suit did not come under that section (c). Sub s (1) cl (a) of the present section gives effect to the Calcutta, Bombay and Allahabad decisions. A suit for the removal of a trustee must therefore be instituted in conformity with the provisions of this section. The High Court of Madras has held that a suit by the trustees of a temple for a declaration that the appointment by the Devasthanam Committee of the defendant as a trustee in place of a deceased trustee is invalid and for an injunction to restrain him from interfering with the management of the temple is in effect a suit for the removal of the defendant from the office of trustee and that it cannot be instituted without the sanction required by this or the next section (d). A similar view has been taken by the Patna High Court (e). This view has been dissented from by the High Court of Bombay on the ground that to bring a suit within this section there must either be an alleged breach of trust or the direction of the Court must be deemed necessary for the administration of the trust and that neither of these conditions was present in the Madras case. The Bombay case was similar to the Madras case and it was held that the case did not fall within this section (f).

In a suit under this section by two trustees of a temple against a co trustee for his removal the Court has the power to investigate charges of misconduct made by the defendant against the plaintiff and even to remove them (g).

In framing a scheme of management under this section [see clause (g)] it is desirable to include a provision for the removal of trustees for breach of trust for where such a provision is included the removal of a defaulting trustee may be obtained by an application in execution of the decree and the costs and trouble of a regular suit which would otherwise be probably necessary may thus be avoided (h). But some recent Madras cases consider such a provision ultra vires (i).

In connection with the removal of a trustee it may be noted that there is no hard and fast rule that because a manager of a shrine has arrogated to himself the position of owner he should be removed from the office of trustee. Each case must be decided with reference to its circumstances (j). Thus it has been held that mere lax and improvident management on the part of the manager of a shrine fostered by the belief that he was entitled to manage the trust property free from control and very much as though he was its absolute owner is no ground for removing him from the trust (k).

**Trustee** —A person appointed trustee by the Court though his appointment may be impeached as being illegal is a trustee within the meaning of clause (a) and not a trespasser (l). So is a trustee *de son tort* that is a person who has not been appointed trustee but who takes charge of the trust property and purports to manage it as trust property (m). The Acharya of a temple is a constructive trustee within the meaning of this section and he may be sued as such (n). And so is the head of a mutt (o).

- (c) *Pangas mi v Varadappa* (1894) 17 Ma 1 46. See also *Va ya ra v F m ra a* (1900) 23 Ma 53.  
(d) *Sub am a v Frisk namaj* (1910) 4 Ma 669 61 per Spencer J. 3 IC 80.  
(e) *Syed v D ba* (19 ) 4 Pat 41 88 IC 103 ( ) A 1 44.  
(f) *Aliya th v I k is a* (19 ) 46 Bom 101 64 IC 33 ( ) A 1 6.  
(g) *B l l e s n a v J ya ia* (19 ) 43 Ma 1 L J 34 8 IC 194 ( ) A M 80.  
(h) *D mol bhat v Bh g i l* (1900) 4 Bom 4 ( ) 49 Ma 1 580 95 IC 0 ( ) A 31 59 B h a y y a v I e n l t i y a / n a m r h y (19 6) 50 M d L J 403 94 IC 4 ( ) A M 5. *I eer rayha a h ar*

- v *4 d o c a l C e l* (19 ) 51 Ma 31 108 IC 66 ( ) A M 10 3 FB.  
(j) *Da ud v B h t y a v Bhat B i j a l* (1893) 2 Bom 493.  
(k) *Annaya v a ay* (189 ) 1 Bom 5 6.  
(l) *S y u d A l v A h Jan* (1913) 3 All 98 18 IC 573.  
(m) *J u a l K a s h o r a L a k s h m n d s* (1899) 3 Bom 6 9 B d r e e D a s v C l o o n L i (1906) 23 Cal 89 80-806 Ram B i d a s v N y a a (19 ) 44 All 6 60 IC 990 ( ) A A 54 B h r i L a l v S h a r a (19 ) 47 All 1 84 IC 631 ( ) A A 834.  
(n) *S h r i p a t n a l v L a k s h m i a s* (19 3) Bom L I 47 84 IC 803 ( ) A B 193.  
(o) *V e l l u p p a v P u n n a r a m* (19 ) 50 Ma 36 101 IC 470 ( ) A M 614.



Clause (b) appointing new trustee—A suit for the appointment of new trustees of a temple on the ground that the defendants are not lawful trustees and that the office of trustees is therefore vacant is a suit under clause (b) of this section (p)

Under this section the Court in sanctioning a scheme may provide for the appointment of additional or new trustees though such appointment may not be in conformity with the original constitution of the trust or with the rules in force in respect to it (q)

Clause (d) directing accounts and inquiries—This clause is new Under the corresponding s 539 of the Code of 1882 the High Court of Bombay held that a suit to remove the trustees of a public charity and to compel them to account and to make good the losses sustained by the charity by reason of default on the part of the trustees and for the appointment of new trustees was a suit within that section though a relief for accounts was not one of the reliefs specifically mentioned in that section. Such a relief it was said was covered by the words further or other relief (r) The present clause gives legislative recognition to the above decision (s)

Clause (e) apportionment of income—A suit for a declaration as to what proportion of the trust property [e.g. offerings placed by devotees before an idol] should be allocated to the pujans (officiating priests) and what to the gurus (temple servants) relates to a relief covered by cl (e) of the section (t)

Clause (f) authorizing trust property to be let—An application by a mutawali for sanction of the Court to grant a lease of the walf property is not a suit under this section (u)

Clause (g) settling a scheme—This section vests a very wide discretion in the Court as regards directions to be given for the administration of public trusts In giving effect to the provisions of the section and in appointing new trustees and settling a scheme the Court is entitled to take into consideration not merely the wishes of the founder so far as they can be ascertained but also the past history of the institution and the way in which the management is carried on theretofore in conjunction with other existing conditions that may have grown up since its foundation (v) The Court may refuse to frame a scheme where no mismanagement is proved (w)

A scheme framed by the Court may be varied if good cause is shown (x) But where a scheme is once settled it precludes a suit to establish a private right to manage the property [e.g. hereditary trusteeship] which if established would interfere with the scheme settled by Court (y)

The Court has power under this section to frame a scheme in respect of a public temple though it be under the control of a Temple Committee constituted under the Religious Endowments Act 20 of 1863 (z) But where a trust is a private trust e.g. for a family idol the settlement of a scheme under this section is inappropriate (a)

In decrees passed under this section liberty is generally reserved to the parties to apply to the Court as occasion arises as to the effect of such a clause see the under

- (p) *V. I. Pa. a v Venkatachari* (1903) 6 M d 450  
 (q) *Iraj Goswami v Trimala* (1901) 9 M d 319  
 (r) *Synd v Collector of Kai* (1891) 1 Bom 48  
*Amritam v Iamj* (1908) 19 Bom 11 87  
 (s) *Lakshmi Chelliar v Krishnamurthi*  
*Ayar* (1917) 6 Mad LJ 18 100 IC  
 841 (27) A M 416  
 (t) *Sail m v G. u* (1914) 5 Bom 683 690  
 60 IC 94 (1) A D 29  
 (u) *Fakrunnisa v District Judge* (1901) 47 Cal 50 51 C 4  
 (v) *Mahomed Iem ul v Ahmed* (1916) 43 I A 17 13 43 Cal 1055 1101 1106 35 I C

- 30  
 (w) *Id oate Ge e al v Yusuf Ali* (1911) 4  
 B m L R 1000 84 I C 79 (1) A B  
 38  
 (x) *Pr i g Dass v Tirumala* (1901) 28 Mad  
 313 R m do v Ha ma t'a (1913) 36  
 Mad 364 1 I C 449  
 (y) *Pamados v Hanumantha* (1913) 36 Mad 364  
 12 I C 449 S Kharam v Ganu (1914) 45  
 Bom 683 691 C 0 1 (1) A B 297  
 (z) *Sul rama v S byramania Iyer* (1916) 39  
 Mad 00 3 I C 11  
 (a) *Gopal Lal v Purna Chandra* (1912) 41 I A  
 100 49 Cal 459 67 I C 561 (1) A PC  
 3

mentioned case (b) The Madras High Court has in recent cases held that liberty to apply for modification of the scheme or for a relief coming under section 92 is ultra vires (c) although such clauses have appeared in schemes approved by the Privy Council (d) The High Court of Rangoon has followed the Madras decisions (e) These decisions it is submitted are incorrect The suit having been filed with the consent of the Advocate General and the Court being in *seu* in of the case it is perfectly competent to it to provide for a modification of the scheme and no fresh suit is necessary to modify the scheme

Where it is quite clear that a public trust has been properly constituted by will it is not necessary that a suit for the administration of the estate of the testator should precede a suit under this section But it is otherwise where it is doubtful whether there would be funds sufficient for the charitable bequest In the latter case an administration suit may become necessary before any scheme can be framed under this section (f) Where the trust funds are not ascertained and the defendants are accountable for their management of the trust property the proper course is to take the accounts before a scheme is framed (g)

In a suit brought under this section in respect of a public religious trust the Court has jurisdiction to frame a scheme regulative of the conduct of the institution as the owners of moneys and property which it possesses even in cases where the Acharya as the head of its spiritual and temporal affairs is worshipped by the members of the sect as the representative of the god In drawing up the scheme however the Court must not encroach upon the rights and prerogatives of the Acharya as a religious preceptor of the community but while the institutional trust must be respected the sect and body of worshippers for whose benefit it was set up have the protection of the Court against their property being the subject of abuse speculation and waste (h)

Where provision is made in a scheme for an application being made to the Court for the purposes mentioned in it and an order is made on the application the order is not one execution and no appeal lies from it (i)

Clause (h) further or other relief— The words granting such further or other relief as the nature of the case may require must be read with what has preceded as referring to further relief to which the party may be entitled which arises out of the existence of the trust in respect of which the suit has been brought Therefore where the only relief claimed in a suit is for a declaration that certain property is wakf property the suit does not come within the purview of this section Such a relief does not come within the words further or other relief (j) The general clause dealing with further or other relief ought to be read with the preceding specific clauses and the nature of the reliefs which may be properly granted under it is of the same character as the relief which may be granted under the preceding clauses The specific clauses are not merely illustrative but furnish an indication of the nature of the relief which may be granted in a suit under this section (k)

- (b) *Ma adana da v Tar i anda* (19 3) 3 Cal LJ 291 76 I C 0 ( 4) A C 330 See also *V ayan m rti v Acharya* (19-4) 47 M d LJ 714 85 I C 188 ( 5) A M 411
- (c) *Abd l Hakim v Mahomed Burrammudin* (19 6) 49 Mad 580 90 I C 0 ( 6) A M 5 9 *Brahmayya v Venkatan rya n a j n m rth* (1926) 50 Mad L J 403 94 I C 5 4 ( 26) A M 557 *I e ra aghava hariar v Ad oe te Ge eral* (19 7) 51 M d 31 106 I C 665 ( 7) A M 10 3 [F B]
- (d) *P jagi v saru v T Sr ranganath ryl* (1907) 30 M d 138 I C J n hod v *Dakor T mple Commitee* (19 ) 7 Bom L R 8 8 I C 313 ( 2 ) A I C 165
- (e) *U Po Ma ng v U Jun Pa* (19 8) 6 Rang 594 114 I C 293 ( 9) A R 0

- (f) *I e lata ra mha v S dda Rao* (19 3) 45 M d 300 3 03 1 73 I C 991 ( 3) A M 376
- (g) *Chot lai v Manohar* (1900) 24 Bom 60 6 I A 199
- (h) *Sripat prasads v Laxmidas* (19 9) 31 Bom 43 114 I C 19 ( 29) A PC 7
- (i) *Sevak Jernachod Bhogisai v The Dakora Temple Committee* (19-5) 49 Mad L J ( 25) A PC 155 *Abdul Hakim Bang v Buram adin* (19 6) 49 Mad. 580 95 I C 7 0 ( 6) A M 559
- (j) *Jam ludd n v Musyaba Hussain* (1903) 5 All 631 635 *S i q Pam v Basiao Mal* (1919) 1 Lab L J 1 0
- (k) *Badre Das v Choo i Lal* (1906) 33 Cal. 789 810

The question as to the precise scope of clause (h) is of great importance for if the words such further or other relief as the nature of the case may require mean relief of the same nature as clauses (a) to (g) a relief in a suit against strangers to a trust for a declaration that property in their possession is trust property would be outside the scope of this section as it would not be of the same nature as clauses (a) to (g) and the suit could be maintained without the consent of the Advocate General. This very question arose in *Abdur Rahim v Abu Mahomed Barakat Ali* (1) where the Privy Council held that a suit for a declaration that property belongs to a wakf can be maintained by Mahomedans interested in the wakf without the consent of the Advocate General. It was argued in that case on behalf of the defendants that the words further or other relief must be taken not in connection with the previous clauses (a) to (g) but in connection with the nature of the suit—namely any relief other than (a) to (g) that the case of an alleged breach of an express or constructive trust may require in the circumstances of any particular case and that a breach of trust having been alleged the suit came under this section and it could not be maintained without the consent of the Advocate General. But this argument was not accepted and it was held that the words further or other relief in clause (h) must on general principles be taken to mean relief of the same nature as clauses (a) to (g) and that as the relief for a declaration that the property belonged to the wakf was not of that nature the suit was outside the scope of the section. Their Lordships said that the construction suggested on behalf of the defendants would cut down substantive rights which existed before the enactment of the Code of 1908 and a Code regulating procedure should not be construed as having that effect in the absence of express words. Before the enactment of that Code a person interested in a public trust had the right to maintain a suit for such a declaration as the above without the consent of the Advocate General and this is the substantive right referred to above. It follows that when a suit is brought for some of the reliefs mentioned in this section with the consent of the Advocate General and a prayer for a declaration is afterwards added and strangers to the trust are joined as defendants the suit ceases to that extent to be one under sec 92 or of a representative character.

There is a conflict of opinion as to whether a prayer that a deed of trust may be construed by the Court and that the true scope and object of the trust fund may be determined by the Court comes within the words further or other relief (m). See note below. Suits merely for a declaration of trust.

**Suits outside the scope of the section**—This section does not apply unless—

- (1) there is a trust created for public purposes of a charitable or religious nature
- (2) there is a breach alleged of such trust or the direction of the Court is deemed necessary for the administration of such trust and
- (3) the relief claimed is one or other of the reliefs mentioned in the section (n)  
[see note below sub sec (2) ]

If all the three conditions mentioned above are fulfilled the suit must be instituted in conformity with the provisions of this section that is to say it must be instituted either by the Advocate General or by two or more persons interested in the trust with the consent of the Advocate General if it is not so instituted it must be dismissed [see notes above Consent of Advocate General]. But if any one of the three conditions is absent the suit is outside the scope of this section and it may be instituted in the

(1) (19 9) 55 I A 96 85 Cal 519 108 I C 361

( ) (3) A. P. C. 16

(m) *D. H. J. v J. M. J.* (1909) 37 Bom 609 per Datta J at pp 6 31 per

Beaman J., at pp 56 69 2 I C. 01

( ) See the judgment of Woodroffe J in *Budree Das v Chooni Lal* (1906) 33 Cal 89

ordinary manner (o) The mere fact that a suit relates to a public charitable or religious trust or that it relates to property held on such trust is not sufficient to bring it within the scope of this section [see notes below Suits to enforce private rights and

Suits for possession of trust property against trespassers and against alienees from trustees ] At the same time a suit which is clearly within the scope of this section cannot be treated as one outside its scope because in addition to reliefs under this section it claims reliefs not allowed by the section [see notes below Suits for removal of trustees, etc and Where some of the reliefs are outside the scope of this section

Suits to enforce private rights—The suit contemplated by this section is a representative suit [see note above Representative suit and res judicata ] Suits brought not to vindicate or establish the right of the public in respect of a public trust but to remedy an infringement of an individual right or to vindicate a private right do not fall within this section (p) Such suits are instituted in the ordinary manner and not under this section. The following are instances of suits of this character —

- (1) A suit by a person claiming to be a co trustee of a certain *dargah* and entitled as such to a share with the defendant trustee in the management and profits thereof *Miya Isak Ulla v Sayad Bata* (1898) 23 Bom 496
- (2) A suit by the trustees of a fire temple for the vindication of the right of management which was vested in and actually being exercised by them at the date of the obstruction by the defendants *Naroyi v Dastur Kharshedji* (1904) 28 Bom 20 54
- (3) A suit between two individuals each claiming certain rights as *mutualis* over *wakf* property *Manyan v Khadem Hossein* (1905) 32 Cal 273
- (4) A suit between two persons as to which of them is the lawful trustee of a charity *Budree Das v Chooni Lal* (1906) 33 Cal 789 808 *Muhamma v Ahmed* (1913) 35 All 459 20 I C 37 *Niamat Ali v Ali Rea* (1914) 37 All 86 26 I C 778 *Puttu Lal v Dayanand* (1922) 44 All 721 68 I C 786 (22) A A 499 *Ayatunnessa v Kulfu* (1914) 41 Cal 749 22 I C 677 *Giyana v Kandusami* (1887) 10 Mad 375 *Kashinath v Gangubai* (1929) 31 Bom L P 349 117 I C 523 (29) A B 193 The High Court of Bombay has held that where the defendant is in management of the trust property and the plaint also contains a relief for accounts against him the suit is one under this section *Narayan v Vasudeo* (1924) 26 Bom L P 950 86 I C 490 (24) A B 518 This view it is submitted is not correct See 45 Mad 113 69 I C 304 (22) A M 17 cited in ill (6) below
- (5) It has been held by the High Court of Allahabad that the right of a Mahomedan to use a mosque is not a public but a private right It is like the right to use a private road any one who has the right may maintain a suit in respect of it [*Jauahra v Hussain* (1885) 7 All 178 at pp 182 183] To such a suit the provisions of this section do not apply Thus it has been held that any Mahomedan entitled to frequent a mosque may if property belonging to the mosque is sold by the manager of the mosque for his private debts maintain a suit for a declaration that the property is *wakf* property and to set aside the sale and evict the purchaser [*Zafaryag Ali v Bakhtawar Singh* (1883) 10 All 497] Similarly if land attached to a mosque is encroached upon any Mahomedan entitled to use the mosque may sue to eject the trespasser And if the mosque be in a dilapidated condition and a Mahomedan frequenting the mosque or one looking after it is desirous of repairing it but is obstructed by a third person he may

(o) *Madhavrao v Shri Omkareshwar & Ghat* (19 9) | (p) See per Davar J in *Dinsha Petal v Jamsetji*  
31 Bom L R 12 ( 9) 4 B 153 (1909) 33 Bom 509 59 0 I C 01

maintain a suit to establish his right to repair the mosque [*Jawahra v Akbar Husain* (1885) 7 All 178]. The contrary however has been held by the High Court of Calcutta in *Jan Ah v Ram Nath* (1882) 8 Cal. 32 and *Lutfunnissa Bibi v Nazim Bibi* (1885) 11 Cal 33. According to these decisions the right sought to be established in suits such as the above is not a private but a public right and it can only be enforced by a suit brought in conformity with the provisions of this section. But in a later Calcutta case [*Mohammad v Sayiduddin* (1893) 20 Cal. 810] it was pointed out that the reasoning of the Allahabad cases showing that the right of worship of each worshipper in a Mahomedan mosque or religious endowment was an independent right wholly irrespective of the rights of the other worshippers was correct. The view taken in the earlier Calcutta decisions is it is submitted not correct (g) and it cannot be sustained since the decision of the Privy Council in *Abdur Rahim v Abu Mahomed Barkat Ali* (r).

- (6) A suit by a trustee against a co trustee for accounts *Appanna v Narasing* (1922) 40 Mad 113 69 I C 304 (22) A M. 17 [F B] *Bapuji v Govindlal* (1916) 40 Bom 439 34 I C 167
- (7) A suit by an idol as a juristic person against persons who interfere unlawfully with the property of the idol or the income thereof *Darshan Lal v Shikji* (1923) 45 All. 215 71 I C 420 (23) A. A. 120 *Madhavrao v Shri Omkareshwar Ghat* (1929) 31 Bom L R 192 (29) A. B 153
- (8) A suit for a declaration that the plaintiff is entitled to appoint mutawallis *Rugghan Prasad v Dhanoo* (1927) 49 All 430 99 I C 1045 (27) A. A. 257

Suits for a declaration and for possession of trust property against third persons that is strangers to the trust—Suits against strangers to the trust that is against trespassers and against transferees from trustees for a declaration that property in their hands is trust property and for possession are outside the scope of this section. The reason is that the relief claimed is not one of those mentioned in clauses (a) to (h). Such suits must be instituted in the ordinary manner and not under this section (e). This has now been definitely held by the Privy Council in *Abdur Rahim v Mahomed Barkat Ali* (i) [see case (1) below]. The following are instances of suits of this character—

- (1) A suit for a declaration that property belongs to a wakf can be maintained by Mahomedans interested in the wakf without the sanction of the Advocate General *Aldur Rahim v Mahomed Barkat Ali* (1928) 55 I A 96 55 Cal 519 108 I C 361 (28) A.P.C. 16,
- (2) A suit by the disciples of a *mull* for a declaration that the defendant was not the duly appointed successor to the late head of the *mull* and that he was in possession under a false claim of title and for ejecting the defendant from the *mull* properties *Strinivasa v Strinivasa* (1893) 16 Mad. 31 *Ganga Charan v Ramchandra* (1928) 50 All 160 106 I C. 389 (28) A.A. 33 [Here the claim against the defendant is as against a trespasser]
- (3) A suit for a declaration that a certain piece of land of which it was alleged the defendants had taken wrongful possession was a public graveyard, and for the ejectment of the defendants from the land *Muhammad v Kallu* (1899) 21 All 187 *Gha.affar v Yawar Husain* (1906) 28 All 112 117 120 121 *Dasondhay v Muhammad* (1911) 33 All 669 11 I C 36 *Muhammad*

(g) See *1a Iya otha v Swaminatha* (1914) 51 I A 204 31ad 834 891 8 I C 801 (4) A I C 204

(i) (1928) 55 I A 96 55 Cal. 519 108 I C 361 (28) A. P.C. 16

(r) *B. dree D s v Choo Lal* (1906) 33 Cal 59 80

(i) (1928) 55 I A 96 55 Cal. 519 108 I C. 361 (28) A. P.C. 16

*Balsh v Mu'ammatt Piar* (1921) 19 All L J 236 62 I C 744 [Here also the claim against the defendant is as against trespassers.] Compare *Lahfunissa Bibi v Aa run Bibi* (1885) 11 Cal 33 where the suit was for a declaration that certain property was *wakf* property and for recovery of possession thereof from a third party and where the Court held that the suit ought to have been instituted in conformity with the provisions of this section This decision would appear to be no longer law see *Mohiuddin v Sayiduddin* (1893) 20 Cal 810 p 816

- (4) A suit to set aside an alienation of trust property alleged to have been wrongfully made by the trustees and for the recovery of property from the alienee *Ka : Hassan v Sagun* (1900) 24 Bom 170 *Lakshmandas v Ganpatrav* (1884) 8 Bom 365 *Vishwanath v Rambhat* (1891) 15 Bom 148 *Ghlabhai v Uderam* (1911) 36 Bom 29 12 I C 577 [Here the defendants are transferees from trustees]
- (5) A suit by the trustees of a temple against the manager and treasurer of the temple for accounts and for a decree for what may be found due on taking such accounts *Malhar v Varasinha* (1912) 37 Bom 90 17 I C 665
- (6) A suit by two of the worshippers of a temple with the leave of Court under O 1 r 8 against the committee of management (not being trustees) and archakas of the temple for a declaration that a transfer made by the committee to the archakas of the right to collect and receive offerings made by the pilgrims is invalid *Venkataramana v Kasturiranga* (1917) 40 Mad 212 38 I C 73 [F B]
- (7) A suit by the newly appointed trustees of an imambara for possession of the imambara against a former trustee who has been dismissed *Inayat v Faiz Muhammad* (1923) 45 All 33 71 I C 767 (23) A.A. 319 [the defendant in such a case is a trespasser] *Ganga Puri v Mohan Lal* (1923) 4 Lah 295 73 LC 645 (24) A L 131

See notes above Trustee

Suits for removal of trustees for unlawful alienation of trust property and against transferees from those trustees—A common type of suits under this section is a suit against the trustee of a charity for his removal on the ground that he has unlawfully alienated the trust property treating it as his private property and for the appointment of a new trustee in his place It is clear that such a suit is within this section for the relief claimed is one under cl (a) of this section and the ground on which the relief is claimed is a breach of trust in alienating the property It is also clear that the Court cannot remove the trustee unless it finds that the property is trust property and that it has been wrongfully alienated by the trustee The question to be considered is whether the Court has power in the absence of the alienee to declare that the property is trust property and that the alienation is unlawful It has been held by the High Court of Madras that an alienee is not a proper party to a suit under this section and that if he is joined as a party the suit as against him should be dismissed But this it has been held does not preclude the Court from determining in a suit against the trustee alone whether the property is trust property and declaring if it is so found that it is trust property But the transferee not being a party to the suit is not bound by the declaration and if a suit is subsequently brought against him for possession of the property it is open to him to contend that the property is not trust property (u) A similar view has been taken by the High Court of Calcutta (v) On the

(u) *Pagla lu v Pillait* (1914) 31 Mad L J 8 I C 34 1 gas. maj v Channa samy (1911) 3 Mad L J 36 8 I C 898  
*Ecalappa Mudalar v Balakrishnam* (1917) 53 Mad L J 183 30 L C 74 (27) A M 710

(v) *B dhar gh v Aradha* (1901) Cal L J 431 439 dissenting from *Say d r v G r Moh n Das* (1891) 4 C 1 418 *Bud ee Dass Choon L I* (1906) 3 C 1 9 805  
*Chol m M wick v Hajar* (1918) 3 Cal L J 4 4 I C 111

other hand, it has been held by the High Court of Allahabad that the alienee though not a *neces ary* party to the suit (w) is a *proper party* (x) and that if he is joined as a party and the Court declares that the property is trust property he will be bound by such declaration in a subsequent suit for possession against him (y) The High Court of Bombay has gone further and held that the transferee is *not only a proper but a necessary party* and that no such declaration can be made in his absence ( ) But all the High Courts are agreed that in a suit such as the above a decree cannot be passed against the alienee directing him to *deliver possession* of the property to the plaintiffs though he is a party to the suit as such relief is neither specifically mentioned in the section nor implied in cl. (h) and that the remedy of the newly appointed trustee is to institute a separate suit for possession against him (a) The proposition that the Court has no power under this section to pass a decree against an alienee directing him to deliver possession to the plaintiffs is in accordance with a recent ruling of the Privy Council where it was held that a relief or a remedy against third persons that is strangers to the trust was not within the scope of this section (b) It is submitted that the Court has also no power under this section to make a declaration that the property in suit is not trust property *so as to bind the alienee* such a relief also being outside the scope of the section

**Suits only for a declaration of trust**—This section presupposes the existence of a trust for the administration of which it is necessary to make provision. Hence it does not apply to a suit brought solely for the purpose of having a *declaration* of the Court that certain property is *wakf* the fact of endowment being denied on the other side (c) Nor does this section apply to a suit brought merely for a declaration that the plaintiffs are trustees of an endowment (d) See note above Suits for a declaration and for possession of trust property against third persons i.e. strangers to the trust

**Suits for a declaration that the defendant is not a properly appointed trustee and for an injunction against him**—See note above Clause (a) removing any trustee

**Courts competent to try suits under this section**—A suit under this section must be instituted either in the principal Civil Court of original jurisdiction or in any other Court empowered in that behalf by the Local Government But this does not empower the Local Government to direct the transfer of a particular suit pending in a District Court to a particular Judge The authority must be a *general* one to receive suits under this section (e)

The expression *principal Civil Court of original jurisdiction* in this section does not include the Court of an Additional District Judge appointed under s 8 of the Civil Courts Act XII of 1887 (f) unless the District Judge has under sub sec (2) of that section assigned to him the functions of a District Judge relating to all suits cognizable by the District Judge (g)

- (w) *Husain Begam v Collector of Moradabad* (1899) 20 All 46  
 (x) *Ghaffar v Jawar Hussain* (1906) 33 All 11 116 118 119  
 (y) *Muhammad v Muhammad* (1911) 33 All 5 11 I C 18  
 ( ) *Collector of Poona v Ba Chanchalbai* (1911) 33 Bom 40 1 I C 30  
 (a) *Budhai gh v Miradburan* (1905) 2 Cal L J 431 *Gholam Mohtash v Ali Hafiz* (1918) 23 Cal L J 4 47 I C 11 reversing (1915) 4 Cal 1135 3 I C 111 *Budree Das v Choo l Lal* (1906) 33 Cal 89 805 *Ragha abu v Jellati* (1914) 7 Mad L J 66 25 I C 794 *Collector of Poona v Bai Chanchalbai* (1911) 3 Bom 40 1 I C 30  
 (b) *Abdur Rahim v Abu Mahomed* (1903) 55

- I A. 96 65 Cal 319 103 L C 361 (29) A PC 16  
 (c) *Jamul-uddin v Murtaza Hussain* (1903) 35 All 631 *Nihal Shah v Mami Alolan* (1900) Lah L J 457 *Khursaidi Begum v Secretary of State* (1905) 5 Pat 539 94 I C 433 (26) A P 31 *M. an Bakh v Allah Bakh* (1907) 8 Lah 111 99 I C 754 (7) A L 350  
 (d) *B. dres Das v Choom Lal* (1906) 33 Cal 739 810 *Ramados v Han mantha* (1913) 36 Mad 364 1 I C 449  
 (e) *Abdul F rih v Abdus Sodhan* (1911) 32 Cal. 146 13 I C 43  
 (f) *Mahomed v Abdul Hassan* (1914) 41 Cal 836 2 I C 91  
 (g) *Mohabor v Hazi* (1901) 43 Cal 53 6 I C 115 (21) A C 10

Where a suit is brought against an executor in the Court of a Subordinate Judge for the administration of the testator's estate the mere facts, that the will contains directions for applying portions of the estate to charitable purposes does not bring the suit within this section. The Subordinate Judge has jurisdiction to entertain such a suit but if any questions relating to charitable bequests arise before him and a scheme has to be framed under this section he should hold the amount appropriated for charities in the possession of a Receiver until the Advocate General or the Collector obtains the directions of the District Court (A)

Where some of the reliefs are outside the scope of the section—When some of the reliefs claimed are outside the scope of the section the Court is not justified in returning the plaint. It should require the plaintiff to amend his plaint by confining himself to reliefs within the section or it might wait till it came to pronounce judgment and dismiss the suit as to reliefs without the section (a). So in a suit by worshippers for the appointment of trustees and for the ejectment of trespassers the Court may appoint trustees without passing a decree in ejectment (j). But worshippers cannot sue under O 1 r 8 to recover the property unless they are supported by the trustees. They should sue to remove the trustees first and then let the new trustees sue in ejectment (k).

Sub section (2) this section is mandatory—The Legislature has by enacting this section constituted a special tribunal for the trial of a class of suits which it has removed from the cognizance of the ordinary Courts. Those are suits for any of the reliefs specified in sub sec (1) in cases where there is an alleged breach of any express or constructive trust created for public purposes of a charitable or religious nature or

where the direction of the Court is deemed necessary for the administration of any such trust. This class of suits can only be instituted in the special Courts mentioned in this section and they can only be brought either by the Advocate General or by two or more persons having an interest in the trust and having obtained the consent in writing of the Advocate General. This is enacted by sub s (2) of the present section. Under the corresponding section 539 of the Codes of 1877 and 1882 it was doubtful whether every suit of the character described above was to be instituted in the manner aforesaid. Sub-s (2) makes it clear that every such suit must be so instituted. It enacts that no suit claiming any of the reliefs specified in sub sec (1) shall be instituted without the consent of the Advocate General (l). But sub sec (2) must be read with sub sec (1). Reading sub-sec (2) with sub sec (1) it follows that it is not every suit claiming any of the reliefs specified in sub sec (1) that should be brought with the consent of the Advocate General but those suits only which besides claiming any of those reliefs are brought by individuals as representatives of the general public. Accordingly a Full Bench of the Madras High Court has held that a suit by a trustee of a public religious trust against a co trustee for accounts does not fall within this section though the relief claimed is the one specified in sub sec (1) cl. (d). Such a suit is not a representative suit. The relief is sought not in the larger interest of the public but merely for the purpose of vindicating the private rights of one of the trustees and of enabling him to discharge the duties and liabilities which are imposed upon him by the trust (m).

The doubt referred to in the preceding paragraph arose in the following way. The Code of 1859 did not contain any special provisions for the institution of suits relating to public charities. Such provisions were introduced for the first time by s 539 of the Code of 1877. They were reproduced in s 539 of the Code of 1882 and they now find a place in sub sec (1) of the present section. But neither the Code of 1877 nor the Code

(h) *Bapuji v Govindlal* (1916) 40 Bom 439 34 I C 167

(i) *Ramrup v Ramdhari* (1905) 47 All 9 89 I C 40 ( 5 ) A.A. 683

(j) *Lachman v Munia* (1905) 47 All 867 89 I C 639 (25) A.A. 759

(k) *Vadlamudi v Je Kateshaya* (1908) 110

I C 894 ( 8 ) A.M. 614

(l) *Syed v Bibi* (1905) 4 Pat 741 88 I C 1035 ( 5 ) A.P. 644 S.W.V. B. 994 (1905) 3

Ran 13 89 I C 63 ( 5 ) A.P. 294 [suit for possession of a church and for accounts from the deft dants]

(m) *Appan a v Vasainga* (1905) 45 Mad 119 60 I C 304 ( ) A.M. 17 [F.B.]



of 1882 contained any provision corresponding to sub s (2) Before the enactment of the Code of 1877 suits relating to public charitable or religious trusts could be instituted in the ordinary Courts by certain persons as plaintiffs Thus—

- (1) *persons appointed supervisors over trustees* could sue in any ordinary Court competent to hear the suit for the removal of the trustees for malversation and to obtain the appointment in their place of other fit and proper persons (n) similarly
- (2) *one or more of the members of a defined class of the general public* [such as the Satchasi community of Chatra] could sue on behalf of the whole class with the leave of the Court under s 30 [now O 1 r 8] in any ordinary Court competent to hear the suit to obtain a declaration of their right to take part in the management of the worship of a goddess (o)

It is obvious that the above suits fall within the purview of the present section. They also came within the terms of s 539 of the earlier Codes In the absence of any provision in s 539 similar to that contained in sub s (2) the question arose whether these suits were to be instituted in the special Courts mentioned in s 539 and by the Advocate General as plaintiff or whether they could be instituted as before in ordinary Courts and by persons who could have sued if s 539 had not been enacted The High Court of Bombay held that s 539 was mandatory in other words that every suit of the character mentioned in that section must be brought in accordance with its provisions and not otherwise. Therefore the suits referred to above could not be brought by the supervisors as plaintiffs in the one case and by the members of the community in the other but they had to be instituted either by the Advocate General or by two or more persons interested in the trust after obtaining the sanction of the Advocate General and further these suits could only be brought in the *special Courts* indicated in that section, namely the High Court or the District Court as the case might be (p) On the other hand the other High Courts held that section 539 was permissive and that it did not take away the right of suit which existed prior to and independently of it According to the latter view suits of the character mentioned above could, notwithstanding the enactment of section 539 be brought as before by the *abovenamed parties* as plaintiffs in any Court competent to entertain those suits and it was not obligatory to institute them in accordance with the provisions of s 539 (q) Sub section (2) gives effect to the Bombay decisions and supersedes the decisions of the other High Courts It provides in distinct terms that no suit claiming any of the reliefs specified in sub section (1) shall be instituted except in conformity with the provisions of that sub section At the same time it declares that the special provisions of the Religious Endowments Act 20 of 1863 for the institution of suits governed by that Act are not affected by the provisions of this section The provisions of that Act and their bearing on the present section are discussed in the next paragraph

Save as provided by the Religious Endowments Act 1863 —After the downfall of the Mogul Empire in India it was discovered that the income of many endowments granted in land by the presiding Governments of this country and by individuals for the support of mosques temples colleges and for other pious and beneficial purposes was misappropriated by persons managing the endowments It was therefore deemed expedient that the British Government should take charge of these endowments and for that purpose and the purpose also of providing for the maintenance of bridges serais uttaras and other buildings erected for the use of the

(n) *Nelloyappa v Thangama* (1898) 1 Mad 406 *Ism Das v Badri Narayan* (1907) 9 All 7

(o) *Monmotho v Harish Chandra* (1906) 33 Cal 905

(p) *Tricumdas v Kaimji* (189) 16 Bom 66

*Sajid Hussain v Collector of Kara* (1897) 21 Bom 45

(q) *Nelloyappa v Thangama* (1899) 1 Mad 406 *Ism Das v Choon Jali* (1906) 33 Cal 49 800 804 *Monmotho v Harish Chandra* (1906) 33 Cal 90 *Ism Das v Badri Narayan* (1907) 9 All 7

public Regulation 19 of 1810 was passed whereby the general superintendence of all the religious and charitable endowments referred to above was vested in the Board of Revenue. That Regulation applied to endowments in Bengal. A similar Regulation Regulation 7 of 1817 was subsequently passed to provide for like endowments in the Madras Presidency (r). Several years after the passing of these Regulations it was thought that the connection of a Christian Government with the religious establishments of Hindus and Mahomedans was inexpedient and a report was therefore called for by the Government of India in the year 1841 from the Collectors of all Districts with a view to divest themselves of the management of religious endowments and transfer the management to properly qualified individuals. As a result Act 20 of 1863 was passed whereby such of the provisions of the abovementioned Regulations as related to religious endowments were repealed, and provision was made for the transfer of all such endowments in certain cases to trustees and in others to committees (s 38). But the duty of superintending charitable endowments imposed on the Board of Revenue by the old Regulations is still retained, and, in fact express care is taken in the Act to declare that this duty as to charitable endowments is not intended to be affected or interfered with (ss 21 23).

The Religious Endowments Act applies only to public religious endowments as did the old Regulations. It does not apply to private religious endowments. S 14 of the Act provides that any person interested in any mosque temple or religious establishment may sue the trustees or members of a committee for any misfeasance breach of trust or neglect of duty committed by them in respect of the trust vested in them and the Court may in such suit direct the specific performance of any act by them and may decree damages and costs against them and may also direct the removal of any of the trustees or any member of a committee. A suit which does not charge the trustees or member of a committee with misfeasance breach of trust or neglect of duty does not fall under that section (e). S 18 provides that no suit under the Act shall be instituted without the leave of the Court.

The Act is in force in all Presidencies except the Presidency of Bombay where it is in force in North Canara only. But it does not apply to presidency towns so that a suit instituted in a Chartered High Court in the exercise of its ordinary original jurisdiction inherited from the Supreme Court charging neglect of duty on the part of a temple trustee does not require the leave of the Court under s 18 of the Act (f).

After the passing of the Regulations above referred to the Board of Revenue took over the management of some endowments but in the large majority of cases they did not take charge of endowments created by private individuals. The operation of the Act however is not confined to such endowments as had actually been taken under the management of the Board of Revenue under the old Regulations. The Act applies to every public religious endowment to which the provisions of the old Regulations applied, that is to say to every public religious endowment created by the preceding Governments of this country and by individual whether the management of the endowment was taken over by the Board of Revenue or not (u).

Preading s 92 of the Code and the Religious Endowments Act together we have the following result —

- (1) No suit in respect of charitable endowments of a public nature claiming any of the reliefs specified in subsection (1) of section 92 can be brought except in conformity with the provisions of that subsection.

(r) See *Sukra v. S. Rama & Iyer* (1916) 33 Mad 90 93 3 IC 11.

(s) *Subrama v. Krishnanandam* (1919) 4 Mad 668 63 IC 605.

(t) *Pa. Ch. Courie Mull v. Chumroo Lall* (1878) 3 CI 563.

*Ad. v. Ram Naray* (183) 8 Cal 3. *Ch. v. Ram Naray* (1896) 19 All 7. *Uthu v. Ga. gathara* (1894) 1 Mad 9.

of 1882 contained any provision corresponding to sub s (2) Before the enactment of the Code of 1877 suits relating to public charitable or religious trusts could be instituted in the ordinary Courts by certain persons as plaintiffs Thus—

- (1) *persons appointed supervisors over trustees* could sue in any ordinary Court competent to hear the suit for the removal of the trustees for malversation and to obtain the appointment in their place of other fit and proper persons (n) similarly
- (2) *one or more of the members of a defined class of the general public* [such as the Satchasi community of Chatra] could sue on behalf of the whole class *with the leave of the Court under s 30* [now O 1 r 8] in any ordinary Court competent to hear the suit to obtain a declaration of their right to take part in the management of the worship of a goddess (o)

It is obvious that the above suits fall within the purview of the present section They also came within the terms of s 539 of the earlier Codes. In the absence of any provision in s 539 similar to that contained in sub s (2) the question arose whether these suits were to be instituted in the special Courts mentioned in s 539 and by the Advocate General as plaintiff or whether they could be instituted as before in ordinary Courts and by persons who could have sued if s 539 had not been enacted The High Court of Bombay held that s 539 was mandatory in other words that *every* suit of the character mentioned in that section must be brought in accordance with its provisions and not otherwise. Therefore the suits referred to above could not be brought by the supervisors as plaintiffs in the one case and by the members of the community in the other but they had to be instituted either by the Advocate General or by two or more persons interested in the trust after obtaining the sanction of the Advocate General and further these suits could only be brought in the *special Courts* indicated in that section, namely the High Court or the District Court as the case might be (p) On the other hand the other High Courts held that section 539 was permissive and that it did not take away the right of suit which existed prior to and independently of it According to the latter view suits of the character mentioned above could, notwithstanding the enactment of section 539 be brought as before by the *abovenamed parties* as plaintiffs in any Court competent to entertain those suits and it was not obligatory to institute them in accordance with the provisions of s 539 (q) Sub section (2) gives effect to the Bombay decisions, and supersedes the decisions of the other High Courts It provides in distinct terms that no suit claiming any of the reliefs specified in sub section (1) shall be instituted except in conformity with the provisions of that sub section. At the same time it declares that the special provisions of the Religious Endowments Act 20 of 1863 for the institution of suits governed by that Act are not affected by the provisions of this section The provisions of that Act and their bearing on the present section are discussed in the next paragraph

Save as provided by the Religious Endowments Act 1863 —After the downfall of the Mogul Empire in India it was discovered that the income of many endowments granted in land by the presiding Governments of this country and by individuals for the support of mosques temples colleges and for other pious and beneficial purposes was misappropriated by persons managing the endowments It was therefore deemed expedient that the British Government should take charge of these endowments and for that purpose and the purpose also of providing for the maintenance of bridges serais uttaras and other buildings erected for the use of the

(n) *Nella yappa v Tho gama* (1898) 21 Mad 406 *Fam Das v Badri Dasa* (190 ) 9 All

(o) *Monmotho v Harish Chandra* (1906) 33 Cal 905

(p) *Tricumdass v Klimf* (1899) 16 Bom 66

*Sajad H. ein v C H tor of Fa a* (1897) 1 Bom 43

(q) *Nella J Ppa v Thangama* (1894) 21 Mad 406 *B dree Das v Chooni Fall* (1905) 33 C 1 78, 800-804 *Monmotho v Harish C/a dra* (1906) 33 Cal 905 *Ram Das v Badri Varain* (1907) 9 All 7

public, Regulation 19 of 1810 was passed whereby the general superintendence of all the religious and charitable endowments of Madras was vested in the Board of Revenue. That Regulation applied to endowments in general. A similar Regulation, Regulation 1 of 1817 was subsequently passed to provide for like endowments in the Madras Presidency. Several years after the passing of these Regulations, it was thought that the management of a Charitable Government with the religious establishments of Hindus and Mahomedans was imperfect and a report was therefore called for by the Government of India in the year 1841 from the Collectors of all Districts with a view to ascertain the details of the management of religious endowments, and transfer the management to properly qualified individuals. As a result Act 20 of 1863 was passed whereby most of the provisions of the above-mentioned Regulations as related to religious endowments were repealed, and provision was made for the transfer of all religious endowments in certain cases to trustees and in others to committees. The Board of superintending charitable endowments imposed on the Board of Revenue by the old Regulations is still retained, and, in fact, express care is taken in the Act to provide that this duty as to charitable endowments is not intended to be affected in conflict with (s. 122).

The Religious Endowments Act applies to religious endowments as did the old Regulations. It does not apply to non-religious endowments. Section 14 of the Act provides that any person interested in any mosque, temple or religious establishment may sue the trustees or members of a committee for any misfeasance, breach of trust or neglect of duty committed by them in respect of the trust vested in them, and the Court may in such suit direct the specific performance of any act by them, and may decree damages and costs against them, and may also direct the removal of any of the trustee or any member of a committee. A suit which does not charge the trustees or member of a committee with misfeasance, breach of trust or neglect of duty does not fall under that section. (s) Section 15 provides that no suit under this Act shall be instituted without the leave of the Court.

The Act is in force in all Presidencies except the Presidency of Bombay where it is in force in North Canara only. But it does not apply to presidency towns. Thus a suit instituted in a Chartered High Court in the exercise of its ordinary jurisdiction inherited from the Supreme Court charging neglect of duty on the part of a temple trustee does not require the leave of the Court under section 15 of the Act (j).

After the passing of the Regulation above referred to the Board of Revenue took over the management of some endowment but in the large majority of cases they did not take charge of endowments created by private individuals. The operation of the Act however is not confined to such endowment as has actually been taken under the management of the Board of Revenue under the old Regulations. The Act applies to every public religious endowment to which the provisions of the old Regulations applied, that is to say to every public religious endowment created by the preceding Governments of this country and by individuals whether the management of the endowment was taken over by the Board of Revenue or not (u).

Pending section 92 of the Code and the Religious Endowment Act together with the following result—

- (1) No suit in respect of charitable endowments of a public nature in which any of the reliefs specified in subsection (1) of section 92 are sought is brought except in conformity with the provisions of that subsection.

(i) See *Suhar nas v Subrama a Iyer* (1916) 39 Mad 700 03 3 IC 211

(ii) *Subramania v Krishnaswamy* (1919) 4 Mad 603 53 IC 605

(f) *Panch Course Mull v Chumroo Lall* (1878)

J Cal 563 *A. a. and J. L. L. L.*  
*Arish a. J. L. L. L.* (1901) 24 Mad 1  
 (u) J *Al v. L. M. N. Th. (1884) 10 Mad 1*  
*Sh or tan v. Ram Jarga & 11b*  
*AR 7 Muthu v. G. Jachara* (1866)  
 Mad 95

- (2) In the case of *religious* endowments of a public nature to which the *Religious Endowments Act* applies a suit charging the trustee manager superintendent or a member of a committee of a mosque temple of religious establishment with *misfeasance breach of trust or neglect of duty* may be brought under the provisions of that Act with the leave of the principal Civil Court of original civil jurisdiction in the District in which the mosque temple or religious establishment is situate as provided by s 18 of the said Act or it may be brought under the provisions of the Code with the consent of the Collector as provided by s 92 of the Code (v)
- (3) No suit in respect of *religious* endowments of a public nature to which the *Religious Endowments Act* does not apply claiming any of the reliefs specified in sub section (1) of section 92 can be brought except in conformity with the provisions of that sub section

**Death of a plaintiff pending suit**—It has been held by the High Court of Allahabad that where a suit is brought by two persons under this section and one of them dies pending the suit the suit abates unless some other person is brought on the record in place of the deceased. Such person must be one who has an interest in the trust and he must have obtained the consent of the Advocate General as required by this section (w). On the other hand the High Court of Madras has held that a suit brought under this section being a representative suit no question of abatement can arise and the Court has power under O 1 r 10 (2) to add other persons interested in the trust as parties not because they are the legal representative of the deceased plaintiff but because they had become parties to the representatives suit by the very fact of its having been instituted on behalf of all persons interested in the trust and that the consent of the Advocate General to such addition is not necessary (x). The Madras decisions have been followed in Lahore (y) and Rangoon (z). It has since been held by the Judicial Committee that where one of the two plaintiffs dies the suit does not abate as a suit under this section is a representative suit (a). The Allahabad decision it is submitted is not correct.

**Death of defendant trustee pending suit**—Where a suit is brought under this section against a trustee not only for his removal but for framing a scheme and the scheme is one of the main reliefs sought the suit does not abate on the death of the trustee and his successor in office may be brought on the record as a party defendant (b). The suit of course would abate if it was solely for the removal of the trustee.

**Specific Relief Act 1877 s 42**—Where a suit falls within this section the plaintiffs cannot evade the requirements of the Code by framing the suit as one under s 42 of the Specific Relief Act (c). At the same time where the suit is one maintainable under this section and the plaintiff seeks any of the reliefs specified in the section s 42 of the Specific Relief Act does not apply. Thus if a suit is brought under this section for a declaration that the defendants are not the lawful trustees and for the appointment of new trustees the suit will not be dismissed because consequential relief such as delivery of the trust property to the new trustees is not claimed (d). [Sec 42 of the Specific Relief Act provides in effect that where a suit is brought for a

- (v) *Venkataraja v Krishnamma* (1914) 37 Mad 184 OIC 515 *Hansraj v Anant* (1918) 4 Bom 74 756 49 IC 514  
 (w) *Chhabila Ram v Durga* (1915) 37 All 298 3 IC 681  
 (x) *Pa. mesaram v Narayanan* (1917) 48 Mad 110, 34 IC 354 *Sayed v Dost* (19 4) 47 Mad LJ 745 85 IC 666 (3) A.M.L. 244  
 (y) *Copi Das v Lal Dast* (1918) 1 R. No 97 p 31 47 IC 933  
 (z) *C E Dooley v M E Meola* (1927) 5 Rang

- 263, 1031 C. 61 (27) A R. 180  
 (a) *Anand Rao v Ramdas* (19 1) 43 I.A. 12, 16 48 Cal 493 497-499 6 IC 737 (11) A.P.C. 1-3  
 (b) *Singh and v Ade Gen* (1915) 23 Mad LJ 174 27 IC 874  
 (c) *Mifti v Faal* (19 4) 44 All 6 57 IC. 659 (17) A.A. 240  
 (d) *Veti Rama v Venkatarajulu* (1903) 23 Mad 450 *Srinivasa v Srinivasa* (1993) 18 Mad 31

declaratory decree and the plaintiff is able to seek further relief than a mere declaration but omits to do so the suit should be dismissed ]

**Dismissal of suit by trustees no bar to suit by Advocate General—**The fact that de jure managers and trustees of a public charity have been held in a previous suit to have lost their right by limitation to oust de facto trustees does not confer on the latter immunity from suit on the part of the Advocate General under this section (e)

**Limitation—Accounts against trustee de son tort—**A suit for account under this section against a trustee de son tort is governed not by s 10 of the Limitation Act, but by art 120 of the Limitation Act. Such a trustee is only liable to render accounts for 6 years preceding the suit (f)

**Relators cannot appeal in their own right—**Where a suit instituted under this section by the Advocate General at the instance of relators is dismissed and the Advocate General does not think fit to appeal the relators are not competent to file an appeal on their own account against the decree dismissing the suit (g). The reason is that relators are not parties to the suit (h)

**Cy pres doctrine—**Though the section does not expressly empower the Court to apply the cy pres doctrine in the settling of schemes it would seem that the Court has the power to apply the doctrine (i). But it has no jurisdiction to apply the cy pres doctrine extra territorium (j)

**93 [S 539, last para]** The powers conferred by sections 91 and 92 on the Advocate General may, outside the Presidency towns, be, with the previous sanction of the Local Government, exercised also by the Collector or by such officer as the Local Government may appoint in this behalf

Exercise of powers of Advocate-General outside presidency towns.

**Collector—**An Assistant Collector has no power under this section to give his consent to the institution of a suit of the kind contemplated by s 92 [or s 91] in the absence of the Collector. Where such a suit is instituted with the consent of the Assistant Collector but not with the consent of the Collector the plaint must be rejected under O 7 r 11 (k)

**Visitatorial power of Collector—**Formally the Collector had a visitatorial power enabling him to enforce an honest and proper administration of religious endowments. The connection of the Government in its executive capacity with Hindu and Mahomedan foundations was brought to an end for Bombay by Bombay Act 7 of 1863 and for Bengal and Madras by Act 20 of 1863 (l)

**Collector's refusal to sanction proceedings—**The Advocate General seems may give his consent to a suit to be instituted outside the Presidency towns though the Collector may have refused to give his consent under this section (m)

- (e) *Lakshmandas v Jugalkishore* (1898) 16 Bom 16. See also *Gopus v Rajammal* (19 ) 43 Mad L J 449 45 43 69 IC 15 ( ) A.M. 394  
(f) *Dihari Lal v Shri a Baran* (19 ) 47 All 17 84 IC 631 ( ) A.A. 884  
(g) *Jan Mahomed v Syed Nurudien* (1908) 3 Bom 155  
(h) *Attorney General v Wright* (1841) 3 Beav 447. *Attorney General v Lega* [1891] Q B 100 106

- (i) *Mayor of Lyons v Advocate General of Bengal* (1876) 1 Cal 303 314 3°  
(j) *Kanj v Advocate General* (1916) 18 Bom L. 83  
(k) *Somchand v Chhaganlal* (1911) 35 Bom 213 10 IC 803  
(l) *Mis ohar v Lakshram* (188 ) 1 Bom 47 60  
(m) *Aramalla v Aramanda* ( ) A.M. 401 106 IC 375

## PART VI

### Supplemental Proceedings

**94** [*New*] In order to prevent the ends of justice from being defeated the Court may, if it is so prescribed,—

Supplemental proceedings

- (a) issue a warrant to arrest the defendant and bring him before the Court to show cause why he should not give security for his appearance, and if he fails to comply with any order for security commit him to the civil prison,
- (b) direct the defendant to furnish security to produce any property belonging to him and to place the same at the disposal of the Court or order the attachment of any property,
- (c) grant a temporary injunction and in case of disobedience commit the person guilty thereof to the civil prison and order that his property be attached and sold,
- (d) appoint a receiver of any property and enforce the performance of his duties by attaching and selling his property,
- (e) make such other interlocutory orders as may appear to the Court to be just and convenient

This section summarizes the general powers of the Court in regard to interlocutory proceedings. The details of procedure have been relegated to Schedule I

Clauses (a) and (b) Arrest and attachment before judgment.—See O 33 below

Clauses (c) and (e) Temporary injunctions and interlocutory orders — See O 39 below

Clause (d) Appointment of receiver—See O 40 below See also notes to s 51 Receiver in execution proceedings

**95** [Ss 491, 497] (1) Where, in any suit in which an arrest or attachment has been effected or a temporary injunction granted under the last preceding section,—

Compensation for obtaining arrest attachment or injunction on insufficient grounds

- (a) it appears to the Court that such arrest, attachment or injunction was applied for on insufficient grounds, or

(b) the suit of the plaintiff fails and it appears to the Court that there was no reasonable or probable ground for instituting the same,

the defendant may apply to the Court, and the Court may, upon such application, award against the plaintiff by its order such amount, not exceeding one thousand rupees, as it deems a reasonable compensation to the defendant for the expense or injury caused to him

Provided that a Court shall not award, under this section, an amount exceeding the limits of its pecuniary jurisdiction

(2) An order determining any such application shall bar any suit for compensation in respect of such arrest, attachment or injunction

Changes introduced by the section—This section corresponds with ss 491 and 497 of the Code of 1882 except that the words by its order have been substituted for the words in its decree. The words by its order indicate that the award should no longer form part of the decree but should be embodied in a separate order. The order is now made appealable by s 104

Scope of the section—This section provides for compensation to the defendant in the two following cases —

- I (1) Where an arrest or attachment before judgment *has been effected* or a temporary injunction *has been granted* (see Orders 38 and 39) and
- (2) such arrest attachment or injunction was *applied for on insufficient grounds*
- II (1) Where an arrest or attachment before judgment *has been effected* or a temporary injunction *has been granted*
- (2) the plaintiff *fails* in the suit and
- (3) there was *no reasonable or probable ground for instituting the suit*

In case II it is not necessary to show that the arrest attachment or injunction was applied for on insufficient grounds. It is enough if the plaintiff *fails* in the suit and there was *no reasonable or probable ground* for instituting the suit. The principle is that a plaintiff who has obtained an arrest attachment or injunction by instituting a suit without any probable ground should be punished as much as a plaintiff who has obtained the *process* on insufficient grounds

This section is no bar to a regular suit—This section provides a summary remedy for an injured defendant and enables him to seek compensation for the injury done to him by the plaintiff by an *application* to the Court instead of by a *suit*. But the remedy under this section is optional and an injured defendant may if he so chooses institute a regular suit against the plaintiff for compensation for wrongful arrest attachment or injunction (n). This clearly appears from sub section (2) which impliedly recognizes the right of a defendant to institute a regular suit for compensation (o). In a suit for compensation however the plaintiff must prove malice in fact in addition to the facts required to be proved by this section (p). But whether the proceeding is by

(n) *Lar Kumar v J gat Bandhu* (19 ) 3 Cal 1008 100 IC 318 ( 7 ) A C 247  
(o) See *Fala v Ud yar* (1909) 3 Mad 170  
1 C 345

(p) *Nanjappa v Ganapath* (191 ) 3 Mad 593  
1 IC 507 See *Imperial Tobacco Co v Bannan* (1927) 47 Cal LJ 4 106  
1 C 277 ( 23 ) A C 1



way of suit or by an application under this section the defendant is not entitled to any compensation unless the attachment has been effected. Merely procuring an order for attachment before judgment however maliciously is not sufficient to entitle the defendant to compensation (q). As to the period of limitation for a suit see Limitation Act 1908 Sch I arts 19 29 36 and 42 and also the undermentioned cases (r). As to suits for damages for temporary injunction improperly obtained see the undermentioned cases (s).

**On insufficient grounds** —The words are equivalent to 'without reasonable and probable cause' (t).

**An award under this section is a bar to a regular suit** —Once an application is made by a defendant under this section for compensation for wrongful arrest attachment or injunction and an order is made under this section the defendant cannot institute a regular suit for compensation for the same wrong whether any compensation is awarded to him or not. In other words the disposal of an application under this section has the effect of res judicata so as to bar any subsequent suit in respect of the same cause of action. Note that it is the disposal of the application and not the mere presenting of the application that is a bar to a regular suit.

**Amount of compensation** —The amount of compensation that may be awarded under this section cannot exceed Rs 1000. Where a defendant claims a larger amount of compensation he must institute a regular suit.

**Right of defendant not served with summons to apply for compensation under this section** —If a defendant is arrested before judgment he is entitled to apply for compensation under this section though he has not been served with the writ of summons in the suit (u).

**Counter claim for compensation in a summary suit** —If a defendant who is arrested before judgment in a summary suit brought against him on a negotiable instrument under O 37 claims compensation for arrest under this section he is entitled on that ground to apply for leave to defend the suit under O 37 r 3 and if a *prima facie* case is made out leave to defend should be given (v).

**Provincial Small Cause Courts** —A Provincial Small Cause Court has no jurisdiction to make an order for the attachment before judgment of immovable property. But it may order an attachment before judgment of movable property and if the attachment was obtained on insufficient grounds it may award compensation to the defendant under this section (w). See s 7 (b) (i) and O 33 r 13.

**Appeal** —An appeal lies from an order under this section see sec 104 sub sec (1) cl (f).

S 491 of the Code of 1882 provided for compensation for wrongful arrest and attachment. S 497 provided for compensation for wrongful injunction. An order under s 497 was appealable under that Code (x) but orders under s 491 were held not to be appealable (y). The present section combines the provisions of ss 491 and 497 and s 104 gives a right of appeal from all orders under this section whether they are orders made on an application for compensation for wrongful injunction or for wrongful arrest or attachment.

(q) *Pama v Govinda* (1916) 39 Mad 9 3 I C 419.

(r) *Ram Narain v Umrao Singh* (1907) 9 All 615. *S. Rajmal v Mane Ichand* (1904) 6 Bom L. R. 64. *Manohararam v Arulan* (1886) 19 Mad 80. *Murug v Jettaram* (1900) 3 Mad 61. *Sakkal v Ram v Arunachalam* (1900) 33 Mad L. J 34. 25 I C 786.

(s) *Sand Coomar v Gour S. Nar* (18 0) 13 W

R 305. *Mohini v Surendra* (1915) 4 Cal. 850 5 6-557 26 I C 796.

(t) *Roulet v Fitteri* (1894) 18 Bom 717 70.

(u) *Syed Ali v Adib* (1921) 15 Bom 160.

(v) *Loulet v Fitteri* (1894) 18 Bom 717.

(w) *Ibrahim v Sa. garam* (1903) 63 Mad 504.

(x) See Code of 1882 s 589 cl. (1).

(y) *Varanaga v Govinda* (1901) 24 Mad 6. *Lak Nath v Amir Singh* (1906) 29 All 61.

**Undertaking**—Where a temporary injunction has been granted on an undertaking by the plaintiff to compensate the defendant for any loss that may arise by reason of the injunction the undertaking is enforced by an application under this section to the Court which granted the injunction. *A* attaches a house in execution of a decree against *B*. *C* sues for a declaration that the house belongs to him and obtains a temporary injunction staying the sale on his undertaking to pay interest to *A* at 6 per centum on the value of the house if his suit be dismissed. *C*'s suit is dismissed. In such a case the procedure to be adopted by *A* to recover the interest from *C* is to apply not to the Court executing the decree but to the Court which granted the injunction ( )

**Chartered High Court**—Where a temporary injunction was granted by the High Court of Bombay on an undertaking by the plaintiff under Rule 320 of that Court to pay such sum by way of damages as the Court may award as compensation in the event of the party affected sustaining prejudice by such injunction it was held that the Court had power under that rule to award compensation to the defendant exceeding Rs 1 000 on an application by the defendant in that behalf (a)

---

(s) *Varajlal v. Katar* (1908) 2 Bom 4

L R 10 0 I C 63 (0) A B 3

(a) *Haji Abdil v. Mujib* (1906) 8 Bom 1

## PART VII

## Appeals

## APPEALS FROM ORIGINAL DECREES

96 [S 540 Jud Act, 1873 s 49] (1) Save where otherwise expressly provided in the body of this Code or by any other law for the time being in force, an appeal shall lie from

Appea from or'inal  
electro

every decree passed by any Court exercising original jurisdiction to the Court authorized to hear appeals from the decisions of such Court.

(2) An appeal may lie from an original decree passed *ex parte*

(3) No appeal shall lie from a decree passed by the Court with the consent of parties

Changes introduced by the section—Sub section (3) is new. In other respects this section corresponds with s. 40 of the Code of 1882. As to the effect of sub section (3) see notes below under the head. Sub section (3) consent decrees not applicable.

Compare Judicature Act 1873 s 49 which provides that no order made by the High Court or any judge thereof by the consent of parties shall be subject to any appeal except by leave of the Court or judge making such order

**Letters Patent appeals**—The right of appeal from a decree of a single Judge of a High Court to the High Court is governed not by this section but cl 15 of the Letters Patent. The Code makes no provision for an appeal within the High Court that is to say from a single Judge of the High Court. This right of appeal depends on clause 15 of the Charter. (b) But as regards *procedure* the Court and the rules therein contained exceptally the rules contained in O 41 apply to proceedings in a High Court under the Letters Patent save so far as the Code expressly provides to the contrary. (c)

**Right of appeal**—It is not to be assumed that there is a right of appeal in every matter which comes under the consideration of a Court such right must be given by statute or by some authority equivalent to a statute (d) Unless a right of appeal is clearly given by statute it does not exist whereas a litigant has independently of any statute a right to institute any suit of a civil nature in some Court or another (e) No right of appeal can be given except by express words (f) Note in the present section the express word is an appeal shall lie from every decree Rights of appeal again are substantive rights They are not mere matters of procedure Hence an Act

(b) *D* *be* *t* *e* *Nath* *N* *B* *b* *d* *f* *i* (1916) 43 (al  
00 93 94 33 *I* *e* 74 *r* *haphanth* *s*  
*h* *v* (1907) *W* *I* 5 *s*  
*N* *ac* *t* *B* *b* *N* *J* *g* *s* *H* *j* *s* *h* *al*  
(1913) 3 *I* *m* *e* *i* *e* 33 *s* *j*  
*t* *H* *m* *ma* (1918) 0 *I* *m* *i* *j*  
18 *t* 19 47 *I* *e* 449  
(c) *s* *r* *h* *k* *N* *e* (1917) 44 *I* *A*  
6 45 (1 45) 60 *I* *e* (1) *A* *I* *e*  
80

(d) *M* *ak* *k* *s* *br* *v* (1908) 11 *Mad*  
06 33 14 *I* *A* 170 *i* *t* *v*  
*s* *r* *e* (1904) 7 31 *i* 04 *i* *g* *o*  
*h* *t* *g* *e* *o* *coll* *cto* *f* *i* *g* *o*  
(1915) 40 (al 1 *W* 33 *I* *A* 19 (0)  
16 *i* 184  
(e) *Z* *e* *r* *H* *N* *A* *k* *N* *v* *A* *k* *e* *k* *t* *J* (1906)  
*A* *h* *i* *o*  
(f) *N* *y* *v* *s* *t* *xy* *f* *st* *te* (1906) 0 *I* *m*  
80

which takes away an existing right of appeal must not be applied retrospectively in the absence of express enactment or necessary intendment (9)

**Agreement not to appeal**—An agreement whereby the parties agree not to appeal from a decree is binding upon the parties thereto if it is for a lawful consideration and is otherwise valid (A). But an agreement by the next friend of a minor not to appeal is not binding on the minor (1).

**Decree** — As to the distinction between a decree and an order see p 5 above. All decrees are appealable unless the appeal is barred under this Code or any other law. But all orders are not appealable. The only orders appealable are those specified in 104.

Where decree not drawn up—No appeal can be entertained from a decree unless the decree has been drawn up (j) See notes to 33 also notes to s 97 Where preliminary decree not drawn up

Appeal from ex parte decree—S 540 of the Code of 1882 as it originally stood did not contain any clause allowing appeal from ex parte decrees. The clause allowing such appeals was added by s 40 of the Civil Procedure Code Amending Act 7 of 1888. Prior to that Act it was doubted in some cases whether an appeal lay from an ex parte decree. As to the powers of an appellate Court in the matter of ex parte decrees see notes to O 9 r 13. Whether remedies concurrent.

**Forum of appeal**—The value of a suit that is the amount or value of the subject matter thereof determines the forum of suit that is the Court in which the suit is to be filed. It also determines the forum of appeal that is the Court to which the appeal lies. What then is the value of a suit for the purposes of appeal? Now a plaintiff may in his plaint fix a sum *definitively* as the amount of his claim as in a suit for debt or he may fix it *approximately or tentatively* as in a suit for accounts or for mesne profits [O 7 r 2]. When the plaintiff fixes a sum *definitively* it is that sum which determines the forum of appeal and not the amount awarded by the decree and involved in the appeal. Where the plaintiff fixes a sum *approximately* there is a difference of opinion as to the forum of appeal. According to the Calcutta High Court it is the amount decreed by the first Court as the amount due to the plaintiff which determines the forum of appeal (k). According to the Bombay (l) and Allahabad (m) High Courts it is the amount determined by the first Court as the amount due to the plaintiff and accepted by the plaintiff by payment of additional court fee which determines the forum of appeal. According to the Madras High Court it is the amount or value of the subject matter as fixed in the plaint though approximately which determines the Court to which the appeal lies and not the amount decreed. It has accordingly been held by that Court that where in a suit for account filed in the Court of a District Munsif whose jurisdiction is limited to suits of which the value does not exceed Rs 2,000 the plaintiff fixes his claim approximately at Rs 2,000 and the Munsif passes a decree for more than Rs 2,000 the appeal from the Munsif's decree lies not to the High Court but to the District Court (n). In a recent

- (g) *Colo sal S q1 Pefning C mp J Irv 1*  
 [1903] A ( 309 Del (lot) am C n 1  
 Del (o v i a T Comm n 1  
 Del (19) 54 1 A 4 1 9 Lab 54  
 Va a v Sh I (1903) 3 Lom 317  
 Sad r 1f v Dol uid n (19 9) 56 C 1  
 51
- (i) *03 I top C7 Irv 4 Moon (184) 18*  
 Cal 4 S al o G J 4 S 9h  
 D r9 I wa (19 5) 4 All 63 85  
 I C 64 (J) A 4 63 [F B]  
 (i) *Rh le v Suth b I (1883) Q B D*  
 57
- (j) *Ba D r h v Sh h I sh a (1910) 34 Bom*

- [illegible]

case (a) the Allahabad High Court has adopted the same rule as Madras. Where a suit is dismissed by the first Court—in which case the *me ne profits* remain undetermined—the sum stated in the plaint determines the forum of appeal (p). A Full Bench of the High Court of Calcutta has recently held that where a suit is properly brought in the Court of a Munsif for recovery of possession of land and *mesne profits pendente lite* are claimed or assessed at a sum beyond the pecuniary jurisdiction of the Munsif the Munsif has jurisdiction to fix such *mesne profits* and pass a decree for a sum beyond his pecuniary jurisdiction. The value of such a suit for purposes of jurisdiction is the value of the immovable property plus *me ne profits up to the date of the suit* where such profits are claimed. If a suit is rightly entertained as within the jurisdiction of the Munsif and a decree passed his power to grant the proper and adequate relief is not affected by any event which increases the value of the relief during the pendency of the suit. The forum of appeal is determined by the value of the suit and not by the amount decreed (q). The undermentioned decisions (r) of the same High Court must be taken to have been overruled by the Full Bench case. See notes to s 4 on p 19 above also notes to s 10 Over valuation and Under valuation on p 89 above.

A decree is passed by Court V in respect of a cause of action which arose at Kadiri. Appeals from decrees of Court V lie to Court C. Subsequently Kadiri is transferred to the territorial jurisdiction of Court I from which appeals lie to Court B. To which Court does the appeal from the decree lie to Court C or to Court B? The answer is to Court B because a transfer of territorial jurisdiction *ipso facto* effects a transfer of venue (s).

**Who may appeal**—An appeal under this section may be preferred by any of the following persons—

- 1 Any party to the suit *adversely affected by the decree* (t) or if such party is dead by his legal representative (u) [see s 146]
- 2 Any transferee of the interest of such party who so far as such interest is concerned is bound by the decree provided his name is entered on the record of the suit (v) [See notes to s 4 Representative on p 156 above]
- 3 An auction purchaser may appeal from an order in execution setting aside the sale on the ground of fraud [See notes to s 4 Appeal on p 166 above]

No person unless he is party to the suit is entitled to appeal under this section (w).

We have said above that any party to a suit adversely affected by a decree may prefer an appeal from the decree. The question whether a party is adversely affected by a decree is a question of fact to be determined in each case according to its particular circumstances. It is clear that if a plaintiff's claim is decreed in its entirety and all the issues are found in his favour the plaintiff cannot appeal from the decree. In case the plaintiff's claim is decreed in its entirety but one of the issues is found against him can the plaintiff appeal from the adverse finding? It has been held that he cannot (x). The reason is that the very fact that the decree is entirely in the plaintiff's favour notwithstanding a finding adverse to him on one of the issues shows that such finding was unnecessary to the determination of the plaintiff's suit. It has been stated in the

(a) *M. An. moul. (1911) 46 B.L.R. (19) 47*  
 All 534 861 (10) (1) A.A. 36  
 (p) *S. by A. S. R. v. J. J. R. (1910)*  
 41 I.C. 41 (1) C. 4  
 (q) *Radhika v. U. S. R. (1907) 33*  
 I.C. 114 871 (1) C. 4 (1) A. 10 6 B.R.  
 (r) *Ba. pend. v. J. R. (1910) 43 (2) 600 R*  
 I.C. 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31 31  
 24 (1) W. N. 34 41 (1) 10  
 (s) *S. D. v. R. (1914) 3 Mad 477*

26 I.C. 19  
 (t) *A. R. v. S. R. (1907) 9 C.I.*  
 W. N. 81  
 (u) *C. v. S. R. (18 1) B. I. R. 16*  
 (v) *M. R. v. A. S. R. (18 4) B. I. R. 14*  
 (w) *S. R. v. S. R. (1919) 19*  
 B. I. R. 19 42 I.C. 841  
 (x) *S. R. v. S. R. (1914) 37*  
 B. I. R. 11 C. 16

notes to s 11 pp 70-71 above that when a finding on an issue is not necessary to the determination of a suit such finding does not operate as *res judicata* and it is an elementary principle that an appeal is not admissible on any point that does not operate as *res judicata*. Similarly if a suit is brought by A against B and the suit is dismissed in its entirety B cannot appeal from the decree. And even if one of the issues is found against B B cannot appeal from the finding for such finding does not operate as *res judicata* for the reason stated above (y). See notes to s 11. Decision in the former suit must have been necessary to the determination of that suit on p 71 above and the cases there cited.

It sometimes happens where there are two or more defendants that although a suit is dismissed as against one of them in other words the decree on the face of it is entirely in his favour the decree implicitly negatives the right claimed by such defendant as against the plaintiff and the other defendants. In such a case it has been held that an appeal lies at the instance of such defendant on the ground that he is adversely affected by the decree. A owes Rs 2000 to A. A assigns the debt first to B and then to C. C sues A and B to recover the debt alleging that the assignment to B had become void through non fulfilment of the conditions upon which it was made. A decree is passed against A but the suit is dismissed as against B. Here the decree necessarily implies the finding that the assignment to B had become void inasmuch as but for such a finding the decree could not have been passed in favour of C who admittedly was the second assignee of the debt. B may therefore appeal from the decree though as against him the suit was dismissed (z).

In some cases an appeal may be preferred by a defendant against his co-defendants. A sues two Hindu brothers B and C on a promissory note passed by B for money borrowed by him (B) as manager of the family alleging that B and C were joint and that the loan was obtained by B for family purposes. C does not appear at the hearing. C appears and admits that he and B are joint but denies that the loan was obtained for family purposes. An issue is raised as to whether the debt contracted by B was for family purposes. It is found by the Court that the loan was obtained by B for family purposes and a decree is passed against B and C. Here C can appeal from the decree as between himself and B. The rule is that when a Court deals with a case as raising not only a question between the plaintiff and the defendants but also as between the defendants one of the defendants can appeal from the decree as between himself and the other defendants (a). See notes to s 11. *Res judicata* between co-defendants on p 70 above.

**Joinder of appellants**—It is irregular for defendants with different defences to a suit and with different grounds for appeal to join in a single appeal (f).

**Sub section (3) consent decrees not appealable**—Sub section (3) is new. It declares that no decree passed by consent of parties shall be appealable. Under the Code of 1882 consent decrees were passed under s 310. Under the present Code (c) a consent decree may be passed under O 23 r 3. This rule corresponds with s 375 of the Code of 1882 except that certain words which occurred at the end of s 310 have now been omitted. S 37 ran as follows—

If a suit be adjusted wholly or in part by any lawful agreement or compromise

or if the defendant satisfy the plaintiff in respect to the whole or any part of the matter of the suit such agreement or compromise

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| (9) L. J. 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677, 678, 679, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 696, 697, 698, 699, 700, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 747, 748, 749, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 767, 768, 769, 770, 771, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 784, 785, 786, 787, 788, 789, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 798, 799, 800, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 809, 810, 811, 812, 813, 814, 815, 816, 817, 818, 819, 820, 821, 822, 823, 824, 825, 826, 827, 828, 829, 830, 831, 832, 833, 834, 835, 836, 837, 838, 839, 840, 841, 842, 843, 844, 845, 846, 847, 848, 849, 850, 851, 852, 853, 854, 855, 856, 857, 858, 859, 860, 861, 862, 863, 864, 865, 866, 867, 868, 869, 870, 871, 872, 873, 874, 875, 876, 877, 878, 879, 880, 881, 882, 883, 884, 885, 886, 887, 888, 889, 890, 891, 892, 893, 894, 895, 896, 897, 898, 899, 900, 901, 902, 903, 904, 905, 906, 907, 908, 909, 910, 911, 912, 913, 914, 915, 916, 917, 918, 919, 920, 921, 922, 923, 924, 925, 926, 927, 928, 929, 930, 931, 932, 933, 934, 935, 936, 937, 938, 939, 940, 941, 942, 943, 944, 945, 946, 947, 948, 949, 950, 951, 952, 953, 954, 955, 956, 957, 958, 959, 960, 961, 962, 963, 964, 965, 966, 967, 968, 969, 970, 971, 972, 973, 974, 975, 976, 977, 978, 979, 980, 981, 982, 983, 984, 985, 986, 987, 988, 989, 990, 991, 992, 993, 994, 995, 996, 997, 998, 999, 1000. | (1) J. 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677, 678, 679, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 696, 697, 698, 699, 700, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 747, 748, 749, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 767, 768, 769, 770, 771, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 784, 785, 786, 787, 788, 789, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 798, 799, 800, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 809, 810, 811, 812, 813, 814, 815, 816, 817, 818, 819, 820, 821, 822, 823, 824, 825, 826, 827, 828, 829, 830, 831, 832, 833, 834, 835, 836, 837, 838, 839, 840, 841, 842, 843, 844, 845, 846, 847, 848, 849, 850, 851, 852, 853, 854, 855, 856, 857, 858, 859, 860, 861, 862, 863, 864, 865, 866, 867, 868, 869, 870, 871, 872, 873, 874, 875, 876, 877, 878, 879, 880, 881, 882, 883, 884, 885, 886, 887, 888, 889, 890, 891, 892, 893, 894, 895, 896, 897, 898, 899, 900, 901, 902, 903, 904, 905, 906, 907, 908, 909, 910, 911, 912, 913, 914, 915, 916, 917, 918, 919, 920, 921, 922, 923, 924, 925, 926, 927, 928, 929, 930, 931, 932, 933, 934, 935, 936, 937, 938, 939, 940, 941, 942, 943, 944, 945, 946, 947, 948, 949, 950, 951, 952, 953, 954, 955, 956, 957, 958, 959, 960, 961, 962, 963, 964, 965, 966, 967, 968, 969, 970, 971, 972, 973, 974, 975, 976, 977, 978, 979, 980, 981, 982, 983, 984, 985, 986, 987, 988, 989, 990, 991, 992, 993, 994, 995, 996, 997, 998, 999, 1000. | (1) J. 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563 |
|--|---|--|



for the purpose (m) In some cases it may be done by an application for a review (n) But it cannot be done by a rule (o) See notes to s 11 Consent decree and estoppel.

By consent of parties —To constitute consent there must be an agreement between the parties Mere acceptance by a party of an order offered by the Court does not amount to consent (p)

**97 [New]** Where any party aggrieved by a preliminary decree passed after the commencement of this Code does not appeal from such decree, he shall be precluded from disputing its correctness in any appeal which may be preferred from the final decree

Appeal from final decree where no appeal from preliminary decree

**Preliminary decree**—For definition of preliminary decree see s 2 (2) above

**Appeal from preliminary decree**—This section is new The object of the section is to estop parties aggrieved by a preliminary decree who do not appeal from such decree within the period of limitation from afterwards disputing its correctness in any appeal which may be preferred from a decree

This section enacts that where a party aggrieved by a preliminary decree does not appeal from such decree within the period of limitation he shall be precluded from disputing its correctness in any appeal which may be preferred from the final decree The reason of this enactment is that it is unreasonable that a party aggrieved by a preliminary decree should allow proceedings to be carried on to their final stage and large costs to be incurred and then object to the preliminary decree in an appeal from the final decree Recent Calcutta decisions under the Code of 1892 were quite the other way According to the decisions a party aggrieved by an order in the nature of a preliminary decree was not bound to appeal from the order though the order was appealable as a decree he was at liberty to wait until the final decree was passed and then to dispute the correctness of the order in an appeal from the final decree though the period of limitation for an appeal from the order had then expired Thus it was held that when an order was passed in a suit for dissolution of partnership and accounts, declaring the shares of the parties and referring the case to a commissioner for taking accounts it was open to the party aggrieved by the order to dispute its correctness in an appeal from the final decree though no appeal was preferred from the order and the period prescribed by the law of limitation for appealing from the order had then expired (q) In a subsequent case it was held by a Full Bench of that Court in *Akadem Hossein v Emdad Hosein* (r) [Maclean C J and Rampur J dissenting] that where an order was passed in a suit for partition declaring the rights of the parties (s) it was open to the party aggrieved by the order to dispute its correctness in an appeal from the final decree though no appeal was preferred from the order within the time allowed by law The contrary had been laid down in an earlier case decided by the same High Court (t) but that

(i) *H H f id B k g Co W H g* [183] 1  
(7) 23 1 with [1836]  
1 (h) 63 15 H g v Sa [189] 1  
(1) 34 M rat I h oob J (1891)  
1 B n 94

(n) 4 Fox J T s (1894) 10 Cal 61 61

(o) F t ob S b (191) 36 Bom 11  
1 C 64

(p) H B r (1840) W N 116 Hol d s  
F ed (1843) 10 T L R 139

(q) B a V at B i K a t (1836) 3 Cal  
406 S O 0 r 1

(r) (190) 9 Cal 3  
(1) S O 0 r 18 bel w

(s) B t a D r F a C u d Dry (196)  
3 Cal 9



or satisfaction shall be recorded and the Court shall pass a decree in accordance therewith so far as it relates to the suit and such decree shall be final so far as it relates to so much of the subject matter of the suit as was dealt with by the agreement compromise or satisfaction

O 23 r 3 is a reproduction of s 37c with the omission of the word italicized above (d). This omission has been supplied by sub section (3) of the present section. The said words barred an appeal from a consent decree only so far as such decree related to so much of the subject matter of the suit as was dealt with by the agreement compromise or satisfaction on which the decree was based. If a consent decree dealt with any matter extraneous to the suit that is matters that did not relate to the subject matter of the suit it was held that the decree though passed with the consent of parties was appealable and that it should be modified by omitting such terms as did not relate to the subject matter of the suit (e). As regards the terms so excluded it was held that they might be enforced in a separate suit as a contract (f). It would be so also under the present Code. See in this connection the observations of the Judicial Committee in *Hemant Kumari Debi v. Vidnapur Zamindari Company* (g).

Both under O 23 r 3 and the corresponding s 37c of the Code of 1882 the agreement or compromise in terms of which the Court is invited to pass a consent decree must be lawful. It was accordingly observed by the High Court of Bombay in *Goculdas v. James Scott* (h) a case under s 37c that notwithstanding the declared invalidity of the decree an appeal against it would be maintainable where the party against whom the decree was passed alleged that there had been in fact no lawful agreement come to in which case the condition precedent to the making of the decree would not be fulfilled. These observations were mere *obiter dicta* but they were adopted by the High Court of Madras in *Sridharan v. Puramallan* (i) where it was held that an appeal would lie from a consent decree if the agreement in terms of which the decree was passed was not lawful. The present Code does not allow an appeal from a consent decree in any case. But it is competent to either party to appeal from the order recording the compromise where the compromise is not a lawful compromise on the ground that the Court had no power under O 23 r 3 to record a compromise that was not lawful [O 43 r 1 cl (m)]. See notes to O 23 r 3 Appeal.

Plaintiffs sued up in an account stated. The Court found that the account stated was a deliberate fabrication and fraud and the plaintiff had to fall back on items in the general account. Each of these was found to be barred by limitation but defendants consented to a decree for such items as plaintiff could prove. A decree was passed on this footing. The Privy Council held that it was a consent decree and not appealable and that if it were not a consent decree plaintiffs' claim would have to be dismissed (j).

Procedure for setting aside consent decrees.—Sub section (3) in so far as it bars an appeal from consent decrees gives effect to the principle that a judgment by consent acts as an estoppel (k). A consent decree however may be set aside on any ground which would invalidate an agreement such as misrepresentation fraud or mistake (l). This cannot be done by an appeal and it must be done by a fresh suit brought

(d) The italicized words were added at the revision of the Code in 1907. See the notes to O 23 r 3.

(e) *Pratt v. Thamma* (1882) 14 M 1 410. *Pratt v. Thamma* (1900) 26 B 106. *Pratt v. Thamma* (1900) 30 M 1 414.

(f) *J. M. L. v. J. M. L.* (1907) 21 Cal 46.

(g) (1919) 46 I A 10. 164 C 1 44 42.

(h) (1882) 16 B 106. *Pratt v. Thamma* (1907) 26 B 106.

(i) (1900) 3 M 1 101.

(j) *James v. Thamma* (1900) 3 M 1 410. *Pratt v. Thamma* (1900) 30 M 1 414.

(k) *Pratt v. Thamma* (1882) 14 M 1 410. *Pratt v. Thamma* (1900) 26 B 106. *Pratt v. Thamma* (1900) 30 M 1 414.

(l) *Pratt v. Thamma* (1882) 14 M 1 410. *Pratt v. Thamma* (1900) 26 B 106. *Pratt v. Thamma* (1900) 30 M 1 414.

6. 04

for the purpose (m) In some cases it may be done by an application for a review (n) But it cannot be done by a rule (o) See notes to s 11 Consent decree and estoppel

By consent of parties —To constitute consent there must be an agreement between the parties Mere acceptance by a party of an order offered by the Court does not amount to consent (p)

97 [New] Where any party aggrieved by a preliminary decree passed after the commencement of this Code does not appeal from such decree he shall be precluded from disputing its correctness in any appeal which may be preferred from the final decree

Appeal from final decree where no appeal from preliminary decree

Preliminary decree—For definition of preliminary decree see s 2 (2) above

Appeal from preliminary decree—This section is new The object of the section is to estop parties aggrieved by a preliminary decree who do not appeal from such decree within the period of limitation from afterwards disputing its correctness in any appeal which may be preferred from a decree

This section enacts that where a party aggrieved by a preliminary decree does not appeal from such decree within the period of limitation he shall be precluded from disputing its correctness in any appeal which may be preferred from the final decree The reason of this enactment is that it is unreasonable that a party aggrieved by a preliminary decree should allow proceedings to be carried on to their final stage and large costs to be incurred, and then object to the preliminary decree in an appeal from the final decree Recent Calcutta decisions under the Code of 1882 were quite the other way According to these decisions a party aggrieved by an order in the nature of a preliminary decree was not bound to appeal from the order though the order was appealable as a decree he was at liberty to wait until the final decree was passed and then to dispute the correctness of the order in an appeal from the final decree though the period of limitation for an appeal from the order had then expired Thus it was held that when an order was passed in a suit for dissolution of partnership and accounts declaring the shares of the parties and referring the case to a commissioner for taking accounts it was open to the party aggrieved by the order to dispute its correctness in an appeal from the final decree though no appeal was preferred from the order and the period prescribed by the law of limitation for appealing from the order had then expired (q) In a subsequent case it was held by a Full Bench of that Court in *Khaleem Hossein v. Firdad Hossein* (r) [Maclean C.J. and Rampini J. dissenting] that where an order was passed in a suit for partition declaring the rights of the parties (s) it was open to the party aggrieved by the order to dispute its correctness in an appeal from the final decree though no appeal was preferred from the order within the time allowed by law The contrary had been laid down in an earlier case decided by the same High Court (t) but that

(m) *H. d. r. field* 1 a 1 g t L st [1891] 11 3 1 W 11 J [1896] 1 (1) 6 3 11 id J S der [1891] (h) 34 W at P t 11 J (1831) 1 Bom 94

(n) *Foot h T a* (1844) 10 Cal 61 61

(o) *F t t So b* (191) 38 Bom 11 11 64

(p) *All F Brow* (1890) W N 116 H l da 11 3 1 W 11 J [1896] 1 (1) 6 3 11 id J S der [1891] (h) 34 W at P t 11 J (1831) 1 Bom 94

(q) *B w Vatt v Ba A n ta* (1896) 3 Cal 406 S O r 1

(r) (190) 99 Cal 8 8

(s) *S O O r* 18 below

(t) *Bot D v Pa n Clu dra Dey* (1896) 1 Cal 9

decision was dissented from by a majority of the Full Bench in *Akadem Ho. sein* a case Under this section omission to prefer an appeal from a preliminary decree precludes objections to it in an appeal from the final decree (u) It is to be noted that the present section applies only to preliminary decrees passed after the commencement of this Code For preliminary decree see O 20 below

Where preliminary decree not drawn up—A right of appeal under this section only arises when a preliminary decree is passed that is drawn up It is the duty of the Court and not of the parties to see that a decree is drawn up Unless a decree is drawn up there is no appeal The provisions of this section do not therefore apply unless the preliminary decree is drawn up (z) See notes to s 33 and notes to s 96 Where decree not drawn up on p 239 above

Two preliminary decrees—The Code it seems contemplates only one preliminary decree (w) The High Court of Calcutta however has held that there may in an exceptional case be more than one preliminary decree (x)

Final decree passed prior to or during pendency of appeal from preliminary decree—Under the Code of 1852 it was held that where *after the passing of the final decree* a party appealed from an order in the nature of a preliminary decree but did not also appeal from the final decree that circumstance was a bar to the hearing of the appeal from that order (y) Under the present Code the High Courts of Madras and Allahabad have held that the mere fact that no appeal has been preferred from the final decree is no ground for not hearing the appeal from the preliminary decree whether the latter appeal is filed before or after the final decree if the preliminary decree is set aside the final decree falls with it (z) On the other hand it has been held by the High Court of Calcutta that where an appeal has been preferred only from the preliminary decree after the final decree has been passed the appeal is incompetent the reason given being that if the preliminary decree were reversed in appeal the final decree would remain unaffected as no appeal was preferred from it But it has been held by the same Court that the appellate Court may in a proper case allow the appellant to amend the memorandum of appeal so as to turn the appeal from the preliminary decree into one from both the preliminary and the final decree (a) If the final decree is passed after the filing of the appeal from the preliminary decree the appellant should file an appeal from the final decree (b) or at least inform the Court of the fact (c) In some cases where this course was not adopted it was held that the decree in appeal from the preliminary decree is infructuous because the final decree cannot be contingent on the result of the appeal (d) In a Calcutta case *Wookerjee* I enlarged the scope of the memorandum of appeal so as to convert it into an appeal against both the final and the preliminary decree (e)

- (u) *Cal 914* 43 C 1011 *Harid* 75 1 *re*  
*Harid* 1 *g* *partu* *phili*  
 (v) *1a* *act* *ry* *s* *t* *f* (1 1) *11*  
*1 R* *8* *6* *6* *1* *1014* (4) *4 B* *31*  
*1A* *1* *1* (113) *3* *B* *11*  
*4* *1* *10* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1*  
*1914* *16* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1*  
 (w) *1a* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1*  
*1 R* *8* *6* *6* *1* *1014* (4)  
*1A* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1*  
 (x) *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1*  
*1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1*  
 (y) *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1*  
*1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1*  
*1A* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1*  
*1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1*  
*1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1*  
 (z) *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1*  
*1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1*

- 3* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1*  
*2* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1*  
 (a) *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1*  
*1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1*  
*1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1*  
*1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1*  
*1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1*  
 (b) *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1*  
*1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1*  
*1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1*  
*1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1*  
 (c) *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1*  
*1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1*  
 (d) *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1*  
*1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1*  
*1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1*  
*1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1*  
 (e) *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1*  
*1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1* *1*



The appeal shall then be heard upon that point only —Under the old section it was the *appeal* that was referred to a third Judge when the Judges hearing the appeal differed in opinion on a point of law and it was held that on such reference *the whole appeal* was open for argument and not only the point of law on which the Judges had differed (*l*) Under the present section the Judges have to state the point of law upon which they differ and the appeal is to be heard *upon that point only*

By whom appeal to be heard upon point of law stated —Where a point of law on which the Judges hearing the appeal differ has been stated the appeal is to be heard upon that point by one or more of the *other* Judges of the Court This was in fact the practice followed in Bombay under the Code of 1882 (*i*) In Allahabad the appeal was heard by a Bench *including* the Judges who first heard it (*j*)

It is to be noted that while the appeal upon the point of law is under this section to be heard by a Judge or Judges other than those who first heard it the point is to be decided according to the opinion of the majority (if any) of the Judges who have heard the appeal *including those who first heard it*

Where Judges differ on a point of law but do not state the point.—A obtains a decree against B in the Court of a Subordinate Judge B appeals from the decree to the District Judge and the decree is confirmed in appeal B appeals to the High Court The appeal is heard by a bench of two Judges The Judges differ in opinion on a point of law but they do not state the point of law and deliver judgments as judgments of the Court without any reservation one Judge holding that the appeal should be allowed and the other that it should be dismissed In such a case the dissentient judgments operate as confirming the decree of the District Court under para 1 of sub sec (2) (*k*) The question still remains whether an appeal lies to the High Court under the Letters Patent from the confirming judgment of the two Judges Under the Letters Patent before they were amended in 1921 it was held that an appeal did lie from such judgment (*l*) Under the amended Letters Patent no appeal lies to the High Court (*m*) It may here be noted that where the Judges differ in opinion on a point of law but do not state the point of law and deliver judgments as judgments of the Court without any reservation they cannot afterwards state the point of law (*n*)

Appeal to High Court from award under Land Acquisition Act.—This section applies to land acquisition appeals by virtue of the provisions of a Act of the Land Acquisition Act 1894 (*o*)

Sub sec (3) Letters Patent appeal—This subsection is new It was added into the section by the Repealing and Amending Act 18 of 1938 It does no more than give effect to the decision before that Act namely that where an appeal is heard by a Bench of two Judges of a High Court and the Judges differ then if the appeal is a Letters Patent appeal the procedure is governed by cl. 36 of the Letters Patent (*p*) but if the appeal is one under the Code

- (A) N. H. In v. N. H. (1894) 13 All 111  
(i) N. H. In v. N. H. (1911) 13 All 44 J. A. H.  
N. H. In v. N. H. (1914) 6 All 11 L. R.  
131  
(j) P. H. In v. H. (1914) 6 All 474  
(k) L. H. In v. H. (1914) 6 All 11  
D. H. In v. H. (1914) 13 All 11  
443 H. In v. H. (1914) 13 All 11  
3 N. H. In v. H. (1914) 13 All 11  
14 H. In v. H. (1914) 13 All 11  
H. In v. H. (1914) 13 All 11  
H. In v. H. (1914) 13 All 11  
(l) H. In v. H. (1914) 13 All 11  
443 H. In v. H. (1914) 13 All 11  
(m) H. In v. H. (1914) 13 All 11  
H. In v. H. (1914) 13 All 11  
H. In v. H. (1914) 13 All 11

- H. In v. H. (1914) 13 All 11  
H. In v. H. (1914) 13 All 11  
H. In v. H. (1914) 13 All 11  
(i) H. In v. H. (1914) 13 All 11  
(j) H. In v. H. (1914) 13 All 11  
(k) H. In v. H. (1914) 13 All 11  
(l) H. In v. H. (1914) 13 All 11  
(m) H. In v. H. (1914) 13 All 11  
(n) H. In v. H. (1914) 13 All 11  
(o) H. In v. H. (1914) 13 All 11  
(p) H. In v. H. (1914) 13 All 11  
(q) H. In v. H. (1914) 13 All 11  
(r) H. In v. H. (1914) 13 All 11  
(s) H. In v. H. (1914) 13 All 11  
(t) H. In v. H. (1914) 13 All 11  
(u) H. In v. H. (1914) 13 All 11  
(v) H. In v. H. (1914) 13 All 11  
(w) H. In v. H. (1914) 13 All 11  
(x) H. In v. H. (1914) 13 All 11  
(y) H. In v. H. (1914) 13 All 11  
(z) H. In v. H. (1914) 13 All 11

the procedure is governed by the present section (g) The difference of procedure between cl 36 and sec 93 is (1) that while a reference on the point of difference is obligatory under cl 36 it is optional under sec 93 and (2) while a reference under cl 36 may be on fact and law it can be on law only under sec 93 See notes under cl 36

Income Tax Act—It is clause 36 of the Letters Patent that applies to a reference to the High Court under s 66 of the Income Tax Act 1922 and not sec 93 of the Code (r)

**99 [S 578]** No decree shall be reversed or substantially varied, nor shall any case be remanded in appeal on account of any misjoinder of parties or causes of action or any error, defect or irregularity in any

No decree to be reversed or modified for error or irregularity not affecting merits or jurisdiction

Substitute the following for the last paragraph on p 296 and for foot notes (p) and (q) —

Sec 93 of Code and cl 36 of Letters Patent—Sub sec (3) is new It was inserted by the Repealing and Amending Act 18 of 1928 It provides that nothing in this section shall be deemed to alter or otherwise affect any provision of the Letters Patent of any High Court Before the Act of 1928 the trend of decisions was that where an appeal was heard by a Bench of two Judges of a Chartered High Court and the Judges differed then if the appeal was one from the Original Side of the High Court the procedure was governed by cl 36 of the Letters Patent (p) but if the appeal was from the decree of a Subordinate Judge the procedure was governed by the present section (g) At the same time it was held by the High Court of Allahabad (q1) that cl 27 of the Letters Patent of that High Court (corresponding to cl 36 of the Letters Patent of the High Courts of Calcutta Madras and Bombay) applied even to appeals from the decree of a Subordinate Judge All the cases were reviewed by a Full Bench of the Madras High Court (q2) and it was held that the effect of sub sec (3) was that cl 36 applied not only to appeals from the original side of a Chartered High Court but also to appeals to the High Court from decrees of subordinate Courts The difference of procedure between cl 36 and sec 93 is (1) that while a reference on the point of difference is obligatory under cl 36 it is optional under sec 93 and (2) while a reference under cl 36 may be on fact and law it can be on law only under sec 93 See notes under cl 36

- (p) *Bhudas v Ba Q Lab* (191) 48 I A 181  
40 Bom 718 60 I C 8 (21) A PC 6  
*Loop Lal v Lakshmi Doss* (1906) 29  
Mad 1 *Vandeput v Alexander Shave*  
(1870) 13 W R 209 *Surajmal v*  
*Hornman* (1918) 20 Bom L R 185  
218 47 I C 443 *Justin Hall v Arthur*  
*Francis* (1919) 4 Cal W N 35<sup>o</sup> 58  
I C 41  
(q) *Bhuta v Laladu* (1918) 43 Bom 433 50 I C  
715 *T n T n v Maung Ba* (193) 1

- Rang 584 596 77 I C 335 (24) 4 R  
148 *Prafulla v Bhawan* (19 ) 5<sup>o</sup> Cal  
1018 91 I C 807 (26) A C 11, P n  
*Jab Alkha at & Pess Co v Ogilvie*  
(19 6) 7 Lah 179 93 I C 44 (48)  
A L 65 *Ventatae bh ah Ventatae*  
*banma* (1941) 21 L W 721  
(q1) *Lachman Singh v Pam Lagan* (1901) 6 All  
10  
(q) *Dhanaraj v Balkusandas* (1979) 53 Mad  
563 116 I C 313 ( J) A W 641

(4) misjoinder of defendants and causes of action (s) [O 2 r 3] [The practice was different under the Code of 1852 see notes to O 2 r 3 Procedure in case of multifariousness]

- (g) *Bh ta Pak f* (1919) 43 Bom 433 50 I C  
1 *T n T v Ma J Ba* (133) 1  
130 54 96 I C 33 (3) 4 R  
145 *F J H Bh f* (19 ) 5 (41)  
1018 91 I C ( ) (6) A C 11  
*Pu J b Akhar t & P s Co v Ogilvie*

- (19 6) 7 Lah 19 93 I C 344 ( 6)  
A L 6  
(r) *E peror v Probh t* (1941) 1 Cal 94 84  
I C 31 ( 4) A C 664  
(s) *Gauri Ah ni v Kesava Des* (19 9) All  
L J 94 114 I C 831 ( 3) A A 143



Irregularity affecting jurisdiction of Court—See s 21 and notes thereto

Suits Valuation Act 1887 section 11—See 11 of the Suits Valuation Act 1887 modifies the provisions of the present section in cases where an objection is taken in appeal that by reason of the over valuation or under valuation of a suit a Court which had no jurisdiction with respect to the suit exercised jurisdiction with respect thereto That section is as follows—

- (1) Notwithstanding anything in section [99] of the Code of Civil Procedure an objection that by reason of the over valuation or under valuation of a suit or appeal a Court of first instance or lower appellate Court which had no jurisdiction with respect to the suit or appeal exercised jurisdiction with respect thereto shall not be entertained by an appellate Court unless—
  - (a) the objection was taken in the Court of first instance at or before the hearing at which issues were first framed and recorded or in the lower appellate Court in the memorandum of appeal to that Court and
  - (b) the appellate Court is satisfied for reasons to be recorded by it in writing that the suit or appeal was over valued or under valued and that the over valuation or under valuation thereof has prejudicially affected the disposal of the suit or appeal on its merits
- (2) If the objection was taken in the manner mentioned in clause (a) of sub section (1) but the appellate Court is not satisfied as to both the matters mentioned in clause (b) of that sub section and has before it the materials necessary for the determination of the other grounds of appeal to itself it shall dispose of the appeal as if there had been no defect of jurisdiction in the Court of first instance or lower appellate Court
- (3) If the objection was taken in that manner and the appellate Court is satisfied as to both the matters and has not those materials before it it shall proceed to deal with the appeal under the rules applicable to the Court with respect to the hearing of appeal but if it remands the suit or appeal or frames and refers issues for trial, or requires additional evidence to be taken it shall direct its order to a Court competent to entertain the suit or appeal.

## APPEALS FROM APPELLATE DECREES

100 [S 584] (1) Save where otherwise expressly provided in the body of this Code or by any other law for the time being in force an appeal shall lie to the High Court from every decree passed in appeal by any Court subordinate to a High Court, on any of the following grounds namely—

- (a) the decision being contrary to law or to some usage having the force of law
- (b) the decision having failed to determine some material issue of law or usage having the force of law,

Second Appeal



- (c) a substantial error or defect in the procedure provided by this Code or by any other law for the time being in force, which may possibly have produced error or defect in the decision of the case upon the merits

(2) An appeal may lie under this section from an appellate decree passed *ex parte*

**Changes introduced by the section**—The word specified in the expression specified law or usage which occurred in cl (a) of s 594 of the repealed Code has been omitted see the undermentioned case (f)

**Scope of the section**—This section deals with second or special appeals. A second appeal can lie to the High Court. A Court of first appeal is competent to enter into questions of fact and decide whether the findings of facts by the lower Court are or are not erroneous. But a Court of second appeal is not competent to entertain questions as to the soundness of a finding of fact by the Court below (g). A second appeal can only lie on one or other of the grounds specified in the present Section (h). A judge to whom a memorandum of second appeal is presented for admission is entitled to consider whether any of the grounds specified in this section exist and apply to the case and if they do not to reject the appeal summarily (i). The limitations to the power of the Court imposed by ss 100 and 101 in a second appeal ought to be attended to and an appellant ought not to be allowed to question the finding of the first appellate Court upon a matter of fact (j). Nothing can be clearer than the declaration in the Civil Procedure Code that no second appeal will lie except on the grounds specified in section [100]. No Court in India or elsewhere has power to add to or enlarge those grounds (k).

No second appeal lies on the ground of an erroneous finding of fact.—There is no jurisdiction to entertain a second appeal on the ground of an erroneous finding of fact however gross or inexcusable the error may seem to be. No doubt a second appeal does lie where there is a substantial error or defect in procedure [see cl (c)] but an erroneous finding of fact is a different thing from an error or defect in procedure. Where there is no error or defect in procedure the finding of the first appellate Court upon a question of fact is final if that Court had before it evidence proper for its consideration in support of the finding (l). The mere fact that the High Court would have upon the documents and evidence placed before the Court of first appeal come to a different conclusion is no ground for a second appeal. It is precisely this revision of evidence which is excluded by the limited character of a second appeal. This section was enacted for the express purpose of securing some measure of finality in cases where

(f) *Pam C'pal v Sh' m' l' t' n* (189 ) 19 I A 8 33 O C il 93 99 100

(g) *Rim G p I v S' a' l' h' aton* (1893) 20 Cal 93 191 A 8

(h) *Luchman v Puna* (1889) 16 C I 3 16 I A 1

(i) *Rudr Prasad v B' j' Nath* (1893) 1 All 36

(j) *P' t' b' C' l' der v Mohent' ra th* (1890) 17 Cal 201 181 A 33

(k) *D' i' ga Cho v' r' a' v' J' e' a' n' u' r' Singh* (1831) 18 C I 23 30 1 I A 1

(l) *D' i' ga C' l' o' u' d' h' v' J' m' a' l' r' S' gh* (1891) 18 Cal 22 17 I A 1 P n (op' at v Sham l' h' to (1893) 90 Cal 23 191 A 8

*P' o' l' l' a' n' v' J' i' a' l' a' B' a' l' a' h* (1891) 18 Cal 448 18 I A 9

*B' a' l' k' r' a' s' h' a' G' e' t' d* (190 ) 28 Bom 617 *L' u' l' a' v' a' r' a' n*

*v J' o' l' Nath* (1894) 1 Cal 04 1 I A 39 *P' t' i' n' d' a' I' y' C' o' v' C' h' a' g' i* (1915) 4 Cal 888 28 I C 45

*V' i' r' a' t' a' v' I' d' i* (19 0) 3 Cal L J 59 I C 3

*R' a' m' S' gh v G' g' R' m* (19—) 3 Lah 349 O I C 20 ( ) A I 3 6 [q' e' t' i' o' n' of intention] *W' a' l' a' J' u' h' m' i' d' v' M' j' m' d* (19 4) 5 Lah 84 80 I C 993 ( 4) A L 444 [finding that entries in Record of Rights are erroneous]

*D' i' p' v' S' gh v I' s' l' a' r* (19 ) 7 Lah L J 11 86 I C 250 ( ) A L 3 3 [wh' ther tendered ly made] *G' a' j' p' S' gh v Natha v gh* (19 ) 7 Lah L J 0 83 I C 98 ( ) A L 333 [whether possession was taken in execution of a decree]

*K' a' j' a' o' P' t' a' p' u' r' v' S' c' r' i' t' a' y' o' f' S' t' a' t' e* (19 9) 27 All L J 0

the balance of evidence verbal and documentary arose for decision (m) Hence the High Court is not entitled in second appeal to go behind the findings of fact of the lower appellate Court which do not result from the misconstruction of a document or the misapplication of law or procedure but upon the oral evidence in the case (n) Similarly there is no ground for a second appeal upon a question of fact unless it can be shown that the lower appellate Court misdirected itself in point of law in dealing with the question upon the evidence (o) In *Pamratn Sulul v Mussamat Vandu* (p) their Lordships of the Privy Council said It has now been conclusively settled that the third Court which was in this case the Court of the Judicial Commissioner cannot entertain an appeal upon any question as to the soundness of findings of fact by the second Court if there is evidence to be considered the decision of the second Court however unsatisfactory it might be if examined must stand final And in *Nafar Chandra Pal v Shukur* (q) their Lordships said Questions of law and of fact are sometimes difficult to disentangle The proper legal effect of a proved fact is necessarily a question of law so also is the question of admissibility of evidence and the question of whether any evidence has been offered on one side or the other but the question whether the fact has been proved when evidence for and against has been properly admitted is necessarily a pure question of fact It has accordingly been held that a finding on appeal that an estate previously to its partition under the Estates Partition Act 1897 had not been partitioned privately or at all is binding on the High Court in second appeal it being entirely a question of fact (r)

Decision being contrary to law — A second appeal will lie where the decision of the lower appellate Court is contrary to law The term law in cl (a) is not limited in its meaning to statute law it means general law (s)

When the question is one of a right construction of a document (t) or of a legal inference from a document (u) the question is one of law and a second appeal will lie Thus where in a suit for a declaration of the plaintiff's proprietary title to the land in suit the lower appellate Court found on a construction of the *wajib ul arz* and other documentary evidence relating to the land that the plaintiffs were proprietors their Lordship of the Privy Council held that the right construction of the documents was a question of law which the High Court was not precluded from considering in second appeal In the course of the judgment their Lordships said That finding (namely that the plaintiffs were proprietors of the lands) of the Subordinate Judge was the result of his having misconstructed the *wajib ul arz* The right construction of documents is a question of law which Judges in second appeal are not by ss 534 and 535 of the Code of Civil Procedure (now ss 100 and 101) precluded from considering by any finding of the lower appellate Court based upon such documents The Subordinate Judge arrived at his finding by inference drawn upon an incorrect construction of the *wajib ul arz* and the Judges in second appeal consequently were not bound by his finding that the plaintiffs were the proprietors of the land (v) Similarly the question whether a writing, which is ostensibly a deed of absolute sale and an agreement by the purchaser to reconvey the property to the vendor constitutes an out and out sale and an agreement

|     |                                |          |
|-----|--------------------------------|----------|
| (m) | 1 A 183 185 45 (1) 152 19 11 C | (1919) 4 |
| (n) | 1 A 183 185 45 (1) 152 19 11 C | 60       |
| (o) | 1 A 183 185 45 (1) 152 19 11 C | 60       |
| (p) | 1 A 183 185 45 (1) 152 19 11 C | 60       |
| (q) | 1 A 183 185 45 (1) 152 19 11 C | 60       |
| (r) | 1 A 183 185 45 (1) 152 19 11 C | 60       |
| (s) | 1 A 183 185 45 (1) 152 19 11 C | 60       |
| (t) | 1 A 183 185 45 (1) 152 19 11 C | 60       |
| (u) | 1 A 183 185 45 (1) 152 19 11 C | 60       |
| (v) | 1 A 183 185 45 (1) 152 19 11 C | 60       |

|      |                                |          |
|------|--------------------------------|----------|
| (1)  | 1 A 183 185 45 (1) 152 19 11 C | (1919) 4 |
| (2)  | 1 A 183 185 45 (1) 152 19 11 C | 60       |
| (3)  | 1 A 183 185 45 (1) 152 19 11 C | 60       |
| (4)  | 1 A 183 185 45 (1) 152 19 11 C | 60       |
| (5)  | 1 A 183 185 45 (1) 152 19 11 C | 60       |
| (6)  | 1 A 183 185 45 (1) 152 19 11 C | 60       |
| (7)  | 1 A 183 185 45 (1) 152 19 11 C | 60       |
| (8)  | 1 A 183 185 45 (1) 152 19 11 C | 60       |
| (9)  | 1 A 183 185 45 (1) 152 19 11 C | 60       |
| (10) | 1 A 183 185 45 (1) 152 19 11 C | 60       |

for reconveyance or a mortgage by conditional sale is a question of construction of documents and the High Court is entitled to interfere in second appeal (w) In a recent Privy Council case where the question was whether the possession of properties by a Hindu widow was merely in lien of maintenance and not adverse to the plaintiffs their Lordships held that the question was one of inference from documents and not one of fact and that they were therefore entitled to draw their conclusion notwithstanding the concurrent opinions of the Courts in India (x) But where the question is not one of construction of a document or of legal inference to be drawn from a document but is one as to the effect to be given to a document as evidence of a fact or facts in issue a second appeal is not admissible Thus where a suit involves a question of the fact of adoption and documents are produced as evidence of the fact of adoption the question whether the documents do or do not support the alleged adoption is a question of fact and no second appeal will lie (y) The law on the subject was thus stated by Mookerjee J in *Makand Deb v Gopi Nath* (z) We hold accordingly that unless there is a question of the legal effect of a deed which may be treated as a document of title or embodies a contract or is the foundation of the suit a second appeal does not lie A second appeal is not admissible merely because some portion of the evidence in writing of which the meaning has been mis taken by the lower appellate Court

Where the lower appellate Court arrives at a conclusion which is an inference based upon an erroneous view of the law the judgment is open to question in second appeal (a) A judgment is also open to question in second appeal where a defect in the judgment is due to an error as to the admissibility of evidence (b) or where secondary evidence is admitted in contravention of the provisions of ss 60 and 66 of the Indian Evidence Act (c) or where there is failure to invoke a presumption of fact under sec 144 of the Indian Evidence Act 1872 (d) The question of burden of proof is a question of law and the High Court is entitled to interfere in second appeal if the lower appellate Court has placed the burden on the wrong party (e) A second appeal will also lie where an unregistered document which requires registration is admitted in evidence (f)

Where the Court of first instance grants a mandatory injunction for the demolition of a building and the decree is reversed in appeal on an erroneous view of the law a second appeal will lie (g) Though a person may not have been duly appointed executor he may render himself liable as an executor if he intermeddles with the estate of the deceased misapplication of law on this point is a good ground for a second appeal (h) The question whether a stipulation in a contract is by way of penalty is a question of law which renders a second appeal competent (i)

Where an appeal which ought to have been preferred to the High Court is preferred to a District Court and the latter Court hears and decides the appeal the decision is contrary to law and a second appeal will lie from the decree of the District

- (w) *Chandra v Gai Maani* (1913) 47 Ma 1  
1 J 34 346 84 I C 50 (5) A M 3  
(z) *Claud Dalgair v Ashor Lal* (1919) 46 I  
A 11 01 4 411 15 156 5 I C 486  
(y) *Iachan Lal v Ka Haraj Lal* (189) Cal  
603 1 A 1 1 int Singh v Durgan  
Jah (1910) 37 I A 191 19 3 All  
363 3 3 61 I C 8 Ud por Za n  
d ry C I U Ch (1913) 9 Cal  
W N 131 4 I C 492 (3) A PC 187  
H I I v L ha (1911) 1 C I W N  
101 I C 30 Lrv Shadh (1912)  
3 4 1 1 J 18 68 I C 1003 (2) A  
C 18 J r a v I an (1913)  
37 C 1 L J 80 I C 55 (2) A C  
38  
(2) (101) 1 C 1 L J 4 5 I C 96  
J I p v B (1910) 1 at L J  
1 I C 19  
(a) *Iah Chaud v B ha* (199) 4 Cal 8

- (b) *Tara Irin* (1913) 36 Cal I J 389  
39 74 I C 341 (3) A C 61 *Bhawal*  
*Baldeo* (1911) 2 Lah 2 1 64 I C 99  
(1) A I 119  
(c) *Lachan Singh v Meenamal Pina* (1890)  
16 I A 1 16 C 1 3  
(d) *Sarav v Lal* (1918) 50 All 145 106  
I C 0 (8) A A 16  
(e) *Mohd Ra v I Mir* (1910) 1 Lah  
49 81 I C 182 I C 9 R v R la  
(1911) Lah 43 64 I C 901 (1) A L  
18 51 p j n v Moh v (1913)  
1 t 919 61 C 31 (4) A P 310  
(f) *Baan Kull p* (1918) 2 Bom 483  
(j) *Jas K I r v I an SA har* (190) 7  
All 699  
(h) *Maan v I S th R p ha d* (1906) 33  
C 1 101 33 I A 16  
(i) *R J p I v I la tja* (1914) 4 Mad L  
J 60 606 B I C 1 (2) A M 84

**Court (j)** The High Court of Madras has held that where a Court assumes jurisdiction which it would not have had if the facts necessary to determine the question of jurisdiction been rightly decided a second appeal lies from the findings of facts (k)

A second appeal will lie where the question is one of proper inference in law from findings of facts—Though a second appeal does not lie from a finding of fact yet where a legal conclusion is drawn from the finding a second appeal will lie under cl (a) of the section on the ground that the legal conclusion was erroneous. Thus the question whether possession is adverse or not is often one of simple fact but it may also be a conclusion of law or a mixed question of law and fact. Where the question of adverse possession is one of simple fact no second appeal will lie but a second appeal will lie from a finding as to adverse possession when such finding is a mixed question of law and fact depending upon the proper legal conclusion to be drawn from the findings as to simple facts (i). Similarly the question whether a Hindu family is joint or separate is generally a question of fact but in certain circumstances it may be a mixed question of fact and law and open to reconsideration by the High Court in second appeal (ii). Where the question in a suit was whether the defendant was bound by a mortgage executed by his mother and it was held that he was their Lordships of the Privy Council held that the finding was substantially one of law and that it was therefore open to question in second appeal. In the course of their judgment their Lordships said "The facts found (by the lower appellate Court) need not be questioned. It is the soundness of the conclusions from them that is in question and this is a matter of law" (iii). As stated by their Lordships of the Privy Council in another case "the proper legal effect of a proved fact is necessarily a question of law" and the High Court is therefore entitled to interfere in second appeal (iv). It has thus been held that the question whether a transfer was made with intent to defeat creditors within the meaning of s 53 of the Transfer of Property Act (v) or whether the plaintiff has made out his title to the property in suit (vi) or whether a railway company took a much care of the good delivered to the company as a man of ordinary prudence would under similar circumstances take of his own goods within the meaning of ss 151 and 152 of the Contract Act (vii) or whether a lumbaradar was guilty of negligence or misconduct (viii) or whether the plaintiff is entitled to the easement claimed by him (ix) or whether property is ancestral or self acquired (x) or whether a decree was obtained by fraud (xi) or whether a tenancy is permanent (xii) is a question of law and a second appeal will lie to the High Court. It has been held by the High Court of Calcutta that where from a certain set of facts a Court infers a lost grant the process is one of inference of fact and not of legal conclusion and that it is not a ground for a second appeal (xiii).

**Usage having the force of law**—The words usage having the force of law mean a local or family usage as distinguished from the general law (v)

- (u) *B dra \ P r a (1918) 4 C 1*  
9 6 431 ( ) S
- (k) *P dd yv \ l y nam (19 ) f Mad*  
L J 6 4 1071 C 331 ( ) M 653
- (l) *L c/a ar M o r (190 ) 19 ( ) 3*  
19 I A 48 I lara \ n a a ( ) r n  
(19 0) 9 4 al W \ 10 7 60 I ( ) 14  
Jog d a \ th \ Rye frt \ H (19 )  
9 6 (al W \ 810 65 I ( ) 00 ( )  
A ( )
- (n) *S anl \ gh \ S I I P (19 ) 44 AH*  
60 6 I ( ) 6 ( ) A A 184 Mst  
I t \ S I l a r \ gh (11 ) 0 AH 180  
10 I C 1 ( ) A 33
- ( ) *I c p l \ S I l a r n (1913) 0 C 1*  
93 18 19 I A 4
- ( ) *\ f (I d a I I ) 5 8 I r (1919) 3*  
I A 187 18 46 (al I 3 10 I I ( )  
CO D I a al M t \ J (19 )  
41 A I 8 S Lah 3 101 I C 33  
( ) A T 10
- (p) *I l a Ch l r \ J l (19 ) 4 C 1 8*
- (q) *I l r n v (a e l (18 ) 21 I ) 1 01*
- (r) *L x i \ r n v \ e r t r f d n e (19 3 ) 27*  
(al W N 1017 80 I C 10 ( ) 4 C A  
0 B dra ( ) I P I l ( ) Co (19 6)  
48 AH 65 96 I C 1046 ( ) A 4 J 4
- (s) *C 7 al \ G n a (19 1) 43 AH 9 60*  
I C 643 ( ) A 4 314
- (t) *D \ J g n (19 0) 1 Lah 08 6 I C*  
29
- (u) *C r l t \ J \ M t I l a I a (19 ) 3*  
Lah 63 I ( ) 1 ( ) A L 37
- ( ) *I l t \ J \ M t I l a (1 ) 1 Lah L J*  
64 84 I ( ) A L 3
- (v) *M a M l v M d S ar (19 ) 54 I A 1 4*  
8 I ah 3 101 I C 3 ( ) A T 10
- (x) *F \ th W r (19 0) 31 ( ) L J*  
01 I ( ) 3 0
- (y) *F a t p l v \ n a a l t (1907) 0 I ( )*  
93 11 I A 4 d n e t i o n f r o m t h b e r  
v t l f t h r m d J I a e n h  
3 J h v b l k h 3 J A (1 4 ) AH 649  
at p 6 3

If the decree appealed from is based on a misconception of the canons which the Privy Council and the High Court have defined as to how a special custom should be proved the High Court may interfere in second appeal ( ) It has been laid down by the Judicial Committee that questions of the existence of an ancient custom are generally questions of mixed law and fact (a) The present section precludes the High Court from interfering in second appeal with the *findings* arrived at by the lower appellate Court on all actual facts from which the existence of the custom has been inferred But the inference as to the existence and the decision as to the validity of the custom are matters of law and these may therefore be revised by the High Court in second appeal (b) Similarly where the question is as to the existence of a custom and the lower appellate Court has acted upon illegal evidence or on evidence legally insufficient to establish the alleged custom (c) or has based its judgment on irrelevant matters (d) or has proceeded upon a wrong construction of a document (e) the error is one of law and the High Court is entitled to interfere in second appeal As to certificates under s. 41 (3) of the Punjab Court Act VI of 1918 in cases of custom see the undermentioned cases (f)

**Clause (c) substantial error or defect in procedure—**

No evidence to go to a jury—Case not raised by parties—Misconception of evidence—Evidence misread or misunderstood—Overlooking material evidence—Irrelevant matters—A second appeal will lie where there is, as an English lawyer would express it, no evidence to go to the jury, because that does not raise a question of fact such as arises upon the issue itself, but a question of law for the consideration of the judge (g). Thus where the lower appellate Court found that a deed of compromise was not for the benefit of a certain infant and there was no evidence in the case upon which that Court could found its judgment, it was held by the Judicial Committee that the case was one of a substantial error or defect in the procedure of the first appellate Court and that it was a ground for a second appeal to the High Court (h). Similarly where the lower appellate Court disposes of a suit upon a case not raised by the parties and to which the evidence has not been directed, it is a substantial error or defect in procedure within the meaning of this section and a second appeal lies to the High Court (i). A second appeal will also lie where the finding of the lower appellate Court is based on a misconception of

- (x) Des P loitas Haa t (193) 1 P n  
110 (u tom ex lui wiilows d dau h  
ters from inherit ne)
- (a) Tel appa D rick non (1917) 34 I A  
24 1 2 8 40 M d 0 1 39 I C  
(c t n of g ntin i na ent i  
of enlowed i r r t s) S el qu t  
i ay in som e s b p re qu t i n s f  
i f e e e M a l o e i m t (1909) 36  
I A 10 0 J i A l l 55 0 4 I C  
457 (M i m i n u c t i — custom v h u l  
i n g t e m l y f r n m h n n c e) 4 n a d  
i g h v D j a b n g h (1910) 3 I A 191  
107 3 d A l l 363 3 3 6 I C 8 (Hindu  
c at — c t e m e n t i n t h s t p r o t h e r  
t o s u c c e d e q u a l l y w i t h f u l l b y t h e r)
- (b) I i a r p p a v M n a l (1918) 41 M a l  
3 4 4 I C 6 3 (M i r a d s r i g h t t o  
T h n i v a m) 0 r u l i n e I l l a v  
I j j e n k i t a (1906) 29 M d 4 n d  
a p r i l a n I k j j i v S e c r e t r y o f  
S i t e (191) 40 M a d 1108 1110 40 I C  
16 J a l s I a d k o r (191) C i  
L J 613 41 I C 9 9 (w h t h e r a h l i g  
w a s t r a n f r a b l l y l o r a l u v e) T j  
I v B a s r L i d (1928) 19 A l l 88  
I C ( 6 ) A 43
- (c) H h i l l 16 d I P h (1906) 23 A l l  
618 (c t m of p r e m p t i o n) P a n B l a s  
v L a t B h i r (1908) 30 A l l 311 (c t m  
c s a l w i t h u t c o n t o f r e m a n i a)
- (d) P a l k h a r a v M a e s (1896) 23 C a l 1 3  
(w h t h e r h o l l i n g t r a n s a c t a b l e w i t h o u t  
l i m i t t o c o n t)
- (e) S h o r t v J i t a (18 0) 18 A l l L J 19  
v I C 388 (c t o r i o f B h a r d h u r  
L J 1 r v J i t e J i l (16 ) 0 A l l  
L J 64 I C 9 6 ( ) A A 8 8  
(c t o n of p r e s c r i p t i o n)
- (f) M a k i M i t i n a (191) L a h 344  
66 I C 40 ( ) A l l 7 v a l i v  
B (19 ) J i l h 344 2 J i C 507  
( ) A L 4 6 I a s M e h r v I l R a n  
(19 4) 5 I a h 6 3 8 I C 404 ( 4 )  
A L 4
- (g) i g a j r a T r p u r a S i n l i (188 )  
13 C a l 40 47 14 I A 101 110
- (h) H e n a t i B r o j l o (1890) 1 C a l 8  
88 I A I 6 6) S h a b a a v S i n  
g a p p (190 ) J i l m 1 31 I A 1 4  
D i 18 I a a t (1919) 48 I A  
140 4 C a l 10 51 I C 17 (t r a d j  
I r t h D i o I p p a (18 3) B o i  
4 (w h t h e r d e f i n i t a s w e o p e r m n n t  
t e n a n t b u i l t t o p a v a r e a b i r n t)  
L k h d i f a t i d (1918) 4 B o i  
3 3 6 4 I C (w h t h e r t h e m o r t  
g e d b t w a f i l l y t i d d)
- (i) (190 ) 9 B m 1 31 I A 1 i v p r M a r  
A v g h v i b a r s g h (191) 19 A l l  
L J 149 1 0 151 61 I C 6 ( 1 )  
A v l

what the evidence is (j) or on evidence which has been misread or misunderstood (k) or the lower appellate Court has misdirected itself in point of law in dealing with the question upon the evidence (l) or has overlooked or ignored material documentary evidence (m) On the same principle a second appeal will lie where the finding of the lower appellate Court e.g. a finding on the existence of a usage is based on irrelevant matters (n) A second appeal also lies where the Lower Appellate Court decides a question of fact not upon the evidence before it but on the authority of a previous finding of a Court of superior jurisdiction upon similar facts in a case between different parties (o)

*Here the Courts below have misconceived the real question they had to try*—The High Court has jurisdiction under this section to set aside the decree of the trial Judge in favour of the plaintiff affirmed on the facts by the first appellate Judge on the ground that the evidence taken showed that the true question of fact which had not been considered and as to which no issue had been framed should have been answered in favour of the defendant (p)

*Other cases of error or defect in procedure*—Omitting to decide a material issue (q) omitting to examine witnesses tendered (r) refusing to receive documentary evidence which ought to have been accepted (s) allowing the plaintiff in the lower appellate Court to change the nature of his suit (t) deciding an appeal without waiting for the return of a commission directed to be issued by the first appellate Court (u) have all been held to be good ground for special appeal But disregard of an Amine's second report as to a boundary line does not constitute a substantial error or defect of procedure within the meaning of this section and is no ground for second appeal (v) The refusal by a lower appellate Court to exercise the discretion vested in it by O 41 r 27 with respect to the admission of additional evidence is a substantial error or defect in procedure and affords a ground of special appeal But where the Court has exercised its discretion in a sound and reasonable way and in the exercise of its discretion refused to admit additional evidence the case is not one of substantial error or defect in procedure (u) Admission by the lower appellate Court of additional evidence tendered by the respondent without the consent of the appellant and without recording the reasons for its admission as required by O 41 r 27 is a substantial error in procedure and is a good ground for second appeal (z) Proceeding with a suit without the legal representatives of the deceased plaintiff being brought on the record is also a good ground for second appeal (y)

*Refusal by Court of first appeal to extend time for filing appeal*—Where an application is made to a Court of first appeal to admit an appeal from the original decree after the expiration of the period of limitation that Court has the power on sufficient cause being shown to admit the appeal [Limitation Act s 5] If the lower appellate Court refuses to admit the appeal holding in the exercise of its discretion that

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>(j) <i>Cund v. Iul</i> (1896) 9 Bom. 3 (It is possession of land) <i>Sadar v. J</i> 8 (194) 46 All. 380 (It is a 845 (whett r 11) term alleged to be defamatory) <i>W. I. M.</i></p> <p>(k) <i>Mattar v. J. v. R. da S. g.</i> (1911) 19 All. J. 149 61 I. C. 6 (21) A.A. 1</p> <p>(l) <i>M. d. ar. r. L. d. r. (o. J. I. v. L. n. (Ja r. n. (1913) 23 Cal. W. N. 131 41 I. C. 49 (3) A. I. C. 147 (I. C.) <i>Je p. j. n. v. I. ha. ja. (1913) 2 Pat. 919 91 6 I. C. 347 (4) A. I. 310</i></i></p> <p>(m) <i>M. a. g. I. l. v. g. v. M. g. I. t. (1913) 1 Rang. 13 136 78 I. C. 449 (3) A. R. 196</i></p> <p>(n) <i>J. lal. d. l. a. v. M. a. e. s. (1896) 23 Cal. 19</i></p> <p>(o) <i>Bai. u. k. Ro. d. v. Sr. J. un. j. Belar. Deb. (1917) 6 Lat. 628 105 I. C. 633 (7) A. P. 209 (I. B.)</i></p> | <p>(p) <i>Da. isa. v. Abdul Samad</i> (1919) 46 I. A. 140 47 Cal. 107 11 I. C. 17</p> <p>(q) <i>Ran. lo. v. G. a. g. am. (181) 16 Tom. 4</i></p> <p>(r) <i>Mo. slat. v. Al. oda</i> (1923) 9 Cal. 40</p> <p>(s) <i>Tal. war. S. ngh. v. B. i. gyan. Das</i> (1908) 19 C. W. N. 31</p> <p>(t) <i>Terrap. t. v. S. de. z. n. Das</i> (1894) 4 Cal. 46</p> <p>(u) <i>Ma. tho. Si. gh. v. Pa. sh. Si. gh.</i> (1894) 16 All. 34</p> <p>(v) <i>Lul. l. a. r. a. n. Jod. \ath</i> (1894) 1 Cal. 504 11 A. 39</p> <p>(w) <i>Pa. n. P. ar. v. Kallu</i> (1901) 3 All. 11 1 Durga. Pr. v. J. i. v. r. n. (1911) 3 All. 39 91 I. C. 26</p> <p>(z) <i>K. bal. v. J. j. n. (1914) 39 Cal. L. J. 261 81 I. C. 999 (1) A. C. 98</i></p> <p>(y) <i>\ath. v. Am. o. S. ngh.</i> (1916) 10 Lab. L. J. 497 117 I. C. 663 (7) A. L. 119</p> |
|---|--|

there was no sufficient cause for not presenting the appeal within the prescribed time there is no ground for a second appeal. The principle is that where a Court has exercised its discretion in a sound and reasonable way the High Court has no power to interfere in second appeal. But if the lower appellate Court does not exercise its discretion at all or exercises it capriciously and arbitrarily or without proper legal material to support its decision a second appeal will lie under cl (a) of the section ( )

**Dismissal of appeal for default**—Though a second appeal may lie from an appellate decree passed *ex parte* no second appeal lies from an order dismissing an appeal for default. Such an order is not a decree (a) see O 41 r 11 (2) and s 2 cl (2) sub cl (b)

**New case in second appeal**—An appellant should not be allowed to set up a new case in second appeal (b) nor should he be allowed to raise a new issue not supported by the evidence on the record (c). See notes below

**Pleas which may be taken for the first time in special appeal**—An appellant will not be allowed to set up for the first time in second appeal a plea not taken by him in the lower Court. But if the objection is one which goes to the very root of the case it may be taken for the first time in second appeal (d). Thus an objection to jurisdiction may be taken for the first time in special appeal if it is patent on the face of the record (e) except it is submitted in the case which fall within s 21 above. Similarly the plea of *res judicata* may be taken for the first time in second appeal provided it can be decided upon the record before the Court (f). So also the plea of want of notice in an ejectment suit (g). As to the plea of limitation see notes to O 41 r 2

**Leave of Court Limitation** which refer to first appeal apply also to second appeals (h)

The High Court will entertain in second appeal a point of law although it has not been raised in any of the lower Courts provided the point of law arises on the findings of the lower Court or on the issues as framed and on the evidence already recorded. Thus where the lower appellate Court awarded to the plaintiff a *third* share of the property in suit on the ground that remoter *gotraj* *sapindas* inherited *per stirpes* and the defendant preferred a second appeal to the High Court on the ground that the plaintiff was *not entitled to any share at all* the defendant was allowed to contend *at the hearing* of the second appeal that the plaintiff was not entitled in any event to more than a *sixth* share as remoter *gotraj* *sapindas* inherited *per capita* and not *per stirpes* (i). But the High Court will not entertain a point of law raised for the first time in second appeal if the point cannot be decided without remanding the case for further evidence (j). Nor can a point of law be taken for the first time in second appeal if it sets up a new right differing in kind from that asserted throughout the trial and not merely *in degree* as in the above case. Thus

|  |   |
|--|---|
| (c) <i>Lar</i> <i>li</i> <i>v</i> <i>c</i> <i>p</i> <i>li</i> (1893) 23 B m 113<br>2 <i>li</i> <i>v</i> <i>c</i> <i>p</i> <i>li</i> (1903) All 1 H c 1<br>1 <i>li</i> <i>v</i> <i>c</i> <i>p</i> <i>li</i> (1904) 6 All 3  | (d) <i>Do</i> <i>li</i> <i>v</i> <i>M</i> <i>th</i> <i>r</i> <i>ro</i> (1893) 18 B m 110<br>(h) <i>S</i> <i>c</i> <i>v</i> <i>p</i> <i>v</i> <i>D</i> <i>o</i> <i>f</i> <i>v</i> <i>a</i> <i>j</i> <i>i</i> (1903) 11 B m 113   |
| (a) <i>S</i> <i>li</i> <i>v</i> <i>r</i> <i>li</i> <i>v</i> <i>J</i> <i>f</i> <i>r</i> <i>li</i> (1896) 3 C 1<br>4   | ( ) <i>V</i> <i>li</i> <i>v</i> <i>G</i> <i>r</i> (1903) 1 B m 309<br><i>C</i> <i>r</i> <i>o</i> <i>p</i> <i>v</i> <i>v</i> <i>J</i> <i>p</i> <i>i</i> (1833) 1 B m 100<br><i>G</i> <i>i</i> <i>t</i> <i>i</i> <i>p</i> <i>p</i> <i>v</i> <i>c</i> <i>i</i> <i>l</i> <i>l</i> <i>p</i> <i>i</i> (189 ) 19 B m 331<br>31 <i>o</i> <i>6</i> <i>v</i> <i>r</i> <i>c</i> <i>i</i> <i>l</i> <i>l</i> <i>p</i> <i>i</i> (191 )<br>44 <i>c</i> <i>l</i> <i>4</i> 34 <i>I</i> <i>c</i> 860 <i>D</i> <i>g</i> <i>b</i> <i>r</i> <i>v</i> <i>y</i><br><i>J</i> <i>i</i> <i>f</i> <i>i</i> <i>l</i> (10 ) <i>I</i> <i>L</i> <i>R</i> <i>4</i><br><i>I</i> <i>c</i> <i>3</i> <i>6</i> ( ) <i>3</i> <i>A</i> <i>B</i> <i>4</i> <i>I</i> <i>a</i> <i>t</i> <i>p</i> <i>p</i> <i>a</i> <i>v</i><br><i>J</i> <i>i</i> <i>p</i> <i>p</i> <i>i</i> <i>c</i> (19 ) <i>A</i> <i>B</i> <i>L</i> <i>1</i> <i>4</i> <i>4</i> <i>8</i><br><i>I</i> <i>c</i> <i>0</i> ( ) <i>4</i> <i>A</i> <i>B</i> <i>4</i> <i>6</i> <i>3</i> <i>v</i> <i>r</i> <i>f</i> <i>i</i> <i>n</i><br><i>B</i> <i>u</i> <i>k</i> <i>o</i> (19 ) <i>4</i> <i>3</i> <i>A</i> <i>B</i> <i>1</i> <i>5</i> <i>1</i> <i>5</i> <i>u</i> <i>i</i> <i>c</i><br>116 ( ) <i>A</i> <i>A</i> <i>i</i> |
| (b) <i>C</i> <i>o</i> <i>p</i> <i>l</i> <i>H</i> <i>a</i> <i>m</i> <i>a</i> <i>r</i> <i>t</i> (198 ) 6 B u 10<br><i>M</i> <i>i</i> <i>t</i> <i>v</i> <i>S</i> <i>i</i> <i>t</i> <i>i</i> <i>J</i> <i>H</i> (189 ) 11 M 1<br>50 <i>J</i> <i>v</i> <i>M</i> <i>u</i> <i>L</i> <i>a</i> <i>i</i> (1884) 10 All 49<br>3 <i>I</i> <i>H</i> <i>2</i> <i>3</i> 64 <i>I</i> <i>c</i> ( ) <i>A</i> <i>I</i> 363                 | (j) (1 ) <i>B</i> <i>L</i> <i>R</i> <i>4</i> <i>u</i> <i>i</i> <i>c</i> 3 6<br>( ) <i>A</i> <i>B</i> <i>4</i> <i>p</i> (10 ) <i>6</i> <i>B</i> <i>1</i> <i>1</i><br><i>I</i> <i>1</i> <i>3</i> <i>4</i> <i>9</i> <i>i</i> <i>c</i> <i>0</i> ( ) <i>A</i> <i>B</i> <i>4</i> <i>6</i><br><i>J</i> <i>r</i> <i>a</i> <i>J</i> <i>r</i> <i>i</i> <i>v</i> <i>J</i> <i>f</i> <i>e</i> <i>a</i> <i>t</i> <i>i</i> (1919)<br><i>4</i> <i>a</i> <i>t</i> <i>W</i> <i>N</i> <i>3</i> <i>4</i> <i>I</i> <i>c</i> (10 ) <i>A</i> <i>p</i> <i>a</i> <i>r</i><br><i>v</i> <i>i</i> <i>r</i> <i>v</i> <i>M</i> <i>i</i> <i>b</i> (10 ) <i>6</i> <i>P</i> <i>t</i><br>98 <i>I</i> <i>C</i> ( ) <i>6</i> <i>A</i> <i>I</i> 401  |
| (c) <i>C</i> <i>o</i> <i>p</i> <i>l</i> <i>H</i> <i>a</i> <i>m</i> <i>a</i> <i>r</i> <i>t</i> (198 ) 6 B u 10<br>13 <i>I</i> <i>c</i> <i>4</i> <i>I</i> <i>c</i> ( ) <i>A</i> <i>B</i> <i>1</i> <i>0</i>   |   |
| (l) <i>I</i> <i>J</i> <i>v</i> <i>D</i> <i>r</i> (1883) 6 M 1  |   |
| (e) <i>B</i> <i>i</i> <i>v</i> <i>d</i> <i>b</i> <i>i</i> (18 ) 8 B H c 4<br>4 <i>I</i> <i>v</i> <i>r</i> <i>H</i> (1883) 12 L 1<br>1 <i>v</i> <i>J</i> <i>i</i> <i>v</i> <i>r</i> (19 ) 13 I 4<br>1 <i>I</i> <i>f</i> <i>i</i> <i>l</i> <i>4</i> <i>J</i> <i>i</i> <i>l</i> (1810) 11 M 1<br>3 <i>D</i> <i>i</i> <i>t</i> <i>H</i> <i>c</i> <i>I</i> (10 ) 43<br>All 14 <i>I</i> <i>c</i> 06 ( ) <i>A</i> <i>A</i> 39 |   |
| (f) <i>K</i> <i>r</i> <i>v</i> <i>J</i> <i>i</i> <i>v</i> <i>S</i> <i>i</i> <i>t</i> <i>i</i> <i>J</i> <i>H</i> (1833) 1<br>All 416  |   |

S  
100.

Second appeal on no other ground

No second period correct  
fair suit

**Suit for mesne profits**—Section 13 of the Provincial Small Cause Courts Act gives jurisdiction to Courts of Small Causes to take cognizance of all suits of a civil nature of which the value does not exceed R. 500 except such suits as are specified in the second schedule of the Act. That schedule consists of several articles of which article 31 is the

(m) 53 3 80 I C 10 (1) 4 (1) 19  
 5 6 1 a v Se n t (1900) 1 M 1 J 4  
 ( ) L 4 h 1 v Lan (1903) 3 P r 1 3 6  
 (o) I d (1 Ir v S h C? d a (1913) 40  
 (1 3 0 1 C 1 0 5 1 l b a v  
 \ bh (1901) Ik m 41-  
 (p) F s f P v K r u a (19 1) 3 Lah  
 1 J 106 60 I t 9 (1) A L 1 J  
 (q) U a l s Ia v C a (19 4) 30 B n L P  
 144 (4) H 34



most important for the purposes of the present section. That article excludes from the jurisdiction of Small Cause Courts any other suit for an account including a suit for the profits of immovable property belonging to the plaintiff which have been wrongfully received by the defendant. This article contemplates cases in which the plaintiff claims an account of moneys which the defendant has received and to an account of which the plaintiff is entitled because the moneys received belonged to him. It has been held by a majority of the Full Bench of the Calcutta High Court that a suit for mesne profits does not fall under this article in other words it is cognizable by a Small Cause Court. Such a suit is not a suit for the profits of immovable properties belonging to the plaintiff which have been wrongfully received by the defendant. A suit for mesne profits is a suit for damages in which the defendant would be liable even if no profits have been actually received by him during the period of dispossession. For in s 2 sub s (12) of the Code mesne profits are defined as profits which the person in wrongful possession of such property actually received or might with ordinary diligence have received therefrom (r). On the other hand it has been held by a Full Bench of the Madras High Court (s) that a suit for mesne profits does come within art 31 of the said Act and is therefore not cognizable by a Small Cause Court. Recent Bombay decisions are difficult to reconcile but the general effect of them is that a suit for mesne profits is a suit for the profits of immovable property belonging to the plaintiff which have been wrongfully received by the defendant within the meaning of art 31 (t) but that it does not come within the said article if the amount claimed is an ascertained sum so that no account has to be taken (u).

**Suit for rent**—The High Courts of Madras and Rangoon have held that a suit for rent is a suit of the nature cognizable by Courts of Small Causes (v). The High Court of Calcutta has held that it is not (w).

**Suit for title**—A Small Cause Court has no jurisdiction to entertain a suit for title relating to immovable property. A suit however which is otherwise cognizable by a Small Cause Court does not cease to be so because it incidentally involves a question of title (x).

**Suit for a declaration**—A Small Cause Court has no jurisdiction to entertain a suit for a declaratory decree. The mere fact however that there is a prayer for a declaration will not prevent a suit from being of the nature cognizable by a Small Cause Court if the other reliefs claimed in the suit could be obtained without asking for a declaration (y).

**Execution**—The expression suit in this section includes execution proceedings (z) from which it follows that if a suit is of the nature cognizable by a Small Cause Court no second appeal will lie from an order made in execution of the decree passed in the suit unless the value of the suit exceeds Rs 500. It is immaterial that the order in execution is made by a Court other than a Court of Small Causes or a Court vested with the powers of a Small Cause Court as where the property attached in execution of the decree is immovable property and the order in execution is made by a First Class Subordinate Judge in his ordinary jurisdiction. The test is what was the nature of the suit

- (r) *Jyoti Bhai Singh v. Madhub Chandra* (1836) 3 C.L. 884.  
 (s) *Sastry v. Anthoni* (1903) M.D. 103.  
 (t) *Atchey v. Mahale* (1901) 5 Bom. 8.  
 (u) *Gibb v. Jaffar* (1906) 30 Bom. 147.  
 (v) *Ajank v. Prashad* (1901) 3 Bom. 6 explained in *Id v. Dadas* (1904) 6 Bom. L.R. 30.  
 (w) *Sodam v. Desai* (1900) 3 Mad. 47.  
 (x) *Ma P. Mo v. U* (1903) 3 Rang. 399 91 I.C. 673 (6) A.R. 19.  
 (y) *Sharma v. Va* (1915) 4 Cal. 638 7.

- (z) *I.C. 8*  
 (1) *Jiv v. Jiv* (1901) Bom. 6.  
 (2) *Jiv v. Jiv* (1903) 3 Bom. 560.  
 (y) *Rao v. Rao* (1907) 30 Mad. 101.  
 (z) *Gora v. Gora* (1841) 1 Beng. L.R. 61 [R.B.] *Dm D. J. v. J. K. K.* (1896) 18 All. 481 *Atala v. S. S. S.* (1899) 1 Mad. 116 *M. v. K. P. v. P.* (1903) 4 Mad. L.J. 1073 I.C. 96 (24) A.M.S. *S. v. D.* (1900) 7 Cal. 484.

in which the decree sought to be executed was paid and not the nature of the proceedings in execution (a) It is also immaterial that the amount sought to be recovered in execution exceeded Rs 500 The test is not the amount claimed in execution proceedings but the amount of the subject matter of the suit (b) An order of remand made by an appellate Court in an appeal from an order of the Court executing a decree in a suit of the nature cognizable by a Small Cause Court is also not appealable (c)

Where the plaintiff decree holder applied under O 21 r 71 to recover Rs 660 being the deficiency of price from a defaulting purchaser and both the lower Courts disallowed the plaintiff's claim it was held that no second appeal lay to the High Court the reason given being that but for the provisions of r 71 a suit would have to be filed for that amount in which case it would have been a Small Cause Court suit and the application therefore must be treated as one made in execution of a Small Cause Court decree (d)

**103 [New]** In any second appeal, the High Court may if the evidence on the record is sufficient, determine any issue of fact necessary for the disposal of the appeal

Power of High Court to determine issues of fact

which has not been determined by the lower appellate Court or which has been wrongly determined by such Court by reason of any illegality, omission, error or defect such as is referred to in sub section (1) of section 100

**Changes in the section**—The last part of the section beginning with the words which has not been determined was substituted by Act 6 of 1926 for the words but not determined by the lower appellate Court which occurred after the word of the appeal

**Scope of the section**—This section is new It was amended by Act 6 of 1926 as stated above The section as it now stands empowers the High Court in second appeal to determine issues of fact (1) where such issues have not been determined by the lower appellate Court or (2) where they have been wrongly determined by that Court provided the evidence on the record is sufficient to enable the High Court to determine such issues. If the evidence on the record is not sufficient the proper course is to refer the issues for trial under O 41 r 2a

In the absence of any such provision in the Code of 1882 there was a conflict of decisions as to the power of the High Court to determine in second appeal issues of fact which had not been determined by the lower appellate Court On the one hand it was held that where the evidence on the record was sufficient to enable the High Court to deliver judgment the High Court had the power at the hearing of a second appeal itself to fix and determine issues of fact necessary for the disposal of the appeal but not determined by the lower appellate Court and it was held in such a case would merely cause delay and increase costs (e) On the other hand it was held that even if the evidence on the record was sufficient the High Court had no such power and the only course open to it was to remand the issues for a further trial

(a) *Varley v. Vagdy* (1906) 30 Bom 113

(b) *Marla v. Varla* (1907) 30 M 1 1 B II B II H harj v Babu (1897) 11 Cal 161 H V 7 L 1 Pans (1907) 3 Loh 141 6 1 C 18 ( ) A L 30

(c) *La Fra v. Shil* (1907) 4 All 60 54 I C 43 S F J al v B (1914) 43 All 403 60 I C 831 ( ) A A

*Mad L J 499 90 I C 31 ( ) A A*

(1) *F J J rya Ch an a (1907) 4 B 3 J I C 19 ( ) A B 33*

(e) *B L K v J Sod A (1907) 17 A 68 I p r l th ram ( ) J 17 J r r J Dookute v B (1907) 14 A 1 61 8 per l etl ram C J 201 11*

the lower appellate Court the ground of the decisions being that the High Court had no power in second appeal to determine any issue of *fact* (f) The pre ent section gives effect to the former view It has been held under this section that where the High Court has framed issues and referred the same for trial to the lower Court under O 41 r 23 and the findings of the lower Court on those issues are incomplete the High Court has power under this section to determine the e issues if there are materials on which the High Court can come to a conclusion (g)

Under the section as it stood before it was amended by Act 6 of 1926 it was held that where a question of fact had been determined by the lower appellate Court but the decision could not be supported because it was based in part on *evidence improperly admitted* the High Court could not look at the evidence to decide whether the remaining evidence after exclusion of evidence erroneously admitted was sufficient to warrant the finding of the Court below and the proper course it was held was to remand the case to the lower Court (A) This resulted in unnecessary remands and the section has now been amended to enable the High Court itself in second appeal to come to the necessary finding of fact in all cases where the finding of the lower appellate Court is vitiated by an error or illegality such as is described in s 100 (1) Since the amendment the High Court may itself determine the necessary issues of fact without remanding the case to the lower Court in cases such as th above (i)

## APPEALS FROM ORDERS

**104 [S 588]** (1) An appeal shall lie from the following orders, and save as otherwise expressly provided in the body of this Code or by any law for the time being in

Ord re  
appeal li from 1th

force, from no other orders —

- (a) an order superseding an arbitration where the award has not been completed within the period allowed by the Court
- (b) an order on an award stated in the form of a special case,
- (c) an order modifying or correcting an award,
- (d) an order filing or refusing to file an agreement to refer to arbitration,
- (e) an order staying or refusing to stay a suit where there is an agreement to refer to arbitration,
- (f) an order filing or refusing to file an award in an arbitration without the intervention of the Court,
- (ff) an order under section 35 A,

(f) C 11 L 1 v Cra f ed (188 ) 9 All 14  
(Y B) Deok 1 Pan 1 (1896) 8 All  
1  
(g) S 1 t a v Te l t 1 J 2 (19 0) 4 I A  
8 43 V 1 56 61 C 11 Ch n l i a a  
v Lee a (19 ) 49 J A 56 4 M 1

56 68 I C 33 ( ) A I C J  
(1) J v t v Harl (19 4) 40 Cal L J 39  
S I C 19 ( 4) A C 104  
(1) I J t a v M Ch dra (19 ) 31  
C W 3 30 I C 189 ( ) A C 1

- (g) an order under section 95 ,
- (h) an order under any of the provisions of this Code imposing a fine or directing the arrest or detention in the civil prison of any person except where such arrest or detention is in execution of a decree ,
- (i) any order made under rules from which an appeal is expressly allowed by rules

Provided that no appeal shall lie against any order specified in clause (ff) save on the ground that no order, or an order for the payment of a less amount, ought to have been made

(2) No appeal shall lie from any order passed in appeal under this section

Appealable orders—This section and O 43 r 1 contain a full list of appealable order. The words save as otherwise expressly provided in the body of this Code or by any law for the time being in force are new. See notes below under the heading Letters Patent appeal

Clause (a)—See Schedule II paragraph (8) and notes thereto

Clause (b)—See Schedule II paragraph (11) and notes thereto

Clause (c)—See Schedule II paragraph (12) and notes thereto

Clause (d)—See Schedule II paragraph (17) and notes thereto

Clause (e)—See Schedule II paragraph (18)

Clause (f)—See Schedule II paragraph (21) and notes thereto. It has been held by the High Court of Calcutta that this clause does not apply to proceedings under cl (2) of s 11 of the Arbitration Act 1899 and that no appeal therefore lies under this clause from an order refusing to set aside an award made and filed under that Act but the High Court has jurisdiction to hear the appeal under cl 15 of the Letters Patent (j). In Calcutta the practice is for the Registrar to file the award. The party dissatisfied with the award may then apply to have it set aside. In Allahabad the practice is to apply to the Court for an order to file the award. Hence it has been held by the Allahabad High Court that if the District Judge refuses to file the award an appeal lies to the High Court under cl (f) from the order refusing to file the award (i).

Clause (ff)—This clause was inserted in the section by Act 9 of 1922. See the proviso to sub sec (1)

Clause (h)—An appeal lies from an order of arrest before judgment (l). See O 16 rr 10 12 17 and 21 (summoning and attendance of witnesses) O 26 r 17 (attendance and examination of witnesses before Commissioner) O 39 r 2 sub r (3) (disobedience of injunction)

Clause (i)—See O 43 r 1

Proviso—The proviso was inserted in the section by Act 9 of 1922

(j) *Crompton & Co v Jeshay* (1918) 4 Cal 0  
461 C 687

(i) *N. L. v. Raja* (1911) 43 All 319

(l) *Sy d Hoo* 611 C 63 (21) A 1 1923  
841 C 0 (4) A R 361 *Chettia* (1924) 2 Rang 36

Sub section (2) — Thus if an appeal is preferred under O 43 r 1 (a) from an order under O 7 r 10 returning a plaint to be presented to the proper Court and an order is made in appeal remanding the case under O 41 r 23 no appeal lies from such order (m). This sub section however does not take away the right of appeal conferred by cl 15 of the Letters Patent (n). The High Court of Allahabad is the only Court that has held that it does (o). See notes below Letters Patent Appeal. See also notes to O 41 r 23 Appeal.

Section 154 — There are some orders which were appealable under sec 588 of the repealed Code which are not appealable under this section. As to these it is provided by s 154 that where the right to appeal has already accrued to a party before the commencement of this Code such right shall not be affected by anything contained in this Code.

Letters Patent appeal — Clause 15 of the Letters Patent provides that an appeal lies from every judgment of a single Judge of the High Court in the exercise of its original civil jurisdiction to other Judges of the Court. Now an order refusing to set aside an award is a judgment within the meaning of the said clause (p). It is clear that if such an order is made by a Municipal Court or by the Court of a Subordinate Judge or by the District Court no appeal will lie from it for it is not an order specified in the present section. It is equally clear that if such an order is made by a Judge of the High Court an appeal will lie from it under the Letters Patent for the present section expressly saves the right of appeal given by any law for the time being in force. Upon this point there was a conflict of decisions under the Code of 1882. The conflict arose from the provision contained in s 588 of that Code that an appeal lay from orders specified in that section and from no other orders [see sub sec (2) of the present section]. The question accordingly arose whether s 588 by declaring that no appeal lie from any order other than those specified in that section took away the right of appeal given by the Letters Patent. It was held by the High Courts of Calcutta Madras and Bombay following a decision of the Privy Council (q) that s 588 did not take away the right of appeal given by cl 15 of the Letters Patent (r) and that an appeal therefore lay from an order of a single Judge of the High Court refusing to set aside an award to the other Judges of the Court. On the other hand it was held by the Allahabad High Court on a different reading of the Privy Council case referred to above that s 588 took away the right of appeal given by the Letters Patent (s) and that no appeal therefore lay from an order refusing to set aside an award though the order might be made by a Judge of the High Court. It is submitted that the words save as otherwise expressly provided by any law for the time being in force include the Letters Patent and that they were added into the present section to give effect to the Calcutta Madras and Bombay decisions. This is the view taken by the High Court of Lahore (t). The High Court of Allahabad however has adhered to its previous view in cases under the present Code (u).

Privy Council appeal. The provision in sub sec (2) deals with internal appeals within the limits of British India. It does not take away the general right of appealing to the Privy Council given by s 109. It applies to the District Judge of East Berar under

(m) *N. v. S. N. Gh. v. B. H. S. N. Gh.* (1911) 37 All 499 I C 666 (H. B. J. M. v. H. B. J. M. Das (1911) P. P. N. 119 p. 406 18 I C 59 B. H. v. H. B. (1910) L. H. J. 47 V. M. H. v. B. L. a. t. (1911) B. M. L. R. 635 88 I C 3 ( ) A B 431  
( ) *I. H. S. Gh. v. A. S. Gh.* (1913) 3 Lah 188 6 I C 349 ( ) A I 340  
( ) *I. A. R. v. M. A. R. L. I.* (1916) 33 All 191 39 I C 460  
(p) *Toolce Mo. v. S. v. S.* (1899) 6 Cal 361  
(q) *H. R. v. C. v. S. v. S.* (1893) 9

Cal 43 10 I A 4  
( ) *T. v. S. v. S. v. S.* (1893) 28 Cal 361 S. H. v. S. v. S. v. S. (1901) Mad 63 Chapp. v. M. v. S. (1893) Mad 63 S. v. S. v. S. v. S. (1893) 11 All 120 4 B. M. F. R. 34  
( ) *B. v. S. v. S. v. S.* (1899) 11 All 3 M. v. S. v. S. v. S. (1893) 11 All 2 6 I C 340  
(r) *R. v. S. v. S. v. S.* (1910) 3 Lah 184 67 I C 333 (2) A L 340  
(u) *P. v. S. v. S. v. S.* (1916) 39 All 191 39 I C 460

Sch II para 20 to file an award in Court. B oppo es the application. The District Judge makes an order refusing to file the award. A appeals from the order [see cl (f)] to the Judicial Commissioner. The Judicial Commissioner makes an order filing the award. B appeals to the King in Council from the order of the Judicial Commissioner. Does the appeal lie to the King in Council? Yes for though no second appeal lies to the High Court by reason of the provisor in sub sec (2) an appeal does lie to the King in Council under s 109 of the Code (z). Similarly though no second appeal lies from an order passed on appeal from the order specified in O 43 cl (j) an appeal lies to the King in Council under s 109 of the Code (w).

**105 [S 591] (1)** Save as otherwise expressly provided, no appeal shall lie from any order made by a Court in the exercise of

its original or appellate jurisdiction, but where a decree is appealed from, any error, defect or irregularity in any order, affecting the decision of the case may be set forth as a ground of objection in the memorandum of appeal.

(2) Notwithstanding anything contained in sub section (1) where any party aggrieved by an order of remand made after the commencement of this Code from which an appeal lies does not appeal therefrom, he shall thereafter be precluded from disputing its correctness.

Changes introduced by the section.—This section corresponds with s 591 of the Code of 1852 except in the following particulars —

- 1 Sub section (2) is new. See notes below. Sub section (2) appeal from order of remand.
- 2 S 591 contained the word "in any such order" after the word "irregularity". The word "such" has been omitted as the expression "such order" gave rise to the contention in some cases before the Privy Council that s 591 applied to non appealable order only a contention that was overruled by the Privy Council (x).

Scope of the section.—An interlocutory order made in a suit is either appealable (s 104) or not appealable. This section like the corresponding s 591 applies to any order that is to appealable as well as non appealable orders. Where an interlocutory order is appealable the party against whom the order is made is not bound to prefer an appeal against it but he may make the irregularity in the order a ground of objection in the memorandum of appeal where an appeal is preferred from the decree in the suit in which the order was made. In other words s 10 allows an appealable order which has not been appealed from to be made the subject of appeal in an appeal from the decree. There is no law prevailing in India which render it imperative upon a party to appeal from every interlocutory order by which he may conceive himself aggrieved under the penalty if he does not do so of forfeiting for ever the benefit of the consideration of the appellate Court. Nothing would be more detrimental to the expeditious administration of justice than the establishment of a rule which would impose upon a

(r) *Pa lat v K ? ha d* (10 S) 1 I A 140 143 149 40 (at 63 64 613  
51 C I 301 83 I C 531 (24) A PC 191 C 26  
(w) *Tel r Kru a v Jof C/a d* (1913) 40 (x) S the three Privy Council cases cited in note (z) below

partly the necessity of appealing whereby on the one hand he might be harassed with endless expense and delay and on the other inflict upon his opponent similar calamities. It was so observed by their Lordships of the Privy Council in *Moheshur Singh v The Bengal Government* (y) and in subsequent cases (z) and it is this principle that underlies the present section. The present section makes it quite clear that an order appealable under s 104 may be questioned under s 105 in an appeal from the decree in the suit although no appeal from the order has been preferred under s 104 (a). And even where the interlocutory order is one from which no appeal lies an error defect or irregularity in that order may be set forth as a ground of objection in the memorandum of appeal where an appeal is preferred from the decree in the suit in which the order was made (b).

**Affecting the decision of the case**—It has been held by almost all the High Courts that the words affecting the decision of the case mean affecting the decision of the case on its merits. It has accordingly been held that an order cannot be attacked in appeal from a final decree unless the error defect or irregularity in the order is one affecting the decision of the case on the merits (c). It has thus been held by the High Courts of Allahabad Calcutta and Lahore that an order under O 9 r 13 setting aside an ex parte decree is not an order that affects the merits of the case such an order merely ensures a hearing upon the merits hence the order cannot be attacked in an appeal from the decree in the suit (d). But the High Court of Madras has held that such an order may be attacked in appeal from the final decree (e). In the Madras case however the ex parte decree was set aside as to one of two defendants who had not applied to set it aside and it was held that the order setting aside the ex parte decree as against that defendant may be attacked in an appeal from the final decree. This decision was approved by the same High Court in a later case where also the facts were peculiar. The point of the decision in the latter case seems to be that an order under O 9 r 13 may be challenged in an appeal from the final decree in the particular circumstances of a case (f). The Rangoon High Court refuses to read the words on its merits into this section and allows an order setting aside an ex parte decree to be impugned in final appeal (g).

An order remanding an appeal from an order returning a plaint for presentation to the proper Court is not an order affecting the decision of the case and cannot be challenged in second appeal (h).

An order under O 41 r 19 re-admitting an appeal which has been dismissed for default is not one which affects the decision of the case on the merits and it cannot therefore be attacked in an appeal from the final decree (i).

It has been held by the High Courts of Bombay Madras Allahabad and Calcutta that an order setting aside an award and directing the case to be tried by the Court

(j) (19 9) 7 M I A 483

(c) *F b s v Ampon a B g n* (186 ) 10 M I A 340 *Sh o th v R n th* (186 ) 10 M I A 413 *Sh h M l a L l*

*v e f Hen v gh* (1869) 1 M I A 15

( ) *See S t o Nath v I m D n* (1896) 18 All 19

(b) *Sc J dji v D labi j* (1900) 22 Bo 1 30 *and God ar v ( j p ts* (1900) 23 Mad 494

(c) *Tax d j Hayati a a* (1903) All 80 *v H d Lal v C llector of B l I h k* (1916) 14 All L J 610 *614 S I C -03* *(h l o v v H oonath* (189 ) Cal 981 *M ha ved v Mo ohar* (19 4) 40 ( 1 L J 388 8 I C 100 ( ) A C 43 *v h Kanu v I ar Lal* (19 14) Cal L J 186 861 ( 10 9 ( - ) A C 11 *S j a B b v Madh a d e* (19 5) 50 (al 4 8 1 C 100 ( ) A C 66 *Fazal*

*v H shmal* (1916) P n Rec n 40 p 115 31 I C 914 *S n d n S ngh v v* *h i m* (19 ) 6 I h 94 83 I C 9 0 ( ) A L 466 *D o l v j a* (19 ) 51 I m 49 101 I C 6 ( ) A B 453

(d) All 40 *p v Cal* 981 *s p a* 6 Lab 94 84 I C 9 0 ( 2 ) A L 466 *s p a* A different opinion was expr s ed *v h ramat Hu l J in v a d am v Bhop l S ng h* (191 ) 34 All 59 59 16 I C 1

(e) *Gopal v Chett v S bbe* (1903) 6 M d 604 60

(f) *Uthman v G e an* (19 4) 4 M d L J 841 64 8 I C 804 ( 4 ) A M 890

(g) *M S M h m l v C llector* (19 ) 5 Rang 80 10 I C 3 9 ( ) A L 1 0

(h) *V e lat a n n v Aot vya* (19 6) 51 Mad L J 119 9 I C 790 ( 6 ) A M 900

(i) *Cal b v Thal r* (190 ) 4 All 464

may be attacked in appeal from the final decree (j) the reason given in the Allahabad case being that such an order affects the decision of the case on the merits (k). The High Court of Lahore has taken a different view (l) but the attention of the Court was not drawn to the decisions of the other High Courts.

An order setting aside an abatement under O 22 r 9 does not affect the decision of the case on the merits. Rather it re-opens the hearing of the case on the merits and it cannot therefore be challenged in appeal from the final decree (m). But there is a difference of opinion whether an order setting aside an abatement may be so attacked if it is made *simultaneously* with the final decree in the suit. It has been held by the High Court of Allahabad that it may be so attacked if passed simultaneously with the final decree (n). On the other hand it has been held by the High Court of Calcutta that an order setting aside an abatement cannot be challenged in an appeal from the final decree whether it is passed before or simultaneously with the final decree (o).

An order refusing leave under 0 (b) cannot be attacked in an appeal from an order returning a plaint for presentation to the proper Court (v)

**Error defect or irregularity** —The error defect or irregularity referred to in this section must be an error defect or irregularity in law or procedure and not in matters of fact (a)

"Where a decree is appealed from —This section contemplates two things namely (1) a regular appeal from a decree and (2) the insertion in that appeal of a ground of objection relating to an interlocutory order. The High Court of Allahabad has held that no appeal will lie where the appeal is *ostensibly* against the decree passed in the suit but the grounds of appeal are solely directed against an interlocutory order made in the suit (r). On the other hand the High Courts of Calcutta and Madras have held that an appeal will lie though the only rea on for the appeal is an erroneous decision in regard to an interlocutory order (s).

It should be noted that in order to take advantage of the provisions of this section the ground of objection must be set out in the memorandum of appeal (i)

Sub section (2) appeal from order of remand — In order under O 41 r 23 remanding a case is appealable where an appeal would lie from the decree of the Appellate Court [O 43 r 1 cl (u)]. Such an order was also appealable under the Code of 1882 [secs 588 cl (28)]. Under s 391 of the Code of 1882 it was held that a party aggrieved by an order of remand could object to its validity in an appeal against the final decree though he might have appealed against the order under s 388 and had not done so (u). Sub section (2) has been added to preclude an appellant from taking on an appeal from the final decree any objection that might have been urged by way of appeal from an order of remand (t).

- (j) *Din d r x lagl tl* (190) 1 6B m 1  
*A taut j j x j j m j j* (1908) 1 1 M 1  
 335 R l t a v D o k i (191) 2 A H  
 4 6 J I ( 411) R d r x V t a (19 )  
 J A H 1 J 6 6 89 I C 1 5 ( ) 4 4  
 66 B a m i n C l a r a v G a d d h r (19 9) 56  
 C a l 21
- (k) 3 A H 4 6 460 29 I C 411 t r a
- (l) *B d h P v P a r a* (19 1) 3 I n h L J  
 9 59 I C 6 6 ( 1) A L 14
- (m) *V o h n d v V o m o l r* (19 4) 40 (a l I J  
 88 8 1 C 100 ( 4) A C 4 3 H r t  
 I a n v H n k e (19 ) 4 A H 8 I C  
 711 ( ) A A 4 6
- ( ) *H e I n r v i b a P r a s a d* (1900) A H  
 430
- (o) *V o l t v V o o h* (19 4) 40 (a l I J  
 88 8 1 C 100 ( 4) A C 4 3 S a j a  
 H b v M a d i w a d a n (19 ) ( 1 4
- (p) *R I C 100 ( ) A C 68*  
*M l e H r t r v d e* (1 ) T a l I J  
 66 88 I C 46 ( ) I J 338
- (q) *S k a t v V t H* (1900) 1 A H 00
- (r) *V o v t h v R a D* (1906) 18 A H 19 V r  
 v q D a n n v q h (1907) 2 A H 366
- (s) *I j i B h a s a r v R l l t i a* (111) 34  
 M a l 2 5 6 I C ( ) C o o p l e r v I t l l  
 (1901) C 114
- (t) *T l a k v C h l r H a z* (1891) 1 A H 110
- (u) *S i t v P i j* (1900) 14 B m 23. S b b a  
 v B i C H r i (183 ) 18 M a l 4 1  
 I A r s j h v h o t i a (1900) 1 A H  
 10 H t s e j a I u n d k a v b o a v  
 J m l a V e n k a t a y d (1903) 3 M a l  
 H C 1 C
- (v) *I v g h v i r g h* (19 1) 2 L a l  
 63 I C 6 ( 1) A L 154



Privy Council appeal—This subsection does not apply to Privy Council appeals (u) See notes to s 109 Final Order

**106 [S 589]** Where an appeal from any order is allowed, it shall lie to the Court to which an appeal would lie from the decree in the suit in which such order was made, or where such order is made by a Court (not being a High Court) in the exercise of appellate jurisdiction, then to the High Court

What Court to hear appeal

Forum of appeal—See notes under the same head to s 96 above

GENERAL PROVISIONS RELATING TO APPEALS

**107 [S 582]** (1) Subject to such conditions and limitations as may be prescribed, an Appellate Court shall have power—

Powers of Appellate Court

- (a) to determine a case finally ,
- (b) to remand a case ,
- (c) to frame issues and refer them for trial ,
- (d) to take additional evidence or to require such evidence to be taken

(2) Subject as aforesaid, the Appellate Court shall have the same powers and shall perform as nearly as may be the same duties as are conferred and imposed by this Code on Courts of original jurisdiction in respect of suits instituted therein

Prescribed — Prescribed means prescribed by the Rules contained in the First Schedule or made under s 122 or s 123 of the Code see s 2 cls (16) and (18)

Sub section (1)—Sub section (1) is new Note that the powers of the appellate Court referred to in cls (a) to (d) are limited by the Rules as appears from the opening words of the section (z)

- Clause (a)—See O 41 rr 24 33
- Clause (b)—See O 41 r 23
- Clause (c)—See O 41 r 25
- Clause (d)—See O 41 rr 27 2b

Sub section (2) —This subsection corresponds to s 582 of the Code of 188-. The appellate Court has power under this section to give leave to a plaintiff to withdraw from a suit under O 23 r 1 (y) See also notes to O 41 r 20

(w) *Am I H s v G I K has* (1911) 33 All 391 9 I C 93 *Fenk ta a ga* Var h (191 ) 39 Mad 09 1 I C 84 | (x) *U M ha v Ram atan* (1916) 43 Cal 148 33 I C 39 (y) See notes to O 23

**108** [Ss 557, 590] The provisions of this part relating to appeals from original decrees shall, so far as may be, apply to appeals—

Procedure in appeals from  
appeal to decrees and orders

- (a) from appellate decrees, and
- (b) from orders made under this Code or under any special or local law in which a different procedure is not provided

Compare O 42 r 1 and O 43 r 2

### APPEALS TO THE KING IN COUNCIL

**109** [S 595] Subject to such rules as may, from time to time be made by His Majesty in Council regarding appeals from the Courts of British India, and to the provisions hereinafter contained, an appeal shall lie to His Majesty in Council—

When appeals lie to King  
in Council

- (a) from any decree or final order passed on appeal by a High Court or by any other Court of final appellate jurisdiction
- (b) from any decree or final order passed by a High Court in the exercise of original civil jurisdiction, and
- (c) from any decree or order, when the case, as hereinafter provided, is certified to be a fit one for appeal to His Majesty in Council

Ss 109 and 110 are to be read together. See also cl 39 of the Letters Patent. For rules of procedure in appeals to the King in Council see O 45 below.

**Difference between the old and the new section**—This section corresponds with s 595 of the Code of 1882 except that in cls (a) and (b) the words 'decree or final order' have been substituted for the words 'final decree' and in cl (c) the words 'or order' have been added after the word 'decree'. This however does not introduce any change in the law. The Code of 1882 contained section 594 which ran thus: 'In this chapter (that is chapter XLV) unless there be something repugnant in the subject or context the expression 'decree' includes also judgment and order.' Chapter XLV of the Code of 1882 relating to appeals to His Majesty in Council has been split into two parts in this Code ss 595-596, 597 and 616 being retained in the body of the Code [now ss 109-112] and the remaining sections being relegated to O 45. S 594 has been reproduced with slight alterations in O 45 r 1. But it is not reproduced in this part of the Code as four only out of the twenty-three sections of that chapter are retained in the body of the Code. What has been done instead is that the words 'decree or final order' have been substituted where the words 'final decree' occurred in the four old sections and the words 'decree or order' have been substituted where the word 'decree' occurred in those sections.

and dismissed the suit but the High Court held on appeal that the will was valid and remanded the case under O 41 r 23 for the decision of subordinate points it was held that the order of the High Court was a final order as the order comprised a decision upon the cardinal issue in the suit and it was one that could never while the decision stood be questioned again in the same suit (u) Similarly where the cardinal point in a suit was whether notice under s 167 of the Bengal Tenancy Act 8 of 1885 to annul certain encumbrances was properly served or not and the High Court reversing the decision of the lower Court held that it was properly served and remanded the case to be tried on the other issues it was held that the order of the High Court was a final order (x) Where the lower Court held that the matter in issue in a suit was res judicata and the High Court held that it was not and remanded the case for trial on the merits it was held by the Calcutta High Court on an application for leave to the Privy Council that the order was final (y) The contrary has been held by the High Court of Allahabad (z) But where the lower Court refused to set aside an ex parte decree on the ground that O 9 r 13 did not apply and the High Court remanded the case for an inquiry on the merits it was held that the order of the High Court was not a final order but a purely interlocutory order directing procedure (a) Where the lower Court refused to set aside an abatement on the ground that the application was barred by limitation and the High Court reversed the order and directed the lower Court to rehear the application for permission to implead the heirs it was held that there was no adjudication on the merits and that the order of the High Court was interlocutory and not final (b) It has also been held that where the lower Court dismisses a suit on the ground that the suit is barred under O 2 r 2 (c) or that the suit as framed is not maintainable (d) or that the plaintiff has no locus standi to maintain the suit (e) and the High Court reversing the decision of the lower Court remands the case for trial to that Court the order of the High Court is not final But there is a conflict of opinion whether where the lower Court dismisses a suit on the ground that it is barred by limitation and the High Court reversing the decision of the lower Court remands the case for trial to that Court the order of the High Court is final some cases holding that the order is interlocutory (f) and others that it is final (g)

**108** [Ss 587, 590] The provisions of this part relating to appeals from original decrees shall, so far as may be, apply to appeals—

Procedure in appeals from  
appeals to decrees and orders

- (a) from appellate decrees, and
- (b) from orders made under this Code or under any special or local law in which a different procedure is not provided

Compare O 42 r 1 and O 43 r 2

## APPEALS TO THE KING IN COUNCIL

**109** [S 595] Subject to such rules as may, from time to time be made by His Majesty in Council regarding appeals from the Courts of British India, and to the provisions herein after contained, an appeal shall lie to His Majesty in Council—

When appeals lie to King  
in Council

- (a) from any decree or final order passed on appeal by a High Court or by any other Court of final appellate jurisdiction,
- (b) from any decree or final order passed by a High Court in the exercise of original civil jurisdiction, and
- (c) from any decree or order, when the case, as hereinafter provided, is certified to be a fit one for appeal to His Majesty in Council

Ss 109 and 110 are to be read together. See also cl 39 of the Letters Patent. For rules of procedure in appeals to the King in Council see O 45 below.

**Difference between the old and the new section**—This section corresponds with s 595 of the Code of 1882 except that in cls (a) and (b) the words 'decree or final order' have been substituted for the words 'final decree' and in cl (c) the words 'or order' have been added after the word 'decree'. This however does not introduce any change in the law. The Code of 1882 contained section 594 which ran thus: 'In this chapter (that is chapter XLV) unless there be something repugnant in the subject or context the expression 'decree' includes also judgment and order.' Chapter XLV of the Code of 1882 relating to appeals to His Majesty in Council has been split into two parts in this Code ss 595, 596, 597 and 616 being retained in the body of the Code [now ss 109, 112] and the remaining sections being relegated to O 45. S 594 has been reproduced with slight alterations in O 45 r 1. But it is not reproduced in this part of the Code as four only out of the twenty-three sections of that chapter are retained in the body of the Code. What has been done instead is that the words 'decree or final order' have been substituted where the words 'final decree' occurred in the four old sections and the words 'decree or order' have been substituted where the word 'decree' occurred in those sections.

**Right of appeal to the Privy Council**—The right of appeal from the High Court to the Privy Council now rests on cl 39 of the Letters Patent and thus is elaborated in ss 109 and 110 of the Code of Civil Procedure. Therefore though there is no express provision in the Provincial Insolvency Act 1920 for appeal to the Privy Council from orders of the High Court made under that Act, an appeal to the Privy Council is competent if the case comes under ss 109 and 110 of the Code ( ). Similarly a decree of a High Court in a testamentary matter is appealable to His Majesty in Council although sec 299 of the Indian Succession Act 1925 provides only for an appeal to the High Court (a). Thus an appeal lies from a judgment of the High Court on the appellate side granting probate of a will (b). But there is no right of appeal if sections 109 and 110 are not applicable *eg* from a decree of a High Court under section 91 (3) of the Pangoon City Municipal Act (c).

**Decree** —For definition of decree see s 2 (2) above. An act of State is not a decree. Hence no appeal lies to the King in Council from an order of the Viceroy and Governor General of India in Council deposing the Maharajah of a Native State in India such an order being an act of State (d).

**Preliminary Decree**—An appeal lies to the King in Council from a preliminary decree *e.g.* a decree declaring the liability of a party and directing accounts to be taken (c)

**Final order** —A final order within the meaning of clauses (a) and (b) of the section is an order which finally disposes of the rights of the parties (f) An order comprising the decision of a High Court upon a cardinal issue in a suit that issue being one that goes to the foundation of the suit and one that can never while the decision stands be questioned again in the suit is final within the meaning of this section notwithstanding that there may be subordinate inquiries to make (g) The expression final is used in contradiction to interlocutory (h) To determine whether an order is final or not it is necessary in each case to ascertain the nature of the proceedings (i)

In *Rahimkhoy v. Turner* (j) which is the leading case on the subject their Lordships of the Privy Council held that where an order directing the taking of accounts which the defendant contends ought not to be taken at all decides in effect that if the result should be found to be again to the defendant he is liable to pay the amount the order is final within the meaning of this section. In the course of the judgment their Lordships said

Now that question of liability was the sole question in dispute at the hearing of the *cau e* and it is the cardinal point in the suit. The arithmetical result is only a consequence of the liability. The real question in issue was the liability and that has been determined by this decree against the defendant in such a way that in this suit it is final. The Court can never go back upon this decree so as to say that though the result of the account may be against the defendant still the defendant is not liable to pay anything. That is finally determined against him and therefore in their Lordships view the decree is a final one within the meaning of section 59 of the Code. In a Calcutta *ca e* it was held that an order refusing to appoint a receiver in a suit is not a

[illegible]

(f) I i h d v C ver l h d (10 6) 4 I A  
I 4 37 Cal 919 2 B m L R 608 n  
I 4 31 Roy v H J r (rba n  
D st wt Co I(1903) I K B 4 549  
(g) I i h d o j T r (1891) I B m 15  
14 I 4 6 M x h Ho v Rodha  
(189) 1 AU 112 I A 1  
(l) R l h s i sh v h rto of J p r (1001)  
4 All O 7 N I A 24 31  
( ) M J r H v h d n (189) 17 AU 11  
11 I 4 1 -  
(j) (1921) I B m 15 14 I A 6 S m i y  
K c h n h n (19) 49 I A 10<sup>a</sup> 111 113  
42 C 1 60 63 666 6 I C I 4 (-2-)  
A PG 237

final order and no appeal lies from it to the Privy Council (1). In a recent Calcutta case however where the High Court had discharged an order made by the District Court appointing a receiver the High Court granted leave to appeal to the Privy Council. The Privy Council affirmed the order of the High Court but observed that as a general rule and in the absence of special circumstances or some unusual occasion for it exercise the power of making interlocutory orders was one which was not a suitable subject for review by the Judicial Committee (2). An order made in revision under s. 116 of the Code granting (i) or refusing (n) leave to sue in forma pauperis is not a final order. An order of the High Court directing the lower Court to proceed with the execution of a decree which the lower Court has refused to execute on the ground that it had no jurisdiction is not a final order (3). An order refusing an application to be brought on the record as the legal representative of a deceased party to a pending appeal is not a final but an interlocutory order (p). But where after a preliminary decree had been passed in a suit for partition declaring that the plaintiff was entitled to a one fourth share in the joint property the lower Court dismissed the suit on the ground that the plaintiff had failed to prosecute the suit and the High Court on revision reversed the order it was held that the order of the High Court was a final order as the effect of the order was to restore the preliminary decree whereby the plaintiff was declared to be entitled to a one fourth share and the order was to that extent a decision upon a cardinal point in the case (7).

An order made on appeal setting aside or confirming a sale under O. 21 rr. 90 and 92 is appealable to His Majesty in Council. Such an order is clearly one which deals finally with the rights of parties. It is true that no second appeal lies from such an order having regard to the provisions of s. 104 (2) read with O. 43 r. 1 (j). But s. 104 (2) cannot restrict the provision of the present section which allows an appeal to the King in Council from final orders (r). Similarly though no second appeal lies from an order passed in appeal from an order fixing an award [see s. 104 (1) (f)] an appeal lies to the King in Council from such an order under this section the order being a final one (s). But an order refusing a stay under s. 19 of the Arbitration Act of 1899 is not a final order as such an order does not finally dispose of the rights of the parties but leaves them to be determined by the Court in the ordinary way (t). For the same reason an order made by a High Court reversing an order passed by the lower Court under O. 23 r. 3 recording a compromise [see O. 43 (1) (m)] and directing the lower Court to proceed with the suit in the ordinary course is not a final order (u).

An order of remand is not ordinarily capable of being the subject of an appeal to His Majesty in Council being ordinarily interlocutory and not final within the meaning of this section but it would be a final order and therefore appealable if it has the effect of deciding finally the cardinal point in the suit (v). Thus where the cardinal issue in a suit was as to the validity of a will and the lower Court held that there was no valid will

- (k) *Chand Dutt v. Dutt* (189) Cal 38  
(l) *De J. J. v. Sarish Chandra* (19-3) 55  
1 A 151 Cal 70 108 IC 342 (-8)  
A IC 49  
(m) *F. J. v. W. F. P. P.* (19) 61 t  
67 100 IC 5 ( ) A 11  
(n) *Bib. Sal. v. J. v. Gopal* (1904) 8 Cal W  
N 36  
(o) *Raj. v. Ramehar* (1910) 4 Lat L J  
401 IC 401  
(p) *G. v. P. P. P.* (1914) 38 B 1 41  
31 C 33  
(q) *L. v. B. L.* (1911) 61 t L J 116  
60 IC 4 J. (1) A P 37  
(r) *K. v. J. v. J. v. J.* (1913) 40  
Cal 63 64 64S 401 4 140 148 149 19  
IC 36  
(s) *J. v. A. v. A. v. A.* (1914) 11 A 1  
C 1361 83 IC 31 (4) A IC 9  
(t) *J. v. A. v. A. v. A.* (1910) 47 t A  
1 4 4 Cal 918 B m L R 146  
IC 50 ppro in S I man v. Har  
[1911] 1 Q B 31 f n v. 111 v m  
L v m D t v t f [1903] 1 K 1 v  
A 119 n v v 104 n [1916] h L 12  
(u) *A. v. A. v. A. v. A.* (1914) 41  
b 1 C 10 ( ) A v 3 A m  
v m v S v m v t (10) J t v  
83 831 t 04 ( ) A C v t b m  
J v m v B f (1914) 46 M 1 v  
v 1 C 933 (4) v M 1 v  
D v v m A v v f (1) 4  
v 1 C 10 ( ) v A  
v m v (1) 36 t v  
(v) *J. v. A. v. A. v. A.* (1914) 41  
340 - 0 31 A h A v v  
B m v (161) 11 AB 11 2

and dismissed the suit but the High Court held on appeal that the will was valid and remanded the case under O 41 r 23 for the decision of subordinate points it was held that the order of the High Court was a final order as the order comprised a decision upon the cardinal issue in the suit and it was one that could never while the decision stood be questioned again in the same suit (u). Similarly where the cardinal point in a suit was whether notice under s 167 of the Bengal Tenancy Act 8 of 1885 to annul certain encumbrances was properly served or not and the High Court reversing the decision of the lower Court held that it was properly served and remanded the case to be tried on the other issues it was held that the order of the High Court was a final order (x). Where the lower Court held that the matter in issue in a suit was *res judicata* and the High Court held that it was not and remanded the case for trial on the merits it was held by the Calcutta High Court on an application for leave to the Privy Council that the order was final (y). The contrary has been held by the High Court of Allahabad (z). But where the lower Court refused to set aside an *ex parte* decree on the ground that O 9 r 13 did not apply and the High Court remanded the case for an *inquiry on the merits* it was held that the order of the High Court was not a final order but a *purely interlocutory order directing procedure* (a). Where the lower Court refused to set aside an abatement on the ground that the application was barred by limitation and the High Court reversed the order and directed the lower Court to *rehear the application* for permission to implead the heirs it was held that there was no adjudication on the merits and that the order of the High Court was interlocutory and not final (b). It has also been held that where the lower Court dismisses a suit on the ground that the suit is barred under O 2 r 2 (c) or that the suit as framed is not maintainable (d) or that the plaintiff has no *locus standi* to maintain the suit (e) and the High Court reversing the decision of the lower Court remands the case for trial to that Court the order of the High Court is not final. But there is a conflict of opinion whether where the lower Court dismisses a suit on the ground that it is barred by limitation and the High Court reversing the decision of the lower Court remands the case for trial to that Court the order of the High Court is final some cases holding that the order is interlocutory (f) and others that it is final (g).

In an Allahabad case an application was made by a company under sch II of 17 to file an agreement to submit to arbitration. The application was opposed (1) on the ground that the agreement not being under the seal of the company was invalid and (2) on the ground of misrepresentation and fraud. The Court of first instance dismissed the application on the sole ground that the agreement not being under the seal of the company was invalid. On appeal the High Court reversed the decree holding that the agreement did not require to be under the seal of the company and remanded the case for trial of the other issues as to fraud and misrepresentation. From this order of remand the respondent applied for leave to appeal to His Majesty in Council. It was held by a Full Bench that the order was not a final order within the meaning of cl (a) of this section there being other important issues to dispose of namely the

- (w) *I A 1 17 All 11 s pr*  
 (x) *1 a Ja Gop I v N f Cland a* (1903) 3 Cal 618  
 (y) *Khaq ndra v S Ja m* (1911) C 1 W N 826 61 I C 76 (1) A C 177  
 (z) *Sajj I v Ishaq* (1901) 18 All L J 83 4 I C 504  
 ( ) (1901) 9 I A 934 23 All 20 s pra  
 (b) *Mumt ud D Is v Jame St e* (19 ) 47 All 33 86 I C 161 ( ) A A 63  
 (c) *17 ad H e in v Gob i Krishna* (1911) 33 All 391 9 I C 93 *1 e Latara ga v Nara mha* (191 ) 35 M A 09 1 I C 84

- (d) *Meh Ch n i v Lab'u Pam* (1911) 10 Lah 166 60 I C (1) A L 203  
 (e) *Sult S gh v Ji t D r* (1914) 5 Lah 32 80 I C 366 (4) A L 51 [B]  
 (f) *Maja t v Ca las na* (1894) 8 Bom 49 *H un N ga v W u run Nara* (1903) All 62 *Daj Nath v Soha I bi* (1909) 31 All 54 3 I C 96  
 (g) *Sattappa v S brama a* (19 ) 43 Mad L J 4 11 C 334 ( ) A M 510 *Dant Lal v Raj Nara n* (1913) 4 All 4 9 I C 87 (4) A A 119 (with r application f r decree ind r O 34 r 6 was b r r 1)

issues of misrepresentation and fraud and leave to appeal was refused (h) Section 105 sub s (2) does not apply to appeals to His Majesty in Council (i)

An order of the High Court refusing to enrol a particular person as a legal practitioner under the Legal Practitioners Act 18 of 1879 is not one from which the High Court has jurisdiction to grant leave to appeal to the Privy Council. Such an order is one passed in the exercise of the administrative powers of the Court (j). An order refusing an application under s 45 of the Specific Relief Act I of 1877 is a final order (k)

Order passed on appeal.—An order passed by a High Court rejecting an application to amend a decree is not an order passed on appeal within the meaning of cl (a) of this section and is therefore not appealable to His Majesty in Council. Moreover it is doubtful whether such an order is a final order (l). Similarly it has been held that an order made by a High Court refusing to admit an appeal presented after the expiration of the prescribed period is not an order passed on appeal within the meaning of this section (m). An order passed in revision does not fall under clause (b) (n).

Any other Court of final appellate jurisdiction.—An appeal lies to the Privy Council from a final order of a District Judge (o) or of the Judicial Commissioner's Court (p) made under s 104. See notes to s 104. Privy Council appeal.

Limitation.—The application for leave to appeal to the Privy Council must be made within 90 days from the date of the decree sought to be appealed from [Limitation Act 1908 Sch I art 179]

Under the Limitation Act of 1877 it was held that in computing the aforesaid period the time requisite for obtaining a copy of the decree appealed from could not be excluded as s 12 of that Act did not apply to such applications (g). It was also held that the application could not be admitted after the expiration of the aforesaid period, though there was sufficient cause for not presenting the application within the prescribed period as s 5 of the Act did not apply to such applications (r). Both these sections have now been amended in the Limitation Act of 1908 and they have been made applicable to applications for leave to appeal. The aforesaid decisions are therefore no longer law and it has now been expressly held that under s 12 of the Limitation Act of 1908 the time requisite to obtain a copy of the decree appealed from is to be excluded (s).

Interlocutory Orders.—See cl 40 of the Letters Patent

Prerogative of the Crown.—The Code does not limit the prerogative of the Crown to admit an appeal. Hence special leave may be granted by the King in Council to appeal where leave has been refused by the High Court (t). But no special leave will as a rule be granted unless there is some substantial question of law or general interest involved (u). See s 112.

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>(h) <i>Yusufiah v The Ganges Sugar Works Ltd</i> (1918) 38 All 150 3 I C 360 (1 B)</p> <p>(i) <i>Ahmad Hussain v Gobind Krishna</i> (1911) 33 All 391 9 I C 93. <i>Lenk i rang v Y. rammla</i> (1915) 34 Mad 503. 1 I C 84. <i>Erto v B. u</i> (19 4) 46 Mad L J 357. 81 C 935 (4) A M 01</p> <p>(j) <i>S. dhanu In re</i> (19 ) 1 Pat 590 70 I C 1 2 (2) A P 603</p> <p>(k) <i>Alcock Ashdown &amp; Co v C. f Revenue A. thorpy</i> (19 1) 3 Bom L J 113 64 I C 9 9 (21) A B 378</p> <p>(l) <i>Su der Koer v Chaudhary</i> (1903) 30 Cal 679</p> <p>(m) <i>Karnandas v Gangda</i> (1908) 3 Bom 108</p> <p>(n) <i>S. raj S. gh v Ph. i Kumari</i> (19 6) 48 All 6 90 I C 904 (20) A A 40</p> <p>(o) <i>S. adatma d v Ph. i Kuar</i> (1893) 0 All 41 51 A 146</p> | <p>(p) <i>Pami v. Kishanchand</i> (19 4) 51 I A 7 51 Cal 301 83 I C 1 (4) A P C 9</p> <p>(q) <i>Moroba v. Ganasham</i> (189 ) 19 Bom 301. <i>Ande son v. Periasam</i> (189 ) 15 Mad 163. <i>Shub S. gh v. Ga. dharp S. ngh</i> (1906) 3 All 391</p> <p>(r) <i>Shub Singh v. Gandharp Singh</i> (1906) 3 All 391</p> <p>(s) <i>Abd. Hal. v. Idm. Genl. of Be. jil</i> (1915) 4 Cal 3 4 I C 273. <i>Ram Sarup v. Jansu. i. Jan</i> (1915) 38 All S. 311 C 906</p> <p>(t) <i>Fakhimboy v. Turner</i> (1891) 15 Bom 155 15 I A 6. <i>Ikra nul. Huq v. Wazir</i> (1906) 33 Cal 893</p> <p>(u) <i>Moti Chand v. Ganga Prasad</i> (190 ) 24 All 174 1 I A 40. See also <i>Sadagopa v. Krishnamoorthy Rao</i> (1907) 0 Mad 195 at p 125 34 I A 93 91</p> |
|---|--|



and dismissed the suit but the High Court held on appeal remanded the case under O 41 r 23 for the decision that the order of the High Court was a final order upon the cardinal issue in the suit and it was not to be questioned again in the same suit. The question in the suit was whether notice under s 167 of the Transfer of Property Act was properly served. The decision of the lower Court held that the suit should be tried on the other issue. It was held that the order (x) Where the lower Court held that the suit was barred under O 2 r 2 (c) and the High Court held that it was held by the Calcutta High Court that the order was final. (y) But where the High Court held on the ground that O 9 r 13 (a) that the suit was barred on the ground that the inquiry on the merits it was held that the order was final but a purely interlocutory order to set aside an abatement on the ground that the suit was barred and the High Court reversed the order of the lower Court for permission to plead the merits and the merits and that the order of the lower Court was final. It has also been held that where the lower Court held that the suit was barred under O 2 r 2 (c) or that the plaintiff has no locus standi to maintain the suit, the decision of the lower Court remanded to the High Court is not final. But there is a conflict of authority. Some Courts dismiss a suit on the ground that it is barred and reversing the decision of the lower Court remand the suit to the lower Court. Some Courts hold that the order of the High Court is final in some cases holding that the order is final in others that it is final (a).

In an Allahabad case an application was made by the respondent to submit to arbitration. The appellant ground that the agreement not being under the seal of the company was invalid. On appeal the High Court reversed the order of the trial court and held that the agreement did not require to be under the seal of the company. The Full Bench of the High Court ordered that the respondent applied for leave to appeal to the Appellate Division. It was held by a Full Bench that the order was not a final order within the meaning of clause (a) of this section there being other important issues to be decided.

- (w) I A 1 17 All 11 s pr  
(x) tna d C pal v Najar Candra (1909) 3  
C 1 618  
(y) Jhaq d a v Saha, sm (19 1) 5 Cal W v  
80 611 C 6 ( 1) A, C 1 7  
(z) S jha I v Jhaq (19 0) 18 All 1 J 83 4  
1 C 204  
(a) (1901) S I A 9 34 23 All, 0 supra  
(b) Munt d D la v J me Sk ner (19 )  
47 All 33 86 I C 161 ( ) 1 4 263  
(c) Jhaad H s v Gob ad Krish a (1911) 33  
All 391 9 I C 93 1 Sahaq ga v  
v as mha (191 ) 33 311 0) 21 I C  
84

- (d) *Mel* *Cl* 1 v *J* 11 *J* 1  
190 80 I C 5 ( 1 ) A 1
- (e) *S* *R* *S* *gh* v *M* *I* *D* 11  
3 9 80 I C 300 ( 1 ) A  
( 1 B )
- (f) *M* *I* 1 v *C* *d* *s* *a* ( 1 ) 11 8 1  
*H* *th* *N* *a* v *M*  
(1903) *Al* 6 9 *Ba* *f* v  
*I* *t* (1903) *Al* 54 *Al* *C*
- (g) *S* *thappa* v *S* *bramanian* ( 1 ) 3 4  
*L* *S* 9 *I* *C* 334 ( 1 ) A 1  
*S* *n* *Lal* *I* *f* *j* *a* *a* (19 3) 4  
9 *I* *C* 87 ( 4 ) A A 110 [w]  
[application for decree under O 34 r  
a] [see barre 1]

issues of misrepresentation and fraud and leave to appeal was refused (h) Section 10, sub s (2) does not apply to appeals to His Majesty in Council (i)

An order of the High Court refusing to enrol a particular person as a legal practitioner under the Legal Practitioners Act 18 of 1879 is not one from which the High Court has jurisdiction to grant leave to appeal to the Privy Council. Such an order is one passed in the exercise of the administrative powers of the Court (j). An order refusing an application under s 40 of the Specific Relief Act 1 of 1877 is a final order (k)

**Order passed on appeal** — An order passed by a High Court rejecting an application to amend a decree is not an order passed on appeal within the meaning of cl (a) of this section and is therefore not appealable to His Majesty in Council. Moreover it is doubtful whether such an order is a final order (l). Similarly it has been held that an order made by a High Court refusing to admit an appeal presented after the expiration of the prescribed period is not an order passed on appeal within the meaning of this section (m). An order passed in revision does not fall under clause (b) (n).

**Any other Court of final appellate jurisdiction** — An appeal lies to the Privy Council from a final order of a District Judge (o) or of the Judicial Commissioners Court (p) made under s 104. See notes to s 104. Privy Council appeal.

**Limitation.**—The application for leave to appeal to the Privy Council must be made within 90 days from the date of the decree sought to be appealed from [Limitation Act 1908 Sch J art 179].

Under the Limitation Act of 1877 it was held that in computing the aforesaid period the time requisite for obtaining a copy of the decree appealed from could not be excluded as s 12 of that Act did not apply to such applications (q). It was also held that the application could not be admitted after the expiration of the aforesaid period, though there was sufficient cause for not presenting the application within the prescribed period as s 5 of the Act did not apply to such applications (r). Both these sections have now been amended in the Limitation Act of 1908 and they have been made applicable to applications for leave to appeal. The aforesaid decisions are therefore no longer law and it has now been expressly held that under s 12 of the Limitation Act of 1908 the time requisite to obtain a copy of the decree appealed from is to be excluded (s).

**Interlocutory Orders** — See cl 40 of the Letters Patent.

**Prerogative of the Crown** — The Code does not limit the prerogative of the Crown to admit an appeal. Hence special leave may be granted by the King in Council to appeal where leave has been refused by the High Court (t). But no special leave will as a rule be granted unless there is some substantial question of law or general interest involved (u). See s 112.

- (h) *Varmaiah v The Cane Sugar Works Ltd* (1910) 39 All 150 3 I C 360 [F B]
- (i) *Ahmad Hussain v Godind Krishna* (1911) 33 All 331 9 I C 83 *Venkatarang v Varaswami* (1915) 38 Mad 509 11 C 84 *Bruta v Bito* (1914) 46 Mad L J 357 78 I C 938 (-3) A M 01
- (j) *Sudhansu In re* (1911) 11 All 590 70 I C 17 (-2) A 1 003
- (k) *Alco L Ashdown & Co v Chief Post Office Authority* (1911) 43 Bom L J 115 61 I C 9 9 (21) A B 378
- (l) *Su de Koer v C. Ishwar* (1903) 30 Cal 679
- (m) *K. Roodas v C. P. da* (1903) 3 Bom 109
- (n) *Siraj Singh v J. A. Kumari* (1918) 48 All 6 90 I C 904 (-5) A A 20-
- (o) *Soodatma d v Ph. L. Au r* (1898) 9 All 41 5 I A 146

- (p) *Ramdas v Aushancho d* (1914) 51 I A 7 51 C 1 361 83 I C 1 (-1) A 20 95
- (q) *Mor bay v Gnanasham* (1891) 19 Bom 301 *Anderson v Fern m* (1891) 1 Mad 163 *Shib S nph v Ga dha p d gh* (1906) 8 All 391
- (r) *Singh Singh v Gandharp Singh* (1906) 8 All 391
- (s) *Abdullah v Admr Genl of Bengal* (1915) 4 Cal 35 4 I C 23 *Ram Sar p v Jawa t f a* (1915) 33 All 8 31 I C 906
- (t) *R. Jambhoy v Turner* (1901) 15 Bom 155 18 I A 6 *Ikrani H uq v Wukue* (1906) 33 All 891
- (u) *Mota Chand v G nra Prasad* (1901) 24 All 174 23 I A 40 *See also Sadayappa v Krishnamoorthy f ao* (1907) 30 Mad 185 at p 183 34 I A 93 99

Clause (c) Certificate as to fitness—Leave to appeal to the Privy Council may be granted (1) when a case fulfils the requirements of s 110 or (2) when it is *otherwise* a fit case for appeal to the Privy Council. In either case a certificate has to be granted by the High Court in the first case a certificate to the effect that the case fulfils the requirements of s 110 and is therefore a fit case for appeal to the Privy Council and in the second case that *for other reasons* it is a fit case for appeal to the Privy Council [see O 4, rr 23]. Clause (c) of the present section refers to the second class of cases. In this class of cases it is not necessary that the order should be a *final* one. Nor is it necessary that the value of the subject matter of the suit should be Rs 10,000 or upwards. (v) The only condition necessary is that the case should be a fit one for appeal to the Privy Council. Referring to this clause Lord Hobhouse said: "That is clearly intended to meet special cases—such for example as those in which the point in dispute is not measurable by money though it may be of great public or private importance" (w). This was amplified in a later case before the Judicial Committee where it was said that clause (c) contemplated cases in which it is impossible to define in money value the exact character of the dispute: there are questions as for example those relating to religious rites and ceremonies to caste and family rights or such matters as the reduction of the capital of companies as well as questions of wide public importance in which the subject matter in dispute cannot be reduced into actual terms of money" (x). Thus where a petition was made by a company for a certificate to appeal to the Privy Council on the ground that the financial and commercial position of the company might be seriously affected by the questions at issue and that those questions were of importance to Indian companies generally the High Court of Bombay granted the requisite certificate. The order sought to be appealed from in that case was an order dismissing a petition presented by the company for a confirmation of a special resolution altering the memorandum of association of the company (y). Similarly when a case involved a substantial question of law and the point in dispute though not measurable by money was of considerable importance namely the extent of the control acquired by one who had built a fire temple for Parsis at Udvarda the High Court of Bombay granted leave to appeal to the Privy Council (z). Similarly the question as to what is the legal position of a person who has collected the debts of a deceased person by virtue of his being a holder of a succession certificate under the Succession Certificate Act 1849 was held to be a substantial question of law of general public importance and leave to appeal was granted under cl (c) of this section (a). Leave to appeal was similarly granted where the question was whether a fraud practised by a mortgagor alone upon a Sub Registrar would vitiate registration and disentitle the innocent mortgagee from enforcing the mortgage (b) so also in a case involving the question whether it is necessary to register documents giving an option of repurchase (c). The mere existence of a substantial question of law is not sufficient to give the High Court jurisdiction to give leave to appeal under clause (c) of this section: the question must also be of great public or private importance (d). As to questions of private importance: meant private importance to both parties to the litigation and not only to one

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| (v) I am boy v T nee (1900) 14 B m 4 9<br>97 v I a i r a n g (19 ) 49 Cnl 06<br>0 I C 510 ( ) A C 4 9   | (z) War v F r a n s l i j (1901) 6 Rom L R<br>-96 in appe l fro t (1904) 5 B m 0   |
| (w) B r a P a r h i d v K a h K r a l a (1901)<br>3 1 A 11 13 -8 All 7  | (a) V a j V a s v I m m a (1916) 34 All<br>1-4 311 C 34  |
| (x) I a d h i h n a v S u r n a n (19 1) 49 I 1<br>41 43 44 M 1 23 9 F O I C R ( 1)<br>A I C 5 H j u l v J c d j (1915)<br>1 1 m L R 10 1 1033 1 I C 43<br>A l j p p a V a c h a p p a (19- ) 43 44d<br>L J -8 63 I C 34 ( ) A 31 1 | (b) D g p a l v P a b l a d (al (19 0) 19 All L J<br>13 54 I C 4   |
| (y) H h y B r r h T d g c o r p o r a t a v<br>D o r b j (1903) 2 B m 41  | (c) J q v J ( 19 ) 0 B m 3<br>100 I C 143 ( ) A R 19   |
|   | (d) M r i t j v B I i d (19 1) 6 P t L J<br>1 5 61 I C 663 ( 1) 4 1 33 J l a n g q B a<br>T h n v I n t e r C o c i j g u (19- )<br>H a n g 43 100 I C 697 ( ) A R 14<br>R u d h a v I m m a n (10 9) 50 All 640 104<br>I L 34 ( ) A 0 |

of them (e) The right of appeal to the Privy Council from a decision of the High Court upon a case stated under sec 66 of the Indian Income Tax Act 1922 is given by sec 66A ( ) only in a case which the High Court certifies to be a fit one for such an appeal. The High Court is justified in refusing a certificate in a case which in its view does not raise any question of such importance as would warrant a certificate under this clause. It is not sufficient that the requirements of sec 110 of the Code are satisfied (f).

The High Court has under this clause to certify that the case is a fit one for appeal to His Majesty in Council. To certify that a case is of that kind though it is left entirely in the discretion of the Court is a judicial process which could not be performed without special exercise of that discretion evinced by the fitting certificate (g). The certificate must make plain upon its face that the discretion conferred upon the High Court was invoked and was exercised (h). It is the certificate and not the order for the certificate which the Judicial Committee has to consider and act upon and unless the certificate upon which the leave to appeal is based is in such a form as to justify that leave it cannot be held that the leave was properly given (i).

As to certificate of fitness in the case of decrees passed by the High Court in appeals from the same decree see the underrmentioned (j). See also notes to O 45 r 3.

**110 [S 596]** In each of the cases mentioned in clauses (a) and (b) of section 109, the amount or value of the subject matter of the suit in the Court of first instance must be ten thousand rupees or upwards and the amount or value of the subject matter in dispute on appeal to His Majesty in Council must be the same sum or upwards,

or the decree or final order must involve, directly or indirectly, some claim or question to or respecting property of like amount or value,

and where the decree or final order appealed from affirms the decision of the Court immediately below the Court passing such decree or final order, the appeal must involve some substantial question of law.

O 45 rr 45—Pread O 45 rr 45 with this section

This section corresponds with s 596 of the Code of 1882 except that the words or final order have been added in paragraphs 2 and 3 after the word decree. See note to s 109 above. Difference between the old and the new section

- (a) *I J R ; see ray T n relala lam* (1934) 41  
Mid L J 17 I C 0 (3) 4 M  
3 leave r (33 d) J esia v Co mla  
clars (1934) 45 Mid I J 14 76 I C 511  
(3) A M 31 (all p to between tw  
temples of con kler blo a tiquity and  
con id rable importance—J e grant d)  
(f) *D the Cloth a d General M Ha Co v Inc me*  
*Tax Commis non Delhi* (1937) 41 A  
4 19 Lah 84 108 I C 156 (-7) A. PC  
(g) *I d u Parsh d v Kash Frishna* (1901) 3

- I 4 11 13 23 All  
(h) *Rafael J ay Sura Na* (1911) 48 I A  
41 44 314 43 80 I C 8 (-1) A. PC  
45 M Ha 3 B A 1 v S gh L Ich J  
(1901) (1) W A 0 6- I C 39  
(1) C 1  
(i) *Padma K. wala Das v Bal A ul Chand* (1901)  
31 A 15 1 J 3 All 41 418  
(j) *M Ja mal Wal Khan v M Kammat*  
*Mohi d D n* (1911) 3 All 14 7 I C  
13

**Construction of the section**—In a recent case the Judicial Committee said It must always be kept in view that no real mischief can arise from not allowing a very wide construction of the section because such cases if worthy of being tried by a higher tribunal can always be dealt with under sub sec (c) of s 109 (A)

**Date of valuation**—As regards the amount or value of the subject matter of the suit in the Court of first instance the material date is the date of the institution of the suit But there is a difference of opinion whether if interest or mesne profits are claimed in a suit and awarded by the decree the interest or mesne profits are to be calculated up to the date of the institution of the suit or up to the date of the decree See notes below Amount or value of the subject matter of the suit in the Court of first instance

As regards the amount or value of the subject matter in dispute on appeal to His Majesty in Council the material date is the date of the decree from which the appeal to His Majesty in Council is to be made (I)

As regards the value of property referred to in the second paragraph of this section the material date is the date of the decree from which the appeal to His Majesty in Council is to be made (m)

#### Value of subject matter of suit

**The amount or value of the subject matter of the suit in the Court of first instance**—In some cases the value of the subject matter in the suit in the Court of first instance may be over Rs 10 000 and the value of the subject matter in dispute on appeal to His Majesty in Council may be less than Rs 10 000 In some cases again the value of the subject matter in the suit in the Court of first instance may be less than Rs 10 000 and the value of the subject matter in dispute on appeal to His Majesty in Council may be over Rs 10 000 What the section requires is that the value of the subject matter of the suit in the Court of first instance must be over Rs 10 000 or upwards and the value also of the subject matter in dispute on appeal to His Majesty in Council must be Rs 10 000 or upwards The word and in the first paragraph of this section means and and not or (n)

**Mesne profits and interest**—The only class of cases under the head amount or value of the subject matter of the suit in the Court of first instance that present any difficulty are those which include a claim for interest or for mesne profits Prior to 1874 appeals to the Privy Council were governed by the Order in Council of April 10 1838 By that Order it was prescribed that the amount or value of the subject matter in dispute in appeal to His Majesty in Council must be Rs 10 000 or upwards It was accordingly held by the Privy Council in cases that interest on money claims and mesne profits of immovable property subsequent to the date of the institution of the suit actually awarded by the decree appealed from may be added in calculating the value of the matter in dispute on appeal to His Majesty in Council but not interest or mesne profits accruing subsequent to the decree and if that amount was Rs 10 000 or upwards a party was entitled to appeal though the value of the subject matter of the suit in the Court of first instance was less than Rs 10 000 (o) It was also held that in no case can the costs of the suit be added to the principal in calculating the appealable value (p) The condition

- (l) *Udovach d v P E G dar* (1955) 50 I A 207 211 8 Cal 60 655 83 I C 445 (5) A PC 19  
(d) *Goorooopasad v Jaggubhai der* (1860) 8 M I A 166 *Pam Kuma v Muhammad* (1904) 41 All 445 51 I C 96  
(m) *Su end a Nath v Dwarak Nath* (1917) 44 Cal 119 35 I C 60a *Raoof v Laxminaba* (1904) 44 Bom 101 55 I C 97a *S Agart v M Jeyya* (1926) 50 Bom 160 94 I C

- 55 (6) A B 6  
(n) *Mot Chand v G Nya Prasad* (1900) 21 All 174 9 I A 40  
(o) *Goorooopasad v Jaggubhai der* (1860) 8 M I A 166 163 *Doorga v Rama Nath* (1860) 8 M I A 6 261 *Gooroodas Jey v Goham Moulah* (186 ) Marshall's Rep 4  
(p) *Doorga Doss v Rama Nath* (1860) 8 M I A 6a

that the amount or value of the subject matter of the suit in the Court of first instance also should be Rs 10 000 or upwards was first prescribed by the Privy Council Appeals Act 6 of 1871 and it was subsequently introduced into s 595 of the Code of Civil Procedure 1877. The first authoritative decision on the meaning of the words amount or value of the subject matter of the suit in the Court of first instance is that of the Judicial Committee in *Mota Chand v Ganga Prasad* (q). In that case the Court of first instance passed a decree for the plaintiff for principal and interest up to the date of the decree amounting to Rs 9 496 with further interest up to the date of realization. From this decree the defendant appealed to the High Court and that Court reversed the decree and dismissed the suit with costs. The plaintiff then applied to the High Court for leave to appeal to His Majesty in Council. On behalf of the plaintiff it was contended that interest subsequent to the decree should be added to the sum of Rs 9 496 and that if that was done the value of the subject matter of the suit would exceed Rs 10 000. But this contention was overruled and the application was refused on the ground that the claim and decree in the original Court were for less than Rs 10 000. The plaintiff then applied to the King in Council for special leave to appeal but the application was refused. In delivering the judgment of the Board Lord Davey said: "In the present case the amount or value of the subject matter of the suit in the Court of first instance construing that in the manner most favourable to the proposed appellant was at the outside the amount for which he recovered his decree which was below Rs 10 000 amounting in round numbers I think to about Rs 9 500. It is conceived that the words construing that in the manner most favourable to the proposed appellant mean even by including interest subsequent to the suit and up to the decree. This decision is an authority for the proposition that interest subsequent to the decree cannot be included in calculating the amount of the subject matter of the suit (r). The High Court of Rangoon has held that interest from the date of the suit up to the date of the decree can be included in determining the amount of the subject matter of the suit (s)." (t)

As to suits for sale in the case of a mortgage there is a conflict of opinion whether interest subsequent to the decree of the Court of first instance can be included in calculating the amount of the subject matter of the suit. It has been held by the High Court of Allahabad that in calculating such amount the Court should include interest from the date of the decree [that is the preliminary decree] up to the expiry of the period of six months provided in O 34 r 4 (u). According to the Calcutta (v) and Patna (v) High Courts such interest should not be included in determining the appealable value.

It has been held by the High Court of Calcutta in two cases that in a suit for recovery of possession of immovable property with mesne profits the value of the subject matter of the suit consists of the value of the property plus mesne profits up to the date of the suit plus mesne profits from the date of the suit until delivery of possession or until the expiration of three years from the date of the decree with interest (w). The decision in the first Calcutta case (x) proceeded on the authority of *Mohideen v Pitchay* (y) a case under the Ceylon Ordinance No 1 of 1889 which does not impose any condition as to the amount or value of the subject matter of the suit in the Court of first instance. The decision in the later Calcutta case however was based on the terms of s 211 of the Code of 1882

(q) (190) 21 All 174 19 I A 40 (suit to recover damages for fraud)  
(r) *Maha ajah Kesho Prasad v Shri* (1918) 3 Pat L J 317 30 44 I C 475

(s) *Thams ndaseen v Chetty* (19) 3 Rang 405 91 I C 647 (26) A R 45

(t) *Gadhar v Ambika* (193) 45 All 133 69 I C 84 (23) A A 78 In *Ishmuntha s m v C Paul* (19—) 43 Mad L J 62 74 I C 600 (—) A M 135 the claim was for Rs 994 and interest. It was held that interest from date of suit up to the

date of the preliminary decree should be added. No question arose as to subsequent interest.

(u) *And Kishore v Pam G lam* (191) 39 Cal 1037 1040 17 I C 21

(v) *Pa vad v Pambhaja* (191) 6 Pat L J 598 6— I C 959 (1) A P 22

(w) *Dalglish v Damodar* (1908) 33 Cal 156 *Kumar Bastania v The Secretary of State* (1910) 11 Cal W N 87 6 I C 79

(x) (1906) 33 Cal 158

(y) [1893] A C 193

now O 20 r 12 ( ) The Calcutta decisions were dissented from by the High Court of Madras in *Subramania Iyyar v Sellammal (a)* where it was held that in calculating the amount of the subject matter of the suit in the Court of first instance mesne profits only up to the date of the institution of the suit can be added to the value of the property of which possession is claimed. The correctness of the Calcutta decisions was also doubted by the Patna High Court in *Vaharajah Kesho Prasad v Shiva (b)* but in later cases (c) the same High Court followed the Calcutta decisions having regard to the practice of that Court in matters of settled practice to follow the Calcutta High Court. The Bombay High Court follows the Madras ruling (d).

**COSTS**—Costs cannot be included in determining the amount of the subject matter of the suit (e).

The sum of money actually at stake may not represent the true value.—In *Patla Krishna v Sundaraswami (f)* their Lordships of the Privy Council said. The sum of money actually at stake may not represent the true value. The proceeding may in many cases such as a suit for an instalment of rent or under a contract raise the entire question of the contract relations between the parties and that question may settle one way or the other affect a much greater value and its determination may govern rights and liabilities of a value beyond the limit. It has thus been held that where the subject matter in dispute relates to a recurring liability and is in respect of a property above the appealable value the case is within the first paragraph of this section. Hence if the rent claimed in a suit is less than Rs 10 000 but the liability is of a recurring nature and the property is above that value the value of the subject matter must be deemed to be over Rs 10 000 (g). It cannot however be said where the suit is to enforce payment of an annuity of Rs 125 per annum that the value of the subject matter of the suit is Rs 10 000 or upwards for such an annuity cannot by any reasonable method of valuation be worth Rs 10 000 (h). Where the sole question was as to the destination of the income of the residue until the residuary attained twenty five and the aggregate amount of the income was less than Rs 10 000 it was held that the value of the subject matter (namely income) was less than Rs 10 000 though the value of the residue was over Rs 10 000 (i).

**Value as laid in plaint**—In suits relating to immovable property the value of the subject matter of the suit is the selling or market value and not the value as deduced from the amount of the stamp upon the plaint. Hence if in a suit for possession of immovable property the value of the property as laid in the plaint is under Rs 10 000 for the purpose of Court fee it is open to the applicant to show when applying for a certificate for leave to appeal to the Privy Council that the market value of the property was Rs 10 000 or upwards (j). But a defendant who had previously adopted the value given in the

(2) (1910) 14 Cal W N 8 6 I C 9

( ) (1916) 3 Mad 843 31 I C 96

(b) (1918) 3 Pat L J 317 30 44 I C 475

(c) *Udhali Prasad v Anip Na a* (1919) 3 Pat L J 377 46 I C 137 *Madras v Kishnude* (1911) 6 Pat L J 46 63 I C 49 (1) 1 1

(d) *Sehagpur v Ma j rya* (1906) 50 Bom 160 64 I C 75 ( ) A B 6

(e) *Falinda P lacy v B ri Varman* (19 ) 6 Pat 411 104 I C 67 (7) A P 3 R

(f) (19 ) 4 I A 11 16 4 Mal 475 491 74 I C 551 (3) A I C 57

(g) *Sripal v Lam ayan* (1931) 50 I A 155 60 Cal 604 73 I C 193 (3) A PL 88 *Padhalakrishna v Sundaraswami* (19 ) 49 I A 11 45 31 4 475 74 I C 281 (3) A I C 7 but also *S ramani v Mahara j Sutte a h der* (1860) 6 M I A 16 168 S also *Kast rbi*

*v Hirai* (19 ) 4 Bom L R 30 67 I C 938 (3) A B 3 The decision in *Dha a Val v Jlot* (1911) 6 Lah L J 78 I C 64 (3) A L 236 seems to be of doubtful authority

(h) *Muzra Abd v Ahmat Hu ain* (1903) 45 Mad L J 3 51 I C 50 (3) A PC 10 [P C] It would require 60 years purchase to make it Rs 10 000

(i) *Hu embloy v Ahmedbloy* (190 ) 6 Bom 319

(j) *Moh a Lal v E bee Doss* (1860) 7 M I A 43 *Lek j loy v Kanhya Singh* (1871) 11 I A 317 *Gourm ny v Abdul* (1860) 8 M I A 263 *Pich a v S rajani* (189 ) 1 Mad 37 *Hari Moh v end a Na ain* (1901) 31 Cal 301 *Na endra Nath v Darka Nath* (1917) 44 Cal 119 32 I C 60 *Nauca Ali v Abu* (1923) 4 Lah 185 7 I C 50 (1) A L 8

plaint for the purpose of an appeal preferred by him to the High Court should not be allowed to contest that valuation on a petition by the plaintiff for leave to appeal to His Majesty in Council on the principle that a party cannot both approbate and reprobate (l)

It has been held by the High Court of Bombay that where in a suit for accounts the plaintiff values his claim for less than Rs 5 000 and institutes his suit in a Court of the Second Class Subordinate Judge whose pecuniary jurisdiction is limited to Rs 5 000 he cannot be heard to say that the amount of the subject matter is Rs 10 000 or upwards (l) In the course of the judgment Beaman J said The amount or value of the subject matter of a suit can in no case exceed the limits of the pecuniary jurisdiction of the Court in which it is instituted It follows that the amount or value of the subject matter of a suit for the purposes of s 109 clause (a) and (b) and s 110 of the Civil Procedure Code if that suit is instituted in a Court the pecuniary limits of whose jurisdiction is Rs 5 000 can never be greater than Rs 5 000 It is different however where a suit is for an injunction and a declaration relating to immovable property for such a suit according to the Bombay decisions may be brought in the Court of a Second Class Subordinate Judge though the value of the property may exceed Rs 5 000 In such a case it has been held that the case does not fall under the first paragraph of this section but that it falls under the second paragraph and that the plaintiff is not precluded from showing that the decree involved some claim or question to property of the value of Rs 10 000 or upwards within the meaning of the second paragraph (m)

In a suit for a general account against a trustee which charges him also with specific items of malversation each item of malversation does not constitute a distinct subject matter (n)

*Value of subject matter in dispute on appeal to Privy Council*

The amount or value of the subject matter in dispute on appeal to His Majesty in Council —Not only the amount or value of the subject matter of the suit in the Court of first instance but the amount or value of the subject matter in dispute on appeal to His Majesty in Council must be Rs 10 000 or upwards The word and in the first paragraph of the section cannot be read as or (o) The words amount or value of the subject matter in dispute on appeal to His Majesty in Council mean the amount or value at the date of the High Court decree under appeal (p) A sues B to recover Rs 10 800 The trial Judge passes a decree for A for Rs 8 280 with interest at the rate of 6 per cent per annum from the date of suit till the date of realization B appeals from the decree to the High Court and A's suit is dismissed A appeals for leave to appeal to His Majesty in Council If interest were to be added to the decretal amount Rs 8 280 the valuation of the proposed appeal to the Privy Council would be over Rs 10 000 Is A entitled to add the interest? The Allahabad Court has held that he is not (q)

A mortgages his property to B C claims that a portion of the property of the value of about Rs 6 000 belongs to him and that it did not belong to A B then sues A on the mortgage the mortgage debt being Rs 38 000 and joins C as a defendant A decree is passed in favour of B on the mortgage C's claim is allowed in part by the Court of first instance but it is disallowed altogether by the High Court Is C entitled to appeal to the King in Council? No because though the amount of the decree passed in favour

(l) *Kristo Indro v Humones* (1871) 1 I A 84  
*Moolia & Sons v Leon Shum Sw y* (19 6) 4 Rang 9\* 98 I C 107 (-6) A R 138

(l) *Hijabai v Jamshedji* (1913) 15 Bom L R 101 21 I C 783 See notes to s 6 Pecuniary limits for passing decrees

(m) *Mohani v Ba Kesh* (1916) 40 Bom 477

37 I C 371

(n) *Sanda v Kal a dia* (1900) 5 K.L. 9  
(o) *3rd Chand v Ganga Prasad* (1907) 127 174 23 I A 40  
(p) *Gooroo persad v Juggutichunder* (190 1) 11 I A 164  
(q) *Ram Kumar v Jil Hammat* (1907) 127 445 55 I C 9 d



of *A* exceeds Rs 10 000 the value of *C*'s claim is less than Rs. 10 000 (r) Note that *C* ought not to have been joined as a party to the suit at all [see notes to O 34 r 1 Persons having an interest etc.]

Single decree in several appeals—*A* claiming to be the next reversioner on the death of a Hindu widow sues *B C* and *D* being alienees of separate items of the estate of the last male holder and obtains a decree against them *B C* and *D* prefer separate appeals which are all disposed of by one decree *A* applies for leave to appeal to His Majesty in Council from the decision as to the items in possession of *B* and *D* The claims against the several alienees being based on really different causes of action the fact that only one appellate decree was drawn up does not affect the requirements of this section and consequently no leave can be granted in such of the appeals in which the value of the subject matter was below Rs 10 000 (s)

Abandonment of appeal in part after grant of certificate—*A* obtains a decree against *B* for Rs 11 000 *B* applies for leave to appeal from the decree to the Privy Council and a certificate is granted Afterwards in the printed case and at the hearing *B* withdraws part of his appeal reducing by so doing the amount in dispute to Rs 9 000 Does this render the appeal incompetent? No if *B* had a bona fide intention when he applied for a certificate to appeal in respect of the whole amount of the decree (t)

#### Claim to property of value of Rs 10 000 or upwards

Or the decree or final order must involve directly or indirectly some claim or question to property of the value of Rs 10 000 or upwards—The decree or final order referred to in the second paragraph of the section is the decree or final order from which the appeal is to be preferred to the Privy Council The material date for determining the value of the property under this paragraph is the date of that decree or order (u)

Note that the expression used in the second paragraph of this section is "property" while that used in the first paragraph is "subject matter of the suit and subject matter in dispute on appeal to His Majesty in Council. It has been held by the High Court of Madras (1) that the second paragraph of this section applies only to cases which involve some claim or question to or respecting property additional to the actual subject matter in dispute in the appeal and to be taken into account therewith in making up the appealable value or it may possibly also apply to cases involving claims incapable of a money valuation such as claims to easements and the like but apart from this if nothing beyond the actual subject matter in dispute is involved the first paragraph of the section alone applies. This decision is at variance with the view expressed by Maclean C J at the end of his judgment in *Dalglish v Damodar* (w) but that part of the judgment of the learned Chief Justice was an obiter dictum not supported by reasons. In a recent Patna case (x) Miller C J expressed his preference for the view taken by the Madras High Court The Madras view has also been adopted by the Rangoon High Court (y) In *Udaychand v P L Gudar* ( ) the plaintiff brought a suit to set aside an award in favour of the defendant for Rs 3 900 The trial Judge set aside the award, but the appellate Court reversed the decree and dismissed the suit The plaintiff applied for leave to appeal to His Majesty in Council alleging that if the appeal succeeded he could proceed with a suit which had been stayed in which he had claimed Rs 81 000 as

(r) *Patil Kuvu v Prot Singh* (1916) 33 All 433 1 A 187 35 I C 939  
(s) *Radhu v Somasudam* (1919) 4 L Mad 40 1 C 431  
(t) *K Ika Singh v J and Jam* (1925) 23 Cal 431 1 A 68  
(u) *Sundar Nath v Dwarika Nath* (1917) 44 Cal 119 35 I C 60 *P. v. Laxmidevi* (1907) 41 Bom 301 35 I C 97

(v) *Subram v Aravar v Sellammal* (1916) 29 Mad 813 816 819 31 I C 96  
(w) (1906) 33 Cal 136  
(x) *M. A. v. A. v. M. A. v. S. A.* (1914) 31 I C 31 33 I C 43  
(y) *Moodi v. Le. S. A. v. S. A.* (1906) 41 I C 10 10 I C 10  
(z) (1907) 41 I C 10 10 I C 10

damages against the defendant for breach of the contract which had led to the reference to arbitration. The High Court refused leave and the plaintiff applied for special leave to appeal from the decree of the High Court. The Judicial Committee held that the plaintiff's claim upon the contract was too remote to be considered as being property indirectly involved within the meaning of this section and the petition was dismissed. Their Lordships said: "Their Lordships are not inclined to attempt any precise definition of the word property. The Civil Procedure Code has not done so and any definition might not be found in the future precisely to fit the circumstances which the kaleidoscope of actual experience may produce. But they think that the present is not a case where the issue of this suit can be said directly or indirectly to involve other property. Let the situation be considered. If this appeal were allowed and were successful what would be the position?"

Their Lordships think that this is not really consequential on the present decree and too remote to be entitled to the description of being property indirectly involved in the issue of this suit.

Where the plaintiff a tenant in common obtained a decree against the defendant another tenant in common for a mandatory injunction directing the defendant to demolish buildings erected by the defendant on a plot of common land the buildings being worth more than Rs. 10,000 the High Court granted leave to the defendant to appeal to the Privy Council though the subject matter of the suit was valued for purposes of court fees at Rs. 1,000 (a). Similarly where the plaintiff obtained a decree for possession of a piece of land worth Rs. 2,000 and the result of the decree was to oblige the defendant to remove buildings worth more than Rs. 10,000 which the defendant had built on the land leave was granted to appeal to the Privy Council (b). Where the value of the subject matter of the suit was below Rs. 10,000 but the effect of a deed of gift with regard to the construction of which there was a dispute would govern the ownership of property worth five lac a certificate of appeal was granted (c). Similarly where the value of the subject matter in dispute on appeal to His Majesty in Council was below Rs. 10,000 but the proposed appeal to His Majesty in Council involved a decision as to the validity of an award which dealt with property worth over Rs. 10,000 a certificate of appeal was granted (d).

A sues B for a declaration that he is entitled to a one-third share in the property in suit and for a decree for partition and for delivery of his share to him. The property exceeds Rs. 10,000 in value but the share claimed by A is of a value less than Rs. 10,000. A decree is passed for A as prayed. B then applies for leave to appeal to His Majesty in Council. Does the decree involve a claim or question to property of a value exceeding Rs. 10,000? Yes according to the Calcutta High Court (e). No according to the Bombay High Court unless there be other property outside the subject matter in dispute which can be affected by the decision (f). In one of the Bombay cases (g) Jenkins C.J. held that in order to determine the value prescribed by this section the decree has to be looked at as it affects the interests of the parties prejudiced by it and where the detriment to the party seeking relief is estimated at less than Rs. 10,000 then the value of the matter in dispute in appeal is not of the prescribed value and the decree itself does not involve any claim or question to or respecting property of the prescribed value and the case does not fulfil the requirements of the section. The Patna High Court has followed the Bombay decisions (h).

(a) *Am. Chandra v. Shashi Bhushan* (1904) 31 Cal. 30 (I.C.)

(b) *Sremuth v. Jaganappa* (1911) 34 Mad. 53 (I.C. 31)

(c) *Alma v. Hanba* (1896) 1 Cal. W. N. 1332 (I.C. 31) also *B. p. n. d. v. p. z.* (19 ) C. I. W. N. 618 (I.C. 531) (33)

(d) *A. C. 41. H. gappa v. Vachappa* (19 ) 43 Mad. L. J. 363 (I.C. 395) (33)

(e) *S. K. v. A. K.* (1913) 3 All. 415

(f) *De Silva v. De Silva* (1904) 6 Bom. L. R. 403 (I.C. 31) also *B. p. n. d. v. p. z.* (19 ) 44 Bom. 101 (I.C. 31)

(g) *Lala Bhugnat v. Lal Pashupati* (1906) 10 C. W. N. 561

(h) *De Silva v. De Silva* (1904) 6 Bom. L. R. 403 (I.C. 31) also *B. p. n. d. v. p. z.* (19 ) 44 Bom. 101 (I.C. 31)

(i) (1904) 6 Bom. L. R. 403 (I.C. 31)

(j) *Gosa v. Bha n. v. Bha n. Lal* (1919) 4 Pat. L. J. 41 (I.C. 31)

The High Court of Bombay has also held that in a suit by a partner for accounts and for recovery of his share it is the value of the plaintiff's share that must be looked to and not the value of the whole of the partnership assets (i). It appears however from a judgment of the same High Court in the undermentioned case (j) that if *A* sues *B* claiming the exclusive use of a well and compound valued at Rs. 10,000 odd and the High Court holds that *A* and *B* are equally entitled to the user the decree must be deemed to involve property of the value of Rs. 10,000 odd so as to entitle *A* to a certificate for leave to appeal to His Majesty in Council.

In a suit for an easement of light and air claimed by the owner of property *A* against the owner of property *B* it is the value of the easement and not the value of property *A* that determines the appealable value (k). In a recent Bombay case (l) *B* sued *A* for possession under the Bombay Rent Act 2 of 1918. The rent of the portion occupied by *B* was Rs. 275 per month. The High Court on appeal decreed *A*'s suit. It was held that as the rent capitalized at 20 years purchase amounted to upwards of Rs. 10,000 the decree involved indirectly a claim respecting property of the value of over Rs. 10,000 and that *B* was entitled to leave to appeal to His Majesty in Council (l). In a Lahore case however where *A* sued to eject *B* alleging that *B* was a tenant at will and *B* contended that he was a permanent tenant paying an annual rent of Rs. 1,200 the Court held that the issue in the suit namely whether *B* was a permanent tenant or a tenant at will did not involve any question respecting property of the value of Rs. 10,000 or upwards (m).

#### *Where subject matter of suit not capable of valuation*

Where the matter is under the appealable value or is not capable of valuation—In such a case a party desirous of appealing to the Privy Council may apply for a certificate that the case is a fit one for appeal to His Majesty in Council under s. 109 cl. (c) (n). See notes to s. 109. Certificate as to fitness.

#### *Decree of affirmance*

Where the decree appealed from affirms the decision of the Court immediately below the Court passing such decree.—In this case it is not enough that the appeal involves some substantial question of law. It is also necessary that the amount of the subject matter of the suit and of the subject matter in dispute on appeal must be Rs. 10,000 or upwards or that the decree must involve some claim to property of like amount. The existence of a question of law of itself does not give a right of appeal in the ordinary course of procedure under this section (o). This is clear from the word "and" with which the last paragraph of this section begins.

Privy Council have held that the word "decision" in this clause means merely the decision of the suit and cannot like the word "judgment" be defined as meaning the statement of the *grounds* on which the Court proceeds to pass the decree. It follows from this that in order to affirm the decision of the Court below it is sufficient if the appellate Court affirms the *decree* of the Court below. It need not also affirm the *grounds of fact* on which the judgment was passed. Thus where the decree of the appellate Court was that the appeal be dismissed but the reasons given were not the same as

(i) *Narayan H. Shamji* (1911) 49 I.M. 149 8  
 (j) *App. v. L. K. J.* (1913) 1 N.L.  
 (k) *Sh. J. J. J.* (1911) 1 N.L.  
 (l) *Sh. J. J. J.* (1911) 1 N.L.  
 (m) *Sh. J. J. J.* (1911) 1 N.L.  
 (n) *Sh. J. J. J.* (1911) 1 N.L.  
 (o) *Sh. J. J. J.* (1911) 1 N.L.

(i) *Narayan H. Shamji* (1911) 49 I.M. 149 8  
 (j) *App. v. L. K. J.* (1913) 1 N.L.  
 (k) *Sh. J. J. J.* (1911) 1 N.L.  
 (l) *Sh. J. J. J.* (1911) 1 N.L.  
 (m) *Sh. J. J. J.* (1911) 1 N.L.  
 (n) *Sh. J. J. J.* (1911) 1 N.L.  
 (o) *Sh. J. J. J.* (1911) 1 N.L.

the effect of the lower Court in respect of some matters of fact it was held that the decision of the Court below was affirmed within the meaning of this section and that no certificate should be granted unless the appeal involved a substantial question of law (p). Nor is it necessary in order to affirm the decision of the Court below that the findings of the appellate Court should coincide in terms with that of the Court below: it is sufficient if the findings of fact of the two Courts are in effect the same (q). And it has been held that a decree of the High Court dismissing an appeal for want of prosecution of the appellants not having supplied their counsel with materials upon which to argue the appeal when it was called for hearing is a decree affirming the decision of the Court below (r). Where the appellate Court agrees with the finding of the Court below upon the merits but varies the order as to costs (s) or awards simple interest from a certain date instead of compound interest (t) or allows a cross appeal modifying the decree to the extent of P. 300 (u) it amounts to an affirmation of the decision of the lower Court.

In a Calcutta case (i) under the Land Acquisition Act the applicant claimed Rs 77 000 and odd as compensation but the Collector awarded him Rs 28 The Judge on reference to him upheld the Collector's award The applicant then appealed to the High Court valuing the appeal at Rs 40 000 and odd being the difference between the two sums The High Court increased the amount of compensation by about Rs 7 000 It was held that the decree of the High Court was in affirming decree and leave to appeal to the Privy Council was refused The High Court of Allahabad has held that where the decree appealed from varies the decision of the Court below to the prejudice of the applicant the decree is not a decree of affirmance (w) but it is a decree of affirmance if the variation is in favour of the applicant (x) In *Innapurnabas v Purnao* (y) A alleging that he was adopted by the senior widow of one Shanker sued the junior widow and another for possession of property of over Rs 10 000 in value The junior widow denied the adoption and further she claimed to be entitled to Rs 3 000 per annum for her maintenance The first Court held that the plaintiff's adoption was proved but decreed to the widow Rs 500 per annum as maintenance The Appellate Court increased the maintenance to Rs 1 000 per annum but in all other respects affirmed the decision of the first Court The defendant applied for leave to appeal to the Privy Council but the application was rejected The defendants then applied to the Privy Council for special leave to appeal It was argued on behalf of the defendants that the value of the subject matter of the suit exceeded Rs 10 000 as also the subject matter of the proposed appeal and that even if the maintenance alone was regarded as in dispute its value having regard to the widow's prospects of life exceeded Rs 10 000 This contention was upheld and special leave to appeal was granted but the appeal was limited to the question as to the maintenance allowance

In a suit by *A* against *B* a decree is passed in *A*'s favour. *B* appeals from the decree but the appeal is dismissed by the lower appellate Court. *B* then appeals to the High Court. The appeal is heard by a single Judge of the High Court who reverses the decree of the lower appellate Court. From this judgment *A* appeals to the High Court under clause 15 of the Letters Patent with the result that the judgment of the single Judge is reversed by a Bench of two Judges. *B* applies for leave to His Majesty in Council. Here the decree appealed from is the decree passed by the Bench of two Judges of the High

- (p) *Tay a q q I ha Pan* (1903) AH 103  
30 I 4 3 12 q q I I Hyde F  
(1884) 16 Cal 47 would seem to be no  
1 r l w  
(q) *Tl p a w Cuic ita Iray e js Co* (1904)  
1 1 1 3  
(r) *L n I a I I h a* (1904) O AH 36  
(s) *Ch e I n M l mel* (1911) 5 Cal L J  
33 63 I C 40 ( ) A C 316  
(t) *I h I n I h I a* (1911) I R no  
1 1 1 4 I L 40
- ( ) *I a th n S t r m n* (1 8) I Mad  
I J 9 97 I C 3 (9) A M 10 5  
(e) *P a s e e a I j y* ( ) *Secret ry of St te*  
(1904) 8 C W n 24  
(o) *Bh a a I y I e* 11 n a I Pa t  
(1911) 43 AH 0 64 I C 3 (1) A A  
- 0  
(x) *I m t h* *F u l a D a s* (19 ) 44 AH  
00 64 I C 916 (2?) A A 4  
(y) (19 4) 51 I A 311 51 Cal 963 ( ) A  
1 6

Court The Court immediately below the Court constituted by the two Judges is the lower appellate Court and not the Court constituted by the single Judge of the High Court This therefore is a case in which the decree appealed from affirms the decision of the Court immediately below and no leave to appeal can therefore be granted unless the appeal involves some substantial question of law The above result follows from the fact that the Code makes no provision for an appeal within the High Court that is to say from a single Judge of the High Court the right of appeal from the judgment of a single Judge of the High Court is conferred by cl 15 of the Letters Patent (\*)

### *Judicial Committee and concurrent findings of facts*

Rule of Judicial Committee in cases of concurrent findings of fact when the appeal before the committee fails on the question of law on which leave to appeal was granted—The Judicial Committee has undoubtedly power as a Court of review to review the concurrent findings of facts of the lower Court though the appeal before it may fail on the question of law on which leave to appeal was granted But as a general rule the Committee will not interfere with the findings on the ground that where the question is one of fact it is a question of the weight and credibility of evidence upon which a Court of review can never be in quite as good a position to form an opinion as the Court of first instance (a) In *Umrao Begum v Irshad Usain* (b) Lord Hobhouse in delivering the judgment of the Board said The question is not only a question of fact but it is one which embraces a great number of facts whose significance is best appreciated by those who are most familiar with Indian manners and custom Their Lordships would be specially unwilling in such a case to depart from the general rule which forbids a fresh examination of facts for the purpose of disturbing concurrent findings by the lower Court The mere fact that the lower Courts do not agree on all the steps which lead to one and the same conclusion is no reason for disregarding the said rule (c) It cannot detract from the weight of concurrent findings of fact that different Courts in arriving at the same result upon the same evidence have not been influenced by precisely the same considerations A difference of opinion to that extent is only calculated to suggest that the evidence whatever view be taken of it must necessarily lead to one and the same inference (d) The circumstance that the trial Judge based his findings on oral evidence while the finding of the Appellate Court was based on documents is not a ground for interference (e) Sometimes the nature of the question may be such (as where the question is whether a deed of gift was executed by a Mahomedan under apprehension of death) that the Judicial Committee will not interfere with concurrent findings of the lower Courts on that question even where the evidence is such as to justify either view (f)

The rule [above referred to] however is not an absolute rule it prevails upon the appellant with more or less weight according to the circumstances of the case and no doubt the fact that the Courts have differed on some important but subordinate questions is a matter to be taken into consideration in determining whether the evidence before the lower Courts should be reviewed in detail (g) Thus concurrent findings of facts have been allowed to be disputed where the question of fact appeared to be a good deal mixed up with law (h) They have also been allowed to be disputed where the decisions though ultimately one of fact turned upon the admissibility or value of many subordinate

(2) *D be dra v th v B in dhend a* (1916) 43 Cal 99 31 C 4

(3) *F i a B b v thmet Jal h* (1908) 3 Cal 1 35 I A 6 *Alaomed* 414  
*Wul m st naph i* (19 9) 33 C W 6  
 6 115 I C 20 (9) A PC 63

(b) (1894) 1 Cal 99 *11 I 163 Jf i g Tha*  
*Uo g Ia* (1901) 8 Cal 1 2 I A  
 106 171 I A 43 *d a nara n* (1904)  
 31 C 18 1 31 I A 1 *S da el ja v*  
*I mar m* (190) 31 I 51 81 A 55

(c) *Sa wal S gh v d truz a* (1900) 4 All 1

(1) *tp IS gh v B a r B R A* (1907) 29 All 19

(d) *Wmo S nph v k rt Chu d Chowd J*  
 (1903) 30 C 1 84 8 01 A 9

(e) *Bhagvan S nph Allahad al B k* (19 6)  
 63 I A 43 All 83 98 I C 901

(f) *P t ma B i v t d B i l h a* (1908) 3 Cal 1 3 I A 6

(g) *Ch ipal v nph v B h i Ba l A h* (1906) 3 All 19

(h) *I lam v Ia i e* (18 ) 4 I A 102 1 Mad

facts and involved the construction of documents and other questions of law (1). In a recent case their Lordships of the Privy Council said: "If it appears that underlying findings of fact there are questions of law on which the finding proceeded or that there is a case that the judges misdirected themselves then the rule as to concurrent findings not being the subject of appeal does not apply to the exclusion of such grounds of law as are alluded to (2)."

according to the Allahabad High Court (t) Yes according to the Calcutta High Court (u) In a Bombay case Ranade J accepted the view of the Calcutta High Court Jardine J did not express any opinion (z)

*Substantial question of law*—These words do not mean a question of general importance but a substantial question of law as between the parties in the case involved (w). The application of well defined legal principles to a particular set of facts does not raise a substantial question of law (x). The rejection of an application under O 41 r 27 for the reception of additional evidence does not involve a substantial question of law (y) nor the omission to state reasons in an appellate judgment as required by O 41 r 31 (z) nor the dismissal of an appeal for default in furnishing security for costs under O 41 r 10 (a). The question whether a tenancy is one at will or permanent is a substantial question of law (b) and so is the question whether the rules of the Mahomedan law as to pre-emption apply to an estate which comprises in part movable property (c) and so is a question of limitation especially where it affects the period of limitation for appeals to a Bench from judgments of the original side of the Rangoon High Court (d). But awarding the mortgage rate of interest at 9 per cent per annum from the date of the suit is not such an arbitrary and unwarrantable exercise of discretion under section 34 as to constitute a substantial question of law (e).

## References

**Review**—An order granting leave to appeal to the Privy Council is open to review (f)

## 1 year

**Appeal**—See notes to O 45 r 3 Appeal

## Judicial Committee and appeals from India

**Rules of the Judicial Committee in appeals from India —**

- (1) A point not raised in the plaint before the District Judge or before the High Court cannot be raised before the Judicial Committee (g)
- (2) The Judicial Committee will not disturb the findings of the Court below upon mere issues of fact unless it is clearly satisfied that there has been some miscarriage in the reception or in the appreciation of evidence (h)
- (3) In appeal from second appeals the findings of fact by the first Court are binding on the Judicial Committee unless special leave to appeal from the decision of the first Court has been given (i)
- (4) The Judicial Committee will not criticise with any strictness opinions as to the credibility of witnesses which is eminently a question for the Courts in India (j)

- (f) *B ke Lal v Jag t Varsa* (1901) 3 All 91  
64 J 19 v 117 (1910) 12 All 10  
64 J 19 v 117 (1910) 12 All 10  
(u) *Mor v Vut* (18 ) (a) A (op Vath  
v Col k A Ander (1889) 16 Cal )  
not  
(r) *Iskramil h v re* (1916) 0 Bom 699  
(w) *Pagh aih v D p t Commissioner* (19 )  
54 I A 1 6 2 Luck 93 10 I C 849  
(7) 4 I C 110  
(z) *M th a v J glo* (19-8) 0 All 08 107  
1 I C 33 ( ) 4 61  
(y) *I mch d in th gois* of (1994) 01 Cal  
431  
(z) *S d r Bal v Buthak* (198 ) 9 All 93  
( ) *M Hammal Secretary of State* (1914) 36  
All 5-5 01 I C 3  
(b) *Nar d Vath v Dwa ka Vath* (1917) 44  
Cal 119 35 I C 80  
( ) *Syed Khan v Syed Ebrahim* (19 ) 6 Rang  
189 110 I C 380 ( ) A R 23  
(d) *Surti v Chett v Purn* (19 5) 4 Rang -05  
98 I C 417 ( ) A R 20  
(e) *B g t Si gh v Jai I a* (1915) P H n )  
p 1-2 0 I C 40  
(f) *C rinath v Col ck A Ander* (1899) 16 Cal  
V note  
(g) *S mtham Vath v S rj mont* (1908) 0 C I  
147 4 I A 101  
(h) *I chard v Go ernme t* (1864) 1 W R P C  
4 ( ) *Aryt Kam v t medh* *Nour t lam*  
(1854) 7 M I 20  
(i) *I a guma jari v Trip a* (1837) 11 C I  
40 141 4 101 L Amos 3 gh v P a  
(1932) 18 Cal 1 16 I A 1  
(j) *Sh gh-a-a v Sh la* (1901) -5  
All 381

- (a) As to the circumstances in which the Judicial Committee will allow a re hearing see the undermentioned cases (l)
- (6) In appeals involving questions of valuation the decree complained of will not be interfered with by the Privy Council unless some erroneous principle has been invoked or some important piece of evidence has been overlooked or misapprehended (f)

11

**111 [ S 597 ]** Notwithstanding anything contained in section 109 no appeal shall lie to His Majesty in Council—

Bar of certain appeals

- (a) from the decree or order of one Judge of a High Court established under the Indian High Courts Act, 1861 or the Government of India Act, 1915, or of one Judge of a Division Court, or of two or more Judges of such High Court, or of a Division Court constituted by two or more Judges of such High Court, where such Judges are equally divided in opinion, and do not amount in number to a majority of the whole of the Judges of the High Court at the time being, or
- (b) from any decree from which under section 102 no second appeal lies

**Amendment**—The word and figure or the Government of India Act 1915 were inserted in the section by the Amending Act 13 of 1916

**Decree or order**—In cl (a) the words decree or order have been substituted for the word judgment which occurred in the corresponding s 597 of the Code of 1889 See notes to s 109 under the head Difference between the old and the new section

**Appeal from a decree of a single Judge**—Clauses 15 and 36 of the Letters Patent of the Presidency High Courts and the corresponding clauses of the Letters Patent of the other High Courts were amended by the Orders in Council dated the 3rd November 1907 The effect of these amendments was considered by Rankin C.J. in a recent Calcutta case (m) In the course of the judgment the learned Judge said — Section 111 of the Code however definitely prohibits an appeal to the Privy Council from a single Judge and to this extent overrides clause 39 of the Letters Patent The section is not a mere provision that nothing in the previous section shall be deemed to give a right of appeal from the decision of a single Judge The provisions of clause (a) of section 111 may have been motivated originally by the existence of the right of Letters Patent appeal [cf *Sabhapathi Chetti v Varayanarasami Chetti*] (n) or by the opinion that it is not reasonable in Indian cases that the Privy Council should be called upon to decide cases until a Bench has dealt with them But in any case the effect of section 111 upon

(l) *Paj dera v Raj v Raja G. R. S. G.* (1938) 1 Moo 1 C 11 1 em 1a v ras  
1889 C 11 of Ward (1889) 11 App Cas  
600 *P. m. Var g n Singh v Adh d a*  
v th (1917) 48 1 A 57 44 Cal 344 78 1  
C 93

(h) *Amam v Collector of Nagpore* (1909) 42  
Cal L.J. 93 114 1 C. 537 (29) A P. 9  
(m) *S. R. d. A. v Dalimudd* (1929) 56 Cal  
51 519-520 113 1 C. 49 (23) A C 610  
(n) (1901) 25 Mad 555 503



2 clause 39 of the Letters Patent cannot now be controlled by such considerations [Safyanarayana I araprasada v Venkata Bhasya Karla] (c) It appears to me therefore that the new clause in the Letters Patent takes away in all second appeals decided by a single Judge (without his giving a certificate that the case is a fit one for appeal) the right to go to the Privy Council under the ordinary law though the right of the judicial Committee to give special leave is not of course affected That right was a limited and a qualified right but such as it was it was open to the party prior to the 14th January 1928

**112** [S 616] (1) Nothing contained in this Code shall  
 Savings be deemed—

- (a) to bar the full and unqualified exercise of His Majesty's pleasure in receiving or rejecting appeals to His Majesty in Council or otherwise howsoever, or
- (b) to interfere with any rules made by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and for the time being in force, for the presentation of appeals to His Majesty in Council, or their conduct before the said Judicial Committee

(2) Nothing herein contained applies to any matter of criminal or admiralty or vice admiralty jurisdiction, or to appeals from orders and decrees of Prize Courts

Clause (1) (a)—See notes to s 109 Prerogative of the Crown

## PART VIII

## Reference, Review and Revision

**113** [S 617] Subject to such conditions and limitations as may be prescribed, any Court 11  
Reference to High Court may state a case and refer the same for the opinion of the High Court, and the High Court may make such order thereon as it thinks fit

Reference to High Court—See O 46 below

Benares State Court—The High Court of Allahabad has no power to entertain a reference on an application submitted to His Highness the Maharaja of Benares in a civil case from the Benares State Court (p)

**114** [S 623] Subject as aforesaid, any person con-  
Review sidering himself aggrieved—

- (a) by a decree or order from which an appeal is allowed by this Code but from which no appeal has been preferred,
- (b) by a decree or order from which no appeal is allowed by this Code, or
- (c) by a decision on a reference from a Court of Small Causes,

may apply for a review of judgment to the Court which passed the decree or made the order, and the Court may make such order thereon as it thinks fit

See notes to O 47 r 1 below As to rules of procedure see O 47 below

**115** [S 622] The High Court may call for the record of any case which has been decided by any Revision. Court subordinate to such High Court and in which no appeal lies thereto, and if such subordinate Court appears—

- (a) to have exercised a jurisdiction not vested in it by law, or
- (b) to have failed to exercise a jurisdiction so vested,  
or

✓ (c) to have acted in the exercise of its jurisdiction illegally or with material irregularity,

the High Court may make such order in the case as it thinks fit

Code of 1882 s 622—This section corresponds with s 622 of the Code of 1882 There is no material alteration in the section

**Limits of revisional jurisdiction**—The jurisdiction exercised by the High Court under this section is called **Revisional Jurisdiction**. The powers of the High Court under this section can only be invoked in cases in which no appeal lies to the High Court provided the case has been decided by any Court subordinate to such High Court and such subordinate Court appears—

- (1) to have exercised a jurisdiction not vested in it by law or
- (2) to have failed to exercise a jurisdiction vested in it by law or
- (3) to have acted in the exercise of its jurisdiction illegally or with material irregularity

The High Court has no power to interfere in revision under this section except in the three cases mentioned above. Whether a particular order is *expedient* or not is not a ground on which the High Court can interfere under this section (q). Further in the exercise of revisional power it is not the province of the High Court to enter into the merits of the evidence it has only to see whether the requirements of the law have been duly and properly obeyed by the Court whose order is the subject of revision and whether the irregularity as to failure or exercise of jurisdiction is such as to justify interference with the order (r). If the High Court finds that the external conditions of jurisdiction of investigation and of command have been satisfied by the inferior Court it should not substitute its own appreciation of evidence or its own judgment thereon for the determination of the inferior Court in any matter committed by the Legislature to the discretion of the inferior Court (s).

**High Courts powers of superintendence**—A case may not fall under this section and yet it may fall under s 15 of the Charter Act 1861 now s 107 of the Government of India Act 1915

**Certiorari**—The provisions of this section are not exhaustive. Cases may be imagined though rare ones which do not fall under this section. For such cases it cannot be said that the powers of the High Courts which have inherited the ordinary or extraordinary jurisdiction of the Supreme Courts to issue writs of certiorari have been taken away by the provisions of this section (t).

**Bombay Regulation 2 of 1827**—The High Court of Bombay has power independently of sec 115 of the Code to call for the proceedings of any subordinate civil Court and to issue orders thereon under Bombay Regulation 2 of 1827 Ch 1 s 5 (2) (u).

**In which no appeal lies**—The High Court cannot act under this section in any case in which an appeal lies to that Court. The word appeal is not confined to first appeal it includes second appeal (v).

(q) *United Shik In the matter of the petition*  
f (191) 31 All 39 14 IC 66  
(r) *Mitra d. A. B.* (1948) 10 All 46  
(s) *S. v. J. & Co.* (1943) 7 Bom 341  
(t) *E. v. G. & Co. f. Madras* (1919)  
46 I A 170 190 43 CI 1 146 155 J  
1 C 09

(u) *Bomb. J. Stearns v. S. G. Ltd. v. Far*  
*d. (1948) Bom 37 106 IC 40 (3)*  
A B 5  
(v) *T. v. I. (191) 0 All 15*  
*M. v. I. (191) 0 All 15*  
*I C 1 W 6 6 631 f. am. p. v. v. a. en*  
*d. v. (191) 19 Cal. L J 81 115 IC*  
*368 (3) A C 6*



has the alternative remedy by way of suit the High Court should not in the exercise of its discretion interfere in revision with such order the power to interfere being exercisable only where there is no other remedy For instance no appeal lies from an order of a District Court made on appeal granting a temporary injunction [s 104 (2)] further any error in such order cannot be objected to in an appeal from the final decree as it cannot possibly affect the decision of the case within the meaning of s 100 nor does a suit lie to set aside such an order the High Court may therefore interfere in revision with the order ( ) Similarly where a Court asks a plaintiff to pay additional Court fee before his suit can be entertained the High Court may interfere in revision with the order as the order in effect amounts to a denial of jurisdiction (a) But why it has been asked and asked pertinently in a large majority of cases should the discretion of the High Court be fettered with such a hard and fast rule? Why should the High Court refuse to interfere in every case in which the injured party has another remedy open to him? Why should not the High Court revise an order even if there is another remedy open to the injured party if its non interference might lead to failure of justice or irreparable injury? This last consideration has weighed with many judges and it has accordingly been held in some cases that the High Court may in a proper case interfere in revision even if there is another remedy open to the aggrieved party With the prefatory remarks the views of the different High Courts on the subject may now be considered

Prior to a Full Bench decision of the Allahabad High Court to be presently noted it was held by that Court that interlocutory orders were not subject to revision first because an interlocutory order cannot be said to be a case within the meaning of this section and, secondly because a party aggrieved by such order though he cannot appeal from the order has another remedy open to him under s 100 namely to make the order a ground of appeal from the final decree in the suit (b) In *Buddhu Lal v Meera Pam* (c) decided in 1921 a Full Bench of the Allahabad High Court held that the word case in this section does not include an issue or part of a case that it does not therefore include an interlocutory order and that the High Court therefore has no power to interfere in revision with interlocutory orders in any case According to this decision the word case means a suit where an application for revision is made in a suit and since the High Court under this section can only call for the record of any case which has been decided it has no power under this section to call for the record of a suit until the suit has been decided The same view of the section has been taken by a Full Bench of the Lahore High Court in *Lalchand v Behari Lal* (d) decided in 1921

(c) *Ba Atrani v Deepa* (1916) 40 Bom 86 33 I C 38

(a) *Farruk Das v Mahant* (1910) 14 CWN 93 31 I C 381 *Lal v Durga Prasad* (1914) 3 Pat 930 80 I C 667 (3) A F 673 *Kulandarelu v Pamasaram* (1918) 51 M d 664 108 I C 539 (23) A M 416 But no revision lies from an order that the Court fee paid is correct [*Muhamad v Ishaq Bee* (1919) 56 Mad L J 30 114 I C 84 (29) A M 191] unless the question is not only one of Court fee but of jurisdiction *Akshay v Panna* (1919) 56 Mad L J 394 (29) A M 336

(b) *Harnaam v Muhammad* (1891) 4 All 91 *Chatterjee v Lekhray* (1893) 5 All 93 *Fareed v Darsi* (1884) 6 All 33 *Dhanda v Chola Lal* (1917) 39 All 54 38 I C 89

(c) (1911) 43 All 504 63 I C 15 (71) A A 1 [E B] *Overruling Bhargava & Co v Jayanath* (1919) 41 All 60 55 I C 331 *Cahakhan Lal v Kanhaiya Lal* (1913) 45 All 18 69 I C 91 (3) A A 118 *Equitable Fire Co v Hafiz Mahomed* (1918) 50 All 76 103 I C 73 (28) A A 97

(d) (1914) Lah 98 84 I C 59 (4) A L 4 [E B]

On the other hand it has been held by the Calcutta (e) Madras (f) Patna (g) and Rangoon (h) High Courts that the word case is wide enough to include an interlocutory order that the words record of any case include so much of the proceedings in any case as relate to an interlocutory order and that the High Court therefore has the power to interfere in revision with orders passed at any stage of a suit though there may be another remedy open to the injured party e.g. by making the order a ground of appeal from the final decree under s 105 subject however to this limitation that the High Court will not interfere unless its non interference might lead to failure of justice or irreparable injury Following this principle the High Court of Calcutta in one case set aside an order of the Subordinate Court framing additional issues which were unnecessary for the disposal of the suit when it appeared that the trial of those issues would entail an expenditure of time and money wholly out of proportion to the matter in dispute and cause irreparable injury to the plaintiff (i). Similarly where the lower Court refused the plaintiff's application for an amendment of the plaint the High Court of Madras set aside the order in revision and directed the plaint to be amended (j). In another case where the question was whether an election petition was maintainable at all, and the lower Court held that it was the Madras High Court set aside the order in revision and dismissed the petition. The Court observed that if the petition did not disclose any ground for an enquiry the lower Court would be holding the inquiry exercise a jurisdiction not vested in it by law and to hold it would simply lead to waste of time of the Court and of the parties (k). The High Court of Bombay also has held that the word case includes part of a case and that the High Court has the power to interfere in revision with interlocutory orders. But there is a difference of opinion within that Court whether the High Court should in the exercise of its discretion interfere only in cases where there would otherwise be no remedy or whether it may interfere even if the injured party has another remedy open to him by an appeal from the final decree under s 105 or by way of suit. On the one hand, it was laid down by a Full Bench in *Shiva Nathaji v Joma* (l) decided in 1883 that though the High Court will not ordinarily interfere in revision with interlocutory orders where the aggrieved party has another remedy open to him either by an appeal from the final decree under s 105 or by suit it will interfere if the appeal would manifestly be ineffectual and non interference would result in a defeat of law and a grave wrong to the aggrieved party. On the other hand a Divisional Bench consisting of Sargent C.J. and Candy J. held in *Motlal v Nana* (m) decided in 1894 that the High Court should not in the exercise of its discretion interfere in revision with interlocutory orders except in cases where the injured party had no other remedy open to him. No reference was made in the judgment to the Full Bench decision in

- (e) *Dhapa v Pam Perashod* (1887) 14 Cal 61 C 6 da v J nja (1909) 14 Cal W N 167 4 I C 384 1 pad Al v Ala H r ain (1910) 15 C I W N 3 3 6 I C 74 Fatidra Va v Har (1914) 0 Cal L J 4 6 433 6 I C 9 4 5 A p ad v T co t s (1915) 4 Cal J 6 9 7 I C 91 5m Sa ad v la v A (1914) 5 Cal W N 921 8 I C 1004 (5) A C 01 Paja Payabid (1914) Cal 1 4 136 85 I C 8 0 (5) A C 3 0 but ee Salam Chand v Bhag D s (1916) 53 C I 6 98 I C 615 (6) A C 1149
- (f) *Iraja v Tir Hia l* (1915) 48 Mad L J 34 87 I C 90 (4) A M 59 J d/a a v lergl e (11) 48 M d L J 451 87 I C 113 (1) A M 59 57 s Kr. l i D s v U a lool Chand (1903) 3 Mad 334 4 I C 563 Sr Poo p ths v J ag l (191) 9 Mad L J 53 30 I C 41 t v a i of Hydrabad l v (15) 11 9 M d 6 M ths ml A33ar J s 11 that the secti n pre-supposes d chl i

- or an order in the nature of a decree
- (g) *Narayan Bhojod* (1919) 4 P t L J 191 44 I C 831 Ha le v Ram B nd r (1919) 41 t L J 19 50 I C 5 0 930 89 Lal v D u lras t (1914) 3 P t 530 89 I C 867 (4) A 1 673
- (h) *J pter G t e t Ins rance Co Ltd v lld L a* (1913) 31 Kan 231 6 I C 45 (1) A 1
- (i) *Sary bat v Moh n* (1914) 23 Cal W N 931 8 I C 1004 (5) A C 01
- (j) *K r i v F K a d* (1914) 48 M d L J 312 8 I C 90 (4) A M 59
- (k) *Jana d a v l e phers* (1914) 48 Mad L J 4 18 I C 113 (5) A 3 0
- (l) (1943) - Bom 311 357 3 [R N] 1 thal v Ballrub a (1946) 10 P m 610, 616 [F B] 5 me an l v (Aayazulal (1911) 3 L m 43 4 101 C 803
- (m) (1934) 14 Pom 3 Irbasappa v Las gouds (1910) 41 Bom 9 I C 43 1 A 1 v Jaja (1916) 44 Bom 613 5 I C 5 6

*Shua Nathaji's case* The decision in *Motilal v Vana* was disapproved by a Divisional Bench of the same High Court in *Secretary of State v Varsibhat (n)* decided in 1924 and the Court followed the principle laid down in the Full Bench ruling. In the course of his judgment Royajee J observed that the section did not make the absence of another remedy a necessary condition of its applicability.

The distinction between the decisions of the High Courts of Allahabad and Lahore on the one hand and those of the other High Courts on the other hand as to the meaning of the term case is brought out by the following case. A institutes a suit against B in Court X. One of the issues in the suit is whether Court X has jurisdiction to try the suit. The Court holds that it has and that the suit must proceed. B applies to the High Court for a revision of the order of Court X. Has the High Court power to interfere in revision with this order which is an interlocutory order? According to the Allahabad (o) and Lahore (p) decisions the High Court has no such power as the decision of an issue in a suit is not a decision of a case within the meaning of this section. According to the High Courts of Bombay (q) and Madras (r) the High Court has the power to interfere with the order in revision as the word case includes part of a case and further the High Court would in the exercise of its discretion interfere with the order if it came to the conclusion that the order was wrong though the order may be challenged in an appeal from the final decree for if Court X had no jurisdiction to try the suit it would result in unnecessary waste of time and money.

As regards orders made on an application for leave to sue *in forma pauperis* a distinction has been made by the Allahabad High Court between an order granting the application and an order rejecting the application. An order rejecting the application has been held amounts to a decision of the case and is therefore open to revision but an order granting the application is not a decision of the case but a mere interlocutory order and it is not therefore open to revision (s). In recent Allahabad cases (t) however Walsh J expressed the opinion that no revision lies even from an order rejecting the application the ground of the decision being that it is not a case decided within the meaning of this section no opinion was expressed by Piggott J. But where the Court of first instance instead of trying the question of the petitioner's pauperism tries the question of his title to the property claimed by him and finding that the title was not established dismisses the application to sue *in forma pauperis* the High Court can interfere in revision for in not trying the question of pauperism the Court failed to exercise the jurisdiction vested in it by law and in trying the question of title it exercised a jurisdiction not vested in it by law (u). The High Court will also interfere in revision if the lower Court dismisses the application on the ground that the petitioner's claim is barred as *res judicata* as such an inquiry is not warranted by the provisions of O 33 r 5 (t).

Even if the section applies to interlocutory orders no High Court will interfere in revision with an order made by the lower Court deciding that certain evidence is inadmissible (u).

**Alternative remedy by way of suit or otherwise**—The powers conferred upon the High Court by this section are discretionary. Hence though a party may not have

- (n) (1924) 48 Bom 43 I C 41 (24) A B  
(o) *Buddhu Lal v Mewa Pam* (19 1) 43 All 564 63 I C 15 (1) A A 1 [F B]  
(p) *Laichand v Bhatt Lal* (1924) 5 Lah 33 84 I C 250 (24) A L 4 [F B]  
(q) *Secretary of State v Varsibhat* (19 4) 43 Bom 43 77 I C 41 (24) A B 6  
(r) *Janardhanan v Verge* (19 5) 48 Ma 1 L J 451 87 I C 113 (5) A M 67 See also *Raja v Rajab Lal* (19 5) 5 Cal 18 138 8 I C 80 ( ) A C 30

- (s) *M A mmad Ayub v Muhammad Mahm d* (1910) 3 All 63 6 I C 831 See also *Il re ran v Muhammad* (1891) 4 All 91  
(t) *Mal deo v The Secretary of Stat* (19 ) 44 All 248 6 I C 55 ( ) A A 1 *Shanker Ban v Pam Do* (19 6) 48 All 493 94 I C 484 (6) A 4 416  
(u) *Sharan v Abd a* (19 3) 45 All 549 73 I C 538 (3) A A 577  
(v) *Lachman v Ram Bahad r* (19 5) 27 All L J 60 86 I C 781 (5) A A 75  
(w) *Isa id v Bai Mariam* (19 7) 99 Bom L R 404

a remedy by way of appeal the High Court may in the exercise of its discretion refuse to interfere under this section if there is *any other remedy* open to the party. The special and extraordinary remedy by involving the revisional powers of this Court should not be exercised unless as a last resource for an aggrieved litigant. (x) The recognised rule is that if a party to civil proceedings applies to us to exercise our powers under s. 115 he must satisfy us that he has *no other remedy* open to him under the law to set right that which he says has been illegally irregularly or without jurisdiction done by a subordinate Court. (y) The other remedy open to the applicant must be a *certain and conclusive* remedy allowed by law.

Upon the principle stated above no application will be entertained to revise an order made under O 21 rr 60 61 or 62 (Code of 1882 ss 560 281 282) for though no appeal lies from such order the party against whom the order is made has a special remedy by way of suit under O 21 r 63 [Code of 1883 s 283] (2) Similarly no application will be entertained to revise a decree passed in a suit for possession instituted under s 9 of the Specific Relief Act 1877 for though no appeal lies from a decree passed in such suit the party against whom the decree is passed is not precluded from instituting a regular suit to establish his title to possession (a) But if the remedy is a *doubtful* one the High Court may interfere by way of revision under this section (b) And even if the remedy is certain and conclusive the High Court may in an exceptional case interfere by way of revision under this section (c) No doubt the ordinary rule is that where an aggrieved party has other remedy available this Court is unwilling to interfere but it is unquestionable that even if there be such remedy this Court may interfere in exceptional cases (d) Thus where the lower Court refused the application of a decree holder for rateable distribution under s 73 on the ground that there was another proper mode of the judgment debtor available for the satisfaction of his claim the High Court of Madras interfered on revision under this section though the applicant had clearly a remedy by suit Miller J said I do not depart from the view that where a party has a remedy elsewhere than in the High Court the High Court should not except in special cases interfere under [this section] But here we have a case in which there is no doubt as to the rights of the parties and no remedy if I do not interfere except by a *suit to which there can be no defence* and which therefore would surely multiply proceedings In such a case the lesser evil at any rate is interference under [this section] (e) When the Court on an erroneous view of the law refused to proceed with the suit until Court fee was paid the Madras High Court interfered with the interlocutory order as this would give more complete and efficacious relief and avoid unnecessary hardship and multiplicity of proceedings (f) In a Patna case Manuk J said When the High Court can by interfering under section 110 in appropriate cases terminate the litigation the mere fact that another remedy *by suit only* lies should not *per se* be a reason for non interference (g) In a Calcutta case the High Court interfered in revision where the lower Court refused to entertain an application for review based on an allegation of fraud though the applicant had a remedy by way of suit (h)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| (x) <i>Sī o Irasad v Kastura Kuar</i> (1888) 10 All 119 1  | (d) <i>Umat H M h d v F i o m</i> (1903) 1 C 11 V 16 4 F q n a d i v i i (Charan)   |
| (y) <i>Gopal Da v A l f Phan</i> (1880) 11 All 39  | (1919) 4 lat L J 94 10 103 4  |
| <i>Gu v Ja sra</i> (1833) 15 All 40  | 150 <i>Sī a v Ioma</i> (1883) L m 341   |
| (z) <i>Sī P asad v A s t Kuw</i> (1889) 10 All 119   | 3   |
| <i>Hwachan v Fel ppan</i> (1885) 8 Mad 484   | (e) <i>Sī e F r i a D r e v Ch a fool C i</i> (1909) Mad 334 4 I C 93 Adm i t r   |
| (a) <i>Bhind I v Pand i</i> (1888) 1 Bom 1   | <i>Ge e el v C i e t t a r</i> (19 8) 5 lang 4  |
| <i>V a Isaboll v D dhar</i> (1900) 14 B m 3 1  | 109 I C 444 ( 8) A I 83   |
| <i>Kash th v Yana</i> (189 1) 1 Bom 31   | (f) <i>I l a n i a v I d a</i> (19 8) 51 Mad 664  |
| <i>Dee al o Iamad D a v Al l Trad g</i> (191 ) P R 60 p 87 31 I C 80                                     | 108 I C 533 ( 8) 4 M 416  |
| (b) <i>Gh I m v Du rka Prasad</i> (1890) 14 All 163 168  | (g) <i>P a y i m m a n d a n v P a Ch a n</i> (1819) 4 Pat L J 94 106 49 I C 1 0 <i>Musam nat H v M u s a a t Aysha</i> (19 9) 1 t L I 415 417 57 I C 4 1 |
| (c) <i>D b D a v Eja H sain</i> (1906) 94 All Emperor v <i>Bihara Lal</i> (19 9) 51 All 338 ( 8) A A 588 | (f) <i>K a t i s h Ch a d a v A g e n d a v A a t h</i> (19 9) 33 C W v 57 ( 200) A C 513   |



Whether High Court may of its own motion call for record—The powers of revision given by this section are very wide and the High Court may of its own motion call for any record under this section if it appears desirable so to do to that Court (1) It is not necessary to the exercise of its powers under this section that it should be put into motion by the party aggrieved by the proceeding complained of. It has been so held by the High Courts of Calcutta Allahabad and Madras (2) In a Bombay case however where a Collector applied to the High Court to revise a decision of a Mamlatdar the High Court declined to interfere stating that in so doing it was following the established practice of the Court and adding that the defendant if he felt aggrieved could himself apply to that Court (3)

Case—The word case is more comprehensive than the word suit. In a case before the Judicial Committee (4) the question arose whether proceedings by petition to a Civil Court in a matter under s 10 of the Religious Endowments Act 20 of 1863 constituted a case within the meaning of this section. Dealing with that question their Lordships said 'No definition is to be found in the Code of the word case. It cannot in their Lordships view be confined to a litigation in which there is a plaintiff who seeks to obtain particular relief in damages or otherwise against a defendant who is before the Court. It must they think include an ex parte application such as that made in this case praying that persons in the position of trustees or officials should perform their trust or discharge their official duties.' The word case also includes proceedings under the Guardians and Wards Act 1800 Probate and Administration Act 1881 Succession Certificate Act 1889 Provincial Insolvency Act 1920 etc (5). The passing of an ex parte decree is deciding a case (6) but it is not settled whether the making of an interlocutory order is so. See note above Interlocutory orders.

Subordinate Court—The High Court has no power of revision under this section unless the case is decided by a Court and further it has been decided by a Court subordinate to the High Court. A Court subordinate to a High Court is one over which the High Court has appellate jurisdiction (a). A District Registrar is not a Court within the meaning of this section (p). Nor is the Rent Controller of Pangoon (q). Nor is a District Judge acting under s 4 of Bombay Act 12 of 1860 (r). The Chief Judge of the Small Cause Court at Bombay acting under the powers granted to him by s 33 of the Bombay Municipal Act 1838 is not a Court subordinate to the High Court of Bombay (s). Nor is a District Judge acting under s 23 of the Bombay District Municipal Act 1873 a Court subordinate to the High Court of Bombay (t) nor a Chief Judge of the Small Cause Court at Rangoon acting under powers conferred by sec 14 of the Rangoon Municipal Act 1922 (u). The Chief Judge Small Cause Court acting under the Madras City Municipal Act (v) or exercising powers under sec 15 of the Rangoon Pent Act 1920 (w) is a persona designata and not a Court subordinate to the

- (1) *Fishesher v Parsi Sah* (1883) 5 All 4  
 (2) *Ira Mal v Ja ki Pershad* (1901) 28 Cal 680 *Gulam Mahomed v Saroda* (1900) 4 Cal W N 635 *Debi Das v Eja H sa* (1900) 5 All 7 *Anti y v D pont* (188) 4351-17  
 (3) *Iandu v Bhaidu* (185) 21 Bom 806  
 (4) *Hil krishna v Isa deva* (1917) 44 L A 61 40 Mad 93 40 I C 60  
 (5) *Pridhu Lal v Merua Sam* (191) 43 All 564 5 63 I C 15 (1) A A 1 Lal (ha i) *Bhuri Lal* (19 4) 5 Lab -33 84 I C 9 (4) A L 45 S e *Bil v Ha d e r* (19 4) 6 Lah L J 219 92 C 41 (4) A L 0 [Gaur di and W is Act 1890—revlon]  
 (6) *Pi Shah v Q rib ShaH* (19 6) 7 Lah 161 9 I C 11 (26) A L 379  
 (a) *Belkrish a v C il tor Bomb* (19 3) 4

- Bom 692 01 73 I C 34 (3) A R 90  
 (p) *Ma vala v I una appa* (1907) 30 Mad 36 *Vay ana v Pattabhirama ya* (19 3) 51 Mad 15 103 I C 190 (3) A M 475  
 (q) *M ad en v Bul hi Ram* (19 5) 3 Ranv 410 91 I C 617 (26) A R 33 (F B)  
 (r) *Cooper In re* (1918) 4 Bom 119 43 I C 465  
 (s) *N eatlar v Sar ya* (19 3) Bom L R 483 73 I C 133 (3) A B 41  
 (t) *Balay v Merua* (189) 21 Bom 9 *Ga gath r v Habi Municip idy* (19 6) 0 Bom 3 7 91 I C 640 (6) A B 344  
 (u) *Mun cip i Corporation Shakur* (19 6) 3 Rao 560 91 I C 350 (6) A R 5  
 (v) *L a h a v Kannapp* (19 7) 50 Mad 11 99 I C 145 (26) A M 93  
 (w) *Anu v Autoboy* (19) 41 ng 304 93 I C 90 ( ) A R 1

**High Court** A Full Bench of the Madras High Court has held that the High Court has no power to revise orders passed under sec 20 of the Madras Estates Land Act I of 1908 by the Board of Revenue (x) The High Court of Kumaon is not a Court subordinate to the High Court of Allahabad (y) But a District Judge acting under s 57 of the Madras Local Boards Act 14 of 1920 is a Court within the meaning of this section (z)

The Court of the Resident at Aden is subordinate to the High Court of Bombay in reference to cases to be stated by the Resident for the decision of the High Court under s 8 of the Aden Courts Act 2 of 1861 (a) His Britannic Majesty's Courts in Zanzibar are also subordinate to the High Court of Bombay (b) A Collector exercising judicial functions under the Bombay Mamlatdar's Courts Act II of 1906 is a Court within the meaning of this section (c) And so is a Civil Court acting or purporting to act under the provisions of s 10 of the Religious Endowments Act 20 of 1863 (d) It has been held by the High Court of Madras (e) and Bombay (f) that where an application is made to a Collector for a reference to the Civil Court under s 18 of the Land Acquisition Act I of 1894 and the application is rejected the Collector in so doing does not act as a Court and his order is not subject to revision by the High Court The High Court of Patna has held that a Collector acting under the second proviso to s 49 of that Act is a Court and an order made by him refusing to refer to the Civil Court a question under that proviso is subject to revision by the High Court (g) The High Court of Calcutta has held that a Collector acting under s. 11 of that Act is not a Court within the meaning of this section (h)

**Decision of a single judge of a Chartered High Court.**—A Judge of a chartered High Court sitting alone is not a Court subordinate to the High Court but performs a function directed to be performed by the High Court there is therefore no revision from his decision under this section (i)

**Decision of a single Judge of Chief Court of Oudh**—The Court of a single Judge of the Chief Court of Oudh sitting to hear and determine a suit of which the value is more than Rs five lacs as provided by sec 7 of the Oudh Courts Act 4 of 1925 is not a subordinate Court to the Chief Court which is the High Court referred to therein and therefore no revision lies against its order (j)

**Jurisdiction**—Jurisdiction has been explained in the notes to s 21 The expression jurisdiction is not confined to the jurisdiction to entertain a suit or appeal A Court may have jurisdiction to entertain a suit or appeal and yet it may have no jurisdiction to pass a particular order in the suit or appeal If it does so the case

- (x) *I ghunada v C vinda* (19 3) 5 M L J 798  
(8) 4 M 103 o err lno v a azimha  
*Pao v Fats of I edlam mud p H* (13 6)  
49 Mad 499 94 I C 164 (5) 4 M 480  
and in effect overruling *P a a*  
*Kali* (1919) 4 Mad 310 51 I C 634
- (y) *Sad r Singh v Am r Singh* (19 4) 45 All  
393 1 I C 921 (-3) 4 A 4 J1
- (z) *P masami v Muthu* (19 3) 46 M d 36  
71 I C 1039 (3) 4 M 19 *Alamat*  
*v Bana a* (19 3) 46 M d 1 3 7- I C  
50 (3) 4 B 4
- (a) *Ph mb v Ma i* (1910) 34 Bom 6 I  
C 867 *Syed v M homed* (19 9) 31 Bom  
L R 5 115 I C 407 (9) 4 B 190  
dissenting from *M a v Meyer* (19 5) 50  
Bom 3 9 I C 367 (-6) 4 B 139
- (b) *M i v Sher ff* (191 3) 36 Bom 105 1 I C  
68
- (c) *Iurat v Ma ad* (1913) 3 I 114  
17 I C 6 6
- (d) *L lakrish a v I asad ra* (191 4) 4 I 4 61  
68 63 40 M a 733 601 40 I C 650

- ( ) *1bd I S tar v Spec id Deputy Colle tor*  
(19 4) 47 Mad 3 84 I C 616 (4) 4  
M 44 [F B] overruling *P masu a*  
*I t i quada Coll t P lhal* (1919)  
4 Mad 31 49 I C 659 See *ad*  
*t ato Ge oral of Bengali Tl Ma d*  
*4eqi Ge oral Collector* (1910) 1 I C 1 W  
4 41 *Krishna Da t H tor f Pabna*  
(191 1) 16 C 1 L J 16 13 I C 4 0
- (f) *Balk is a v I fe Collect r Bo id j* (19 3)  
47 Bom 693 3 I C 3 4 (3) 4 B 30
- (g) *S asant v The I a t 4eq. ti a D p ty*  
*Collect r* (191 1) - 1 at L J 04 33 I C  
650
- (h) *B tish Ind a St m v ation Compa y v*  
*Secretary f State* (1911) 33 Cal 0 8  
I C 107
- ( ) *Debe d a Nath v Bib dhe d a* (1916) 43  
Cal 0 94 33 I C 745 See *Lo Janna*  
*Doss v S b pathy Chetty* (1913) 35 Mad  
138
- (j) *Pan Bas ni v Minor son of Madha S ngh*  
(19 1) Luck 1 99 I C 547 (-7) 4 O.  
59

Whether High Court may of its own motion call for records powers of revision given by this section are very wide and the High Court *own motion* call for any record under this section if it appears desirable so that Court (i) It is not necessary to the exercise of its powers under this should be put into motion by the party aggrieved by the proceeding. It has been so held by the High Courts of Calcutta Allahabad and V a Bombay case however where a Collector applied to the High Court for revision of a Mamlatdar the High Court declined to interfere stating that was following the established practice of the Court and adding that he felt aggrieved could himself apply to that Court (L)

Case —The word case is more comprehensive than the a case before the Judicial Committee (I) the question arising by petition to a Civil Court in a matter under s 10 of the Act 20 of 1863 constituted a case within the meaning of the that question their Lordships said No definition is to be the word case It cannot in their Lordships view be construed which there is a plaintiff who seeks to obtain particular relief against a defendant who is before the Court It must then be application such as that made in this case praying that parties or officials should perform their trust or discharge their case also includes proceedings under the Guardianship and Administration Act 1891 Succession Certificate Act Act 1920 etc (m) The passing of an ex parte decree is not settled whether the making of an interlocutory Interlocutory orders

Subordinate Court—The High Court has no jurisdiction unless the case is decided by a Court and further subordinate to the High Court A Court subordinate in which the High Court has appellate jurisdiction (

Court within the meaning of this section (Pangoon (g) Nor is a District Judge acting under The Chief Judge of the Small Cause Court at Bombay to him by s 33 of the Bombay Municipal Act 1903 Court of Bombay (s) Nor is a District Judge acting under Municipal Act 1873 a Court subordinate to the Chief Judge of the Small Cause Court at Bombay sec 14 of the Rangoon Municipal Act 1903 acting under the Madras City Municipal Act (Rangoon Pent Act 1920 (w) is a person

- (i) *Fytheshar v Hari Singh* (1893) All 1  
 (j) *Pan Mal v Jai Lal Pershad* (1901) 11  
 650 *Glam Malams v Jai Singh* (11  
 4 Cal W N 69 *Debi Das v Jai Singh*  
 (1909) S All 7 *Anthony v D J* (11  
 4 Mal 17  
 (k) *Pandu v Bhadru* (1897) 11 Pon  
 (l) *Balakrishna v Jai Singh* (1911) 44 1  
 261 40 M d 793 40 I C 60  
 (m) *Biddu L v Jai Singh* (1911) 1  
 64 5 63 I C 15 (1) A A 1  
*Chad v Behru Lal* (1914) 5 L h  
 3 84 I C 7 (1) A I 4  
*Bail v Jai Singh* (1914) 6 L h 1 J  
 19 91 (1) A L 50 [Guardians and Wards Act 1890—revision]  
 (n) *Pir J Shah v Qasim Shah* (1916) 7 Lah 161  
 9 I C 141 (20) A L 379  
 (o) *Rattiah v Jai Singh* (1913) 47

- (r) 1  
 (w) 90 1

High Court. A Full Bench of the Madras High Court has held that the High Court has no power to revise orders passed under sec. 90a of the Madras Estates Land Act 1 of 1908 by the Board of Revenue (x). The High Court of Kumaon is not a Court subordinate to the High Court of Allahabad (y). But a District Judge acting under s. 57 of the Madras Local Boards Act 14 of 1904 is a Court within the meaning of this section (z).

The Court of the President at Aden is subordinate to the High Court of Bombay in reference to cases to be stated by the President for the decision of the High Court under s. 8 of the Aden Court Act 2 of 1851 (a) His Britannic Majesty's Courts in Zanzibar are also subordinate to the High Court of Bombay (b) A Collector exercising judicial functions under the Bombay Mamlatdars Courts Act II of 1906 is a Court within the meaning of this section (c) And so is a Civil Court acting or purporting to act under the provisions of s. 10 of the Religious Endowments Act 20 of 1863 (d) It has been held by the High Court of Madras (e) and Bombay (f) that where an application is made to a Collector for a reference to the Civil Court under s. 18 of the Land Acquisition Act I of 1894 and the application is rejected the Collector in doing so does not act as a Court and his order is not subject to revision by the High Court The High Court of Patna has held that a Collector acting under the second proviso to s. 49 of that Act is a Court and an order made by him refusing to refer to the Civil Court a question under that proviso is subject to revision by the High Court (g) The High Court of Calcutta has held that a Collector acting under s. 11 of that Act is not a Court within the meaning of this section (h)

Decision of a single judge of a Chartered High Court — A Judge of a chartered High Court sitting alone is not a Court subordinate to the High Court but performs a function directed to be performed by the High Court there is therefore no revision from his decision under this section (i)

**Decision of a single Judge of Chief Court of Oudh**—The Court of a single Judge of the Chief Court of Oudh sitting to hear and determine a suit of which the value is more than 15 five lacs as provided by sec 7 of the Oudh Courts Act 4 of 1920 is not a subordinate Court to the Chief Court which is the High Court referred to therein and therefore no revision lies against its order (3)

**Jurisdiction** —Jurisdiction has been explained in the notes to s 21. The expression jurisdiction is not confined to the jurisdiction to entertain a suit or appeal. A Court may have jurisdiction to entertain a suit or appeal and yet it may have no jurisdiction to pass a particular order in the suit or appeal. If it does so, the case

- (2) *Pagunada Gosh* (14) 5 M L J 98  
(-8) 4 M 103 *verra la Naas ha*  
*o v Rj ts of Peddannaipail* (19 0)  
49 Mad 443 41 I C 164 (1) A M 480  
in effect overruled *Iama* "  
*Kali* (1919) 4 Mad 10 11 C 634
- (y) *Sada S g v Amar S g* (19 3) 4 All  
83 71 I C 911 (-3) A A 241
- (z) *Gammau v Muttu* (13 3) 46 M 1 536  
11 C 1039 (3) A 1 192 *Alamat*  
*v Basa* a (19 3) 46 Mad 1 3  
90 (-3) A M 4
- (a) *Ibi la v Mari a* (1910) 34 Bom 6 51  
C 867 *Syed v Mahomed* (19 9) 31 Bom  
L R 115 I C 407 (9) A B 190  
discussing from *Mos v Meyer* (19 ) 50  
Lom 3 9 I C 67 (6) A B 133
- (b) *Mai v Shreff* (191 ) 6 Lom 105 1 I C  
68
- (c) *Fu H v M Radu* (1913) 3 Bom 114  
171 C 678
- (d) *Bal kishnav Vasudra* (191 ) 44 I 4 61  
68 69 40 Man 743 601 401 C 60
- (e) *Abd l Sattar Spect l Dep t Collecto*  
(19 4) 47 Mad 3 311 C 616 (4) A  
M 41 [F B] o r r l n P m v r v  
*Tantogutta* (Collector P lghat (1919)  
4 M 1 31 49 I C 6 ) See 4 d  
t t -Ge er t of Lengal v T e Land  
4 g s t n Collector (190 ) 12 C 1  
N 41 *Krush a Das v Collector of Pab a*  
(191 ) 16 Cal L J 16 13 I C 40
- (f) *Bail h a v Tle Collector B waja*, (19 3)  
47 Bom 639 3 I C 34 (3) A B 90
- (g) *S a v T A La d q t t A Deputy*  
*Collector* (1917) Pat L J 04 33 I C  
60
- (h) *B h India Steam Navigation Compa y v*  
*Secretary of State* (1911) 38 Cal - 0 8  
I C 10
- (i) *D be la Nath v Bib the d a* (1916) 43  
Cal 90 33 33 I C 745 46 lso J mna  
*Du v Sabapathy Chetty* (1913) 36 Mad  
138
- (j) *Pa e B san v Minor son of Madho S gh*  
(19 7) Luck 1 99 I C 547 (27) A Q  
59

Whether High Court may of its own motion call for record—The powers of revision given by this section are very wide and the High Court may of its own motion call for any record under this section if it appears desirable so to do to that Court (i) It is not necessary to the exercise of its powers under this section that it should be put into motion by the party aggrieved by the proceeding complained of. It has been so held by the High Courts of Calcutta Allahabad and Madras (j) In a Bombay case however where a Collector applied to the High Court to revise a decision of a Mamlatdar the High Court declined to interfere stating that in so doing it was following the established practice of the Court and adding that the defendant if he felt aggrieved could himself apply to that Court (k)

Case.—The word case is more comprehensive than the word suit. In a case before the Judicial Committee (l) the question arose whether proceedings by petition to a Civil Court in a matter under s 10 of the Religious Endowments Act 20 of 1863 constituted a case within the meaning of this section. Dealing with that question their Lordships said No definition is to be found in the Code of the word case. It cannot in their Lordships view be confined to a litigation in which there is a plaintiff who seeks to obtain particular relief in damages or otherwise against a defendant who is before the Court. It must they think include an ex parte application such as that made in this case praying that persons in the position of trustees or officials should perform their trust or discharge their official duties. The word case also includes proceedings under the Guardians and Wards Act 1890 Probate and Administration Act 1881 Succession Certificate Act 1889 Provincial Insolvency Act 1920 etc (m). The passing of an ex parte decree is deciding a case (n) but it is not settled whether the making of an interlocutory order is so. See note above Interlocutory orders

Subordinate Court.—The High Court has no power of revision under this section unless the case is decided by a Court and further it has been decided by a Court subordinate to the High Court. A Court subordinate to a High Court is one over which the High Court has appellate jurisdiction (o). A District Registrar is not a Court within the meaning of this section (p). Nor is the Rent Controller of Rangoon (q). Nor is a District Judge acting under s 4 of Bombay Act 12 of 1850 (r). The Chief Judge of the Small Cause Court at Bombay acting under the powers granted to him by s 33 of the Bombay Municipal Act 1838 is not a Court subordinate to the High Court of Bombay (s). Nor is a District Judge acting under s 23 of the Bombay District Municipal Act 1873 a Court subordinate to the High Court of Bombay (t) nor a Chief Judge of the Small Cause Court at Rangoon acting under powers conferred by sec 14 of the Rangoon Municipal Act 1922 (u). The Chief Judge Small Cause Court acting under the Madras City Municipal Act (v) or exercising powers under sec 15 of the Rangoon Rent Act 1920 (w) is a persona designata and not a Court subordinate to the

(i) *Bheshkar v Hari Singh* (1883) 5 All 4

(j) *I r n Mal v J nals Persad* (1901) 33 Cal 680 *Gulam Malams a l v S ad's* (1900) 4 Cal W N 69 *Debi Das v Eya Husan* (1900) 8 All 7 *Antony v Dupont* (188 ) 4 Mal 1

(k) *Fa du v Lihardu* (189 ) 1 Bom 506

(l) *Bal Krishna v Vasudera* (1917) 44 I A 61 40 M d 93 40 I C 650

(m) *F lthu Lal v Jier a Lam* (19 1) 43 All 64 63 I C 15 ( 1) A A 1 *Lal ch nd v B ha L I* (19 4) 5 Lab 33 3 84 I C 9 ( 3) A L 4 See *H ll v H nd's* (19 4) 6 Lab L J 19 91 ( 451 ( 3) A L 5 0 [Guardi and Ward Act 1820—revi ion]

(n) *F j Saah v Q ib St A* (19 6) 7 Lab 161 9 I C 14 ( 6) A L 379

(o) *B ltrush a v col tor Bombay* (19 3) 4

Bom 693 01 31 C 3 4 ( 3) A B 90

(p) *Manarata v I ma oppa* (190 ) 30 Mad 3 6 *Vagann v Paltu h amajja* (19 3) 51 M d 65 103 I C 180 ( 3) A M 4 5

(q) *Mohdoo v B ksh Ram* (19 ) 3 Rang 410 91 I C 61 ( 6) A P 33 [E B]

(r) *Coop In re* (1918) 4 Bom 119 43 I C 46

(s) *Navalkar v S oja* (19 3) 2 Bom L R 463 73 I C 133 ( 3) A B 4 1

(t) *Balaji v Altrua ji* (1895) 11 Bom 279 6 *gadh v H lbi Mu se paid* (19 6) 50 Bom 357 94 I C 660 ( 6) A B 344

(u) *Mu cipal Corporation v Shaker* (19 6) 3 Rang 560 91 I C 550 ( 6) A B 5

(v) *Lak h ana v K ppar* (19 7) 50 Mad 1 1 99 I C 149 ( 26) A M 93

(w) *Arav v Kul boy* (19 7) 4 Rang 304 98 I C 90 ( 3) A R 1

High Court A Full Bench of the Madras High Court has held that the High Court has no power to revise orders passed under sec 20 of the Madras Estates Land Act 1 of 1908 by the Board of Revenue (x) The High Court of Kurnool is not a Court subordinate to the High Court of Allahabad (y) But a District Judge acting under s 57 of the Madras Local Boards Act 14 of 1900 is a Court within the meaning of this section ( )

The Court of the Resident at Aden is subordinate to the High Court of Bombay in reference to cases to be stated by the Resident for the decision of the High Court under s. 8 of the Aden Court Act 2 of 1861 (a) His Britannic Majesty's Courts in Zanzibar are also subordinate to the High Court of Bombay (b) A Collector exercising judicial functions under the Bombay Mamlatdars Courts Act II of 1906 is a Court within the meaning of this section (c) And so is a Civil Court acting or purporting to act under the provisions of s 10 of the Religious Endowments Act 20 of 1863 (d) It has been held by the High Court of Madras (e) and Bombay (f) that where an application is made to a Collector for a reference to the Civil Court under s. 18 of the Land Acquisition Act I of 1894 and the application is rejected the Collector in so doing does not act as a Court and his order is not subject to revision by the High Court The High Court of Patna has held that a Collector acting under the second proviso to s 49 of that Act is a Court and an order made by him refusing to refer to the Civil Court a question under that proviso is subject to revision by the High Court (g) The High Court of Calcutta has held that a Collector acting under s 11 of that Act is not a Court within the meaning of this section (h)

Decision of a single judge of a Chartered High Court —A Judge of a chartered High Court sitting alone is not a Court subordinate to the High Court but performs a function directed to be performed by the High Court there is therefore no revision from his decision under this section (i)

Decision of a single Judge of Chief Court of Oudh —The Court of a single Judge of the Chief Court of Oudh sitting to hear and determine a suit of which the value is more than Rs five lacs as provided by sec 7 of the Oudh Courts Act 4 of 1920 is not a subordinate Court to the Chief Court which is the High Court referred to therein and therefore no revision lies against its order (j)

Jurisdiction —Jurisdiction has been explained in the notes to s 21 The expression jurisdiction is not confined to the jurisdiction to entertain a suit or appeal A Court may have jurisdiction to entertain a suit or appeal and yet it may have no jurisdiction to pass a particular order in the suit or appeal If it does so the case

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>(x) <i>Laghunada v Govinda</i> (19 3) M L J 38 (R) A M 10 overruling <i>Nasir v Nisha</i> <i>Pao v Jots of J. ddamand</i> <i>Yall</i> (13 6) 49 M L J 34 I C 164 (1) A M 480 and in effect overruling <i>J. ma v K. K.</i> (1910) 4 Mad 10 511 C 634</p> <p>(y) <i>Sadar Singh v Ama Singh</i> (13 3) 4 All 383 71 I C 931 (-3) A 4 J1</p> <p>(z) <i>Pamanna v M. D. S.</i> (19 3) 46 Mad 536 71 I C 1033 (3) A M 19 <i>Adam v Basa</i> (13 3) 46 Mad 13 - I C 90 (3) A 3 4</p> <p>(a) <i>Iti v M. S.</i> (1910) 34 Bom 6 I C 867 <i>Syed v Malomed</i> (19 3) 31 Bom 18 2 115 I C 407 (9) A 18 190 dissenting from <i>Moses v Meyer</i> (19 3) 30 Bom 3 9 I C 367 (25) A B 139</p> <p>(b) <i>M. v S. S.</i> (1912) 36 Bom 10 I C 66</p> <p>(c) <i>P. v M.</i> (1913) 3 Bom 114 17 I C 676</p> <p>(d) <i>Bal v. S. S.</i> (191) 41 I A 61 68 63 40 M A 733 801 40 I C 650</p> | <p>(e) <i>Abd I. Sattar v. S. S.</i> (19 3) 47 Mad 3 84 I C 616 (4) A M 41 (F B) 10 e uli <i>P. r. meena v. J. d. Acq. v. d. n. C. H. I. r. P. I. g. t.</i> (1919) 4 M d 31 49 I C 653 See <i>Ad. v. t. tor- l. neral of B. g. i. v. Th. La. d. t. g. s. d. Collector</i> (190 ) 1 C I W N 41 <i>F. s. n. d. v. C. H. I. r. f. l. a. b. a.</i> (191 ) 16 C I L J 16 131 C 4 0</p> <p>(f) <i>B. K. v. S. S.</i> (19 3) 47 Bom 639 31 C 3 4 (3) A B 30</p> <p>(g) <i>S. v. S. S.</i> (1917) - Pat. L J 04 39 I C 60</p> <p>(h) <i>B. S. v. S. S.</i> (1911) 33 Cal 0 8 I C 101</p> <p>(i) <i>Debe v. S. S.</i> (1916) 43 Cal 90 94 33 I C 745 See also <i>J. m. d. v. S. S.</i> (1913) 36 M d 133</p> <p>(j) <i>P. v. S. S.</i> (19 7) Luck 1 99 I C 547 (7) A O. 59</p> |
|--|--|

is one under clause (a) of the section and the High Court is entitled to interfere in revision. This follows from the rulings of the Judicial Committee in *Lachmi Narain v Balm Sund* (k) dealt with in the note below. The same topic continued and in *Bir Mohun v Rati Uma Nath* (l).

**Exercise by Court of jurisdiction not vested in it by law**—If a Court assumes jurisdiction which by reason of the pecuniary or territorial limits of the jurisdiction of such Court or by reason of the subject matter of the suit or other proceedings instituted in it is not vested in it by law the High Court to which such Court is subordinate has power under clause (a) to interfere in revision under this section. It will not however do so unless the facts from which absence of jurisdiction may be inferred are patent upon the face of the record (m). Similarly the High Court has power to interfere in revision under clause (a) if the lower appellate Court entertains an appeal from an order from which no appeal lies (n) or if a Testamentary Court appoints a receiver (o) or if the lower Court inquires into a question into which has no jurisdiction to inquire (p) or if the lower Court demands search fee on an application for copies of records in addition to the stamps for copies (q).

For other cases under this head see notes below. The same topic continued and *Wrong decision of lower appellate Court as to jurisdiction of trial Court*.

**Failure to exercise jurisdiction**—Where a Court having jurisdiction to act in a matter declines jurisdiction clause (b) applies. Thus where a Court has jurisdiction to accept a plaint (r) or to execute a decree (s) or to review its judgment (t) but refuses to accept the plaint or to execute the decree or to review its judgment on the ground that it has no jurisdiction the High Court will interfere under this section. When a Subordinate Judge refused to allow an assignee to execute a decree the Allahabad High Court held that there was a failure to exercise jurisdiction because the Judge did not exercise his own judgment but followed a ruling which was not applicable (u). Again when the lower Court made an order on the petition that the petition will be recorded this was said to be no order at all and the Court was directed in revision to hear and dispose of it on the merits (v). Similarly where a Court refused to confirm a sale under s. 312 of the Code of 1882 [now O. 21 r. 92] believing that it had no power to do so if the purchaser objected to the sale on the ground of misrepresentation it was held by their Lordships of the Privy Council that the case was one in which the Court had failed to exercise a jurisdiction vested in it by law and that the decision was therefore subject to revision under the present section (w). The rejection of an application for fixing a standard rent on the ground that the provisions of the Calcutta Rent Act 1920 were not applicable to the case is a refusal by the Rent Controller to exercise jurisdiction conferred upon him by the Act and is accordingly a proper case for interference under this section (x). An order returning a memorandum of appeal for presentation to another Court is also open to revision (y). Interference under this section is also appropriate where a Court has no discretionary power to refuse a relief but refuses the relief believing that it has a discretionary power to do so. Thus where a Court refused the

- (k) (1911) 11 A 314 (1st 61 811 C 44)  
(l) (1893) 9 Cal 8 191 A 154  
(m) *Mishal v Muhammad Hosen* (1919) 14 All 413  
(n) *B. Ma v Panchollal* (1931) 5 Bom. L. R. 14 (1 C 6 (3) A R. 214 (order under O. 1 r. 101))  
(o) *A. A. v. K. N. S. J. A. (1914) 46 All 200*  
(p) *I. C. 383 (4) A. A. 374*  
(q) *M. J. v. J. v. M. G. J. (1911) 11 R. 100*  
(r) *P. J. v. C. G. J. (1913) 41 193*  
(s) *P. J. v. C. G. J. (1913) 41 193*  
(t) *P. J. v. C. G. J. (1913) 41 193*  
(u) *P. J. v. C. G. J. (1913) 41 193*  
(v) *P. J. v. C. G. J. (1913) 41 193*  
(w) *P. J. v. C. G. J. (1913) 41 193*  
(x) *P. J. v. C. G. J. (1913) 41 193*  
(y) *P. J. v. C. G. J. (1913) 41 193*

- Bada v. J. v. D. (1885) 8 All 111*  
(s) *Sham v. J. v. D. (1890) 10 Bom. 90* See also *10 R. 100*  
(t) *I. L. J. 100 801 C 75 (1) A 100*  
(u) *11 A 100 801 C 75 (1) A 100*  
(v) *11 A 100 801 C 75 (1) A 100*  
(w) *11 A 100 801 C 75 (1) A 100*  
(x) *11 A 100 801 C 75 (1) A 100*  
(y) *11 A 100 801 C 75 (1) A 100*

application of a decree holder for a rateable distribution under s 73 though according to its own finding, he was clearly entitled to such distribution on the ground that there was other property of the judgment debtor available for the satisfaction of his claim the High Court of Madras interfered under this section ( ) But where a Court has a discretion in a matter a wrong exercise of such discretion is not a proper ground for interference under this section (a)

For other cases under this head see notes below The same topic continued and Wrong decision of lower appellate Court as to jurisdiction of trial Court

Where a Court in the exercise of its jurisdiction has acted illegally or with material irregularity—Cl (c) of the section contemplates cases other than those referred to in cls (a), and (b) This clause clearly excludes clause (b) for a Court cannot refuse to exercise its jurisdiction and act in the exercise of it with material irregularity (f) The clause refers to cases where the Court *having jurisdiction, and exercising it* has acted illegally or with material irregularity in the exercise of such jurisdiction (c) The words acted in the exercise of its jurisdiction illegally or with material irregularity have given rise to a conflict of decisions It is therefore best first to state how much is settled law and then to deal with the various interpretations put on the words illegally and with material irregularity by the various High Courts

What is not illegality or material irregularity—It is settled even if it be on a point of law that where a Court has jurisdiction to determine a question and it determines that question it cannot be said that it has acted illegally or with material irregularity because it has come to an erroneous decision on a question of fact or even of law—The leading case on the subject is *Amir Hassan Khan v Shro Bahsh Singh* (d) decided by their Lordships of the Privy Council in 1894 In that case it was laid down by their Lordships that where a Court has jurisdiction to decide the question before it and in fact decides the question it cannot be regarded as acting in the exercise of its jurisdiction illegally or with material irregularity merely because its decision is erroneous The mere fact that the decision of the Court is wrong affords no ground for the interference of the High Court under this section In the course of the judgment their Lordships said The question then is did the Judges of the lower Courts in this case in the exercise of their jurisdiction act illegally or with material irregularity? It appears that they had perfect jurisdiction to decide the question which was before them [namely whether the suit was barred as *res judicata*] and they did decide it Whether they decided it rightly or wrongly they had jurisdiction to decide the case and even if they decided wrongly they did not exercise their jurisdiction illegally or with material irregularity Following this decision it has been held that the High Court will not interfere under this section merely because the lower Court allowed an application which was barred by limitation (e) or wrongly decided that a suit was barred by limitation (f) or that it was barred as *res judicata* (g) or because the lower Court proceeded upon an erroneous construction of the sections of an Act (h) or

( ) *Sr Jirsa D v J d M C* (1903)

33 d 34 I ( 503)

(a) *JH I L v B s'ar D s* (1918) 40 All

61 40 I C 1 41 *et Hiss v*

*Ha d ni* (19 6) 49 All 193 90 I ( 243

( b ) A A 14 ( )

(b) *B sa tulla v I a dd n* (19 6) 3 Cal

670 96 I C D ( 6 ) A C 7

(c) *F ista m v Chapa* (1 94) 1 Mad 410 4 1

(d) (188 ) 11 Cal 6 12 I A 37 *Mula iet*

*I v f I han v Abd I lah m n K* (1883)

16 C 1 43 16 I A 104 *Paras r ias v*

*it* (1904) 7 Mad 504

( ) *Laba I a v M u a j ol* (1917) 49 All 454

100 I C 6 9 ( ) A A 38

(f) *S nd S gh v Doru h I r* (1893) 9 All

*S I angop I v Joh n H* (191 ) 33 Cal

4 3 I I C 4 Jf ( L I 6 a e r

(1918) 3 P t L J 6 46 I C 1 6 It

oth r a e here a Co rt nt tal v a

appl at on which on the f of it i

b rred by limitation and f us to nt

L J 6 ate upon t'e q et f f i tat

[Limitation Act s 3] T v B i dd n

in (1915) 13 Cal 16 970 3 I C 4 6

*S tish Chandra v Fakhal* (19 8) 47 Cal

I J 6 107 I C 733 ( 28 ) A C 189

(g) *I tr v I alir s a* (1 11 Dom 4 4

(h) *I bhaba v Noory a* (1886) 13 C 1 30

*I r i na v A darrat* (18 4) 15 Cal 416

*Kal Chavan Sarat Chu ter* (1903) 39

Cal 39 Ga ga t a an Shasht B t

(190 ) 3 C 1 5 F v Singh v al

I n (1906) 4 All 24 Malk rj n

*As A r a* (1901) Bom 33 34 I

A 16



misunderstood the effect of a document in evidence (i) or excluded evidence which it ought to have admitted (j) except where such admission was in direct contravention of a statutory provision (k) or held, though incorrectly that there was no relation of landlord and tenant between the parties to a suit or proceeding (l) or that it was not necessary to give notice to a railway company under s 77 of the Railways Act (m) or that an application to set aside a sale was not time barred (n) or that it wrongly applied secs 130 and 131 of the Transfer of Property Act (o) Similarly no revision lies from an order passed in appeal remanding a case under O 41 r 23 below (p) though such order may be erroneous in law The cases cited above were all cases in which the Court *had* jurisdiction to decide the question before it and decided it in fact but the decision was impeached as being erroneous in law and was sought to be revised under the present section In all those cases the High Court held that though there was an error in law the decision was not open to revision on the ground that a mere error in law is not an illegality within the meaning of this section In all these cases the High Court might well have said in the words of their Lordships of the Privy Council in another case (q) It [the lower Court] made a sad mistake it is true but a Court *has* jurisdiction to decide wrong as well as right The point was further emphasized by their Lordships of the Privy Council in *Balakrishna v Vasudeva* (r) Referring to this section their Lordships said —

It will be observed that the section applies to jurisdiction alone the irregular exercise of it or the illegal assumption of it. The section is not directed against conclusions of law or fact in which the question of jurisdiction is not involved. (s)

The rule laid down in *Balakrishna's case* has been interpreted or rather applied differently by different High Courts. This may be explained by an illustration. *A* applies under O 21 r 89 to set aside a sale in execution of a decree. The lower Court places a wrong interpretation on r 89 and holds that *A* is not a person entitled to apply under that rule and the application is dismissed. *A* then applies to the High Court for a revision of the order of the lower Court. Can the High Court interfere in revision? It has been held by the Patna High Court (t) that it can the reason given being that the case is one of a *refusal to exercise a jurisdiction* vested by law in the lower Court and therefore within this section. In the course of his judgment Mullick J said. The Court's decision upon the point whether the applicant has the necessary legal character is clearly a question involving jurisdiction. An erroneous decision on a question of law or fact *after jurisdiction* has once been legally assumed would not be a ground for interference under section 115 of the Code of Civil Procedure but if the decision is *the very basis and foundation of jurisdiction* in its limited sense as distinguished from powers it at once comes within the purview of the section. The judgment of their Lordships of the Privy Council in *Balakrishna v Vasudera* is in my opinion authority for this view. The same view has been taken by a Full Bench of the Madras High Court (u). These decisions have been dissented from by a Full Bench of the Allahabad High Court (v). In the

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| (t) <i>Da ratl i a s v S le dan</i> (194) 16 All 32  | (p) <i>Chaudhri M an v Ha charan Das</i> (1912) 1 R no 119 p 405 18 I f 59   |
| (j) <i>Malharra v Gulabhai</i> (1899) 3 Bom 171 <i>Enat Mo d i v Balaran</i> (1893) 3 Cal W N 581 But see <i>Blusan v Jroffalla</i> (1911) 48 Cal 119 60 I C 801 (a) A C 251 [shut out evidence] | (q) <i>Malharra v Na hari</i> (1901) 5 Bom 337 -7 I A 15 <i>Rajwant Prasad v Ram la tan</i> (1915) 4 I A 171 176 37 All 425 49f 49 30 I C 849  |
| (k) <i>Fau Ind an Ry Co v Ka a L I</i> (19 3) 28 Cal W N 9 24 50 I C 205 (24) A C 493  | (r) (1917) 44 I A 61 40 Mad 93 40 I C 60   |
| (l) <i>Shew P osad v Ra nehundar</i> (1913) 41 Cal 3 3 31 C 97   | (s) (1917) 44 I A 61 67 40 Mad 793 99 40 I C 650 <i>Ashut Al v Indas Beg n</i> (1917) 39 All 3 4 I C 831 [ult valu tion] <i>Jh ka Lal v B shasha D s</i> (1914) 10 All 61 45 I C 71 [O 23 r l] |
| (m) <i>E t l i n i j C K i Lal</i> (19 3) 9 Cal W N 80 I C 9 (5) A C 433   | (t) <i>M ammi t Dha u t v Shoa SA nt r</i> (1919) 41 All I J 340 51 I C 873  |
| (n) <i>M mmat E i v Pa Nath</i> (19 3) 2 Pat 500 7 I C 430 (24) A P 37   | (u) <i>S nd ram v A/a</i> (1911) 44 All 5 4 63 I C 93 (1) A M 157 [F B]  |
| (o) <i>S nt S gh v Mubarak</i> (1923) 9 Lab 8 106 I C 901 (28) A L 140   | (v) <i>Mad Ram v S nda Si gh</i> (19 3) 45 All 45 4 I C 2 (3) A C 39 [F B]   |

Allahabad case Banerji J after referring to *Dalakrishna's case* said In the present case the Court was competent to determine whether [A] was entitled to make an application under O 21 r 89 and it had jurisdiction to decide that question and it decided it adversely to [A] The Court may have been wrong in its decision but it cannot be said that in the exercise of its jurisdiction it acted illegally or with material irregularity in the sense in which those words have been interpreted by their Lordships of the Privy Council in the case to which I have referred and in earlier cases decided by their Lordships The substantial point of difference between the two divergent views is that the Patna and Madras High Courts treat the refusal by the lower Court to entertain the application as a *refusal to exercise* a jurisdiction vested in it by law while the High Court of Allahabad regards the refusal as no more than a decision though erroneous on a point of law *in the exercise* of the lower Court's jurisdiction There is no difference of opinion between these Courts on the point that where the lower Court assumes jurisdiction or refuses jurisdiction on an erroneous construction of a statute the High Court can interfere in revision The difference arises on the question—is it a case of a refusal to exercise jurisdiction or a case merely of a wrong decision on a point of law in the exercise of the Court's jurisdiction? According to the Patna and Madras High Court it is the former according to the Allahabad High Court it is the latter

Following its Full Bench ruling the Madras High Court has held that though an erroneous decision on a point of limitation is not a ground for interference under this section the High Court can and will interfere if the Small Cause Court refuses to entertain an application for retrial of a suit tried by a single judge of that Court where such refusal proceeds on a wrong view of a question of limitation (x) It has similarly been held by that Court that where a District Judge on an erroneous construction of a statutory rule assumes jurisdiction to declare whether a person elected as a President of a Local Board is duly elected or not and assuming such jurisdiction declares his election to be void the High Court has the power to interfere under this section (y) The same High Court interfered in revision where a Subordinate Judge misconstrued the legal position in the case and refused to release the property under attachment as he should have done (y) also where the result of an erroneous decision was likely to perpetuate the error and to give rise to a multiplicity of suits not for one year but for all time (z)

The High Court of Calcutta has held that where a Judge has misdirected himself as to the meaning and effect of a section or of a rule under the Code the High Court can interfere in revision Thus where a plaintiff was allowed to withdraw his suit under O 23 r 1 with liberty to bring a fresh suit on the same cause of action on the ground of a formal defect in the frame of the suit *after* the suit had been heard and decided against him on the merits the High Court interfered in revision (a) In another case the High Court interfered in revision on the ground that the Munsif had not directed his attention properly to the provisions of O 21 r 60 (b) The Oudh Court interfered in revision where the lower Court allowed the plaintiff to withdraw the suit with liberty to institute a fresh suit the object of the withdrawal being to produce evidence in the new suit which he had omitted to produce at the right time (c) The High Court of Pangoon has held that if the lower Court fails to take into account some proposition of law or some material fact in evidence it acts illegally and its decision may be revised by the High Court but

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>(w) <i>British India Steam Navigation Co. v. Sita Sati</i> (1934) 46 Mad 934 O I C 888 (3) A M 475</p> <p>(x) <i>P. M. v. M. v. M. v. M.</i> (1934) 46 Mad 516 11 C 103 (3) A M 19 <i>Shamada v. P. S. a.</i> (1934) 46 Mad 13 I C 90 (3) A M 54</p> <p>(y) <i>G. N. v. Venkatam</i> (1934) 43 Mad L J 80</p> | <p>(z) <i>Surya v. Sree Pura Venkata</i> (1934) 56 Mad L J 73</p> <p>(a) <i>P. M. v. M. v. M.</i> (1934) 5 Cal 106 113 I C 817 (9) A. G. 88</p> <p>(b) <i>Pajluho v. Bhambhani</i> (1934) 43 Cal L J 51 115 I C 36 (9) A C 1</p> <p>(c) <i>Tal v. Firm Sree Doyal</i> (1934) 3 Luck 403 107 I C 837 (3) A O 45</p> |
|--|--|

that if the lower Court has applied its mind to the case and duly considered the facts and the law applicable then although its decision may be erroneous the High Court cannot interfere in revision (d)

The same topic continued?—The decision in *Amir Hassan Khan's* case presupposes jurisdiction in the Court who the decision is sought to be revised on the ground that it is erroneous. Hence the principle of that decision does not apply where a Court erroneously assumes a jurisdiction which is not vested in it by law (e). Thus if a Court proceeding upon an erroneous construction of a section of an Act assumes a jurisdiction which is not vested in it by law the High Court will interfere in revision and set aside the decree of the lower Court as one passed without jurisdiction (f). Similarly if a Court wrongly decides that a suit of a civil nature and entertains the suit on that basis the decision is open to revision under clause (a) of this section for no civil Court is competent to entertain a suit which is not of a civil nature (g) see § 9 above. Similarly if a Court proceeding upon an erroneous construction of a statute or upon a misapprehension of the law declines to exercise a jurisdiction vested in it by law the High Court has the power to interfere under clause (b) of this section (h). These really are cases under clauses (a) and (b) of the present section. They are not cases under clause (c) which is the clause now under consideration. The reason why these cases are mentioned here is that it was contended in those cases that as the assumption of jurisdiction or the refusal to exercise it had proceeded upon an error of law the High Court had no power to interfere under this section and the decision in *Amir Hassan Khan's* case was invoked in support of that contention. But the High Courts held that if the case came under either clause (a) or clause (b) it was immaterial that the assumption of jurisdiction or the refusal to exercise it proceeded upon an error of law. The High Court also pointed out that the basis of the decision in *Amir Hassan Khan's* case was that the lower Court had jurisdiction to determine the question before it and that it had determined it and all that that case decided was that an erroneous decision of a case in the exercise of the Court's jurisdiction was no ground for interference under this section.

A Court has no power to dismiss a suit after the decree is passed in the suit. If it does so the question arises whether the case is one of exercise of jurisdiction not vested in the Court or one of illegality or material irregularity. In *Lachmi Narain v. Balmalund* (1) the Judicial Committee held that the case was one of exercise of jurisdiction not vested in the Court. In that case the High Court on appeal passed a decree by consent for a partition upon certain terms and remitted the suit to the Subordinate Judge for disposal under the decree. The plaintiff failed to appear on the day appointed by the Subordinate Judge to proceed with the matter and the Judge dismissed the suit under O 17 r 2 and O 9 r 8. The plaintiff applied to the High Court for revision. The High Court decided that the case came both under clause (a) and clause (c) of this section and set aside the order of the Subordinate Judge and ordered the case to be restored to his file. The defendants appealed from this order to the Privy Council on the ground that the High Court had no power to interfere in revision. Their Lordships affirmed the decision of the High Court and said: "Their Lordships do not think it necessary to determine that the case came under para (c) of s. 115. But they think that the order which the Subordinate Judge made was one which he *had not jurisdiction* to make. The order of the Subordinate Judge was not merely wrong in law; it was an order which he had no jurisdiction to make."

- (d) *Fut Chong v Maung Po Cho* (19 9) 7 Rang  
3 9 (9) A R 145  
( ) 1/1 *fav S J* (1845) 11 Mart 0  
(f) *1 h nobh r la det* (189) 116 Rom 08  
*11 3 v B D & L J* (19 6) 60 Rom  
15 941 C 74 (6) A B 66 *See also*  
*J J Mahan v J J Ma Bn* (1893) 0  
Cal 8 19 I 4 104  
(g) *Foss v J tamb* (1907) 5 4H 09 see 11

Besides the cases mentioned above there are cases in which the action of the lower Court has been held *not* to amount to illegality or material irregularity *e.g.* failure to give notice where no notice is required to be given under the Code though it might have been given as a matter of equity (j) deciding a case without taking into consideration a point of law where such point was never raised before the Court (k) omitting to state in the order granting a review that the new matter discovered by the applicant was important (l)

What is illegality or material irregularity — *Amir Hassan Khan's* case decides what is *not* an illegality or material irregularity What is it then which *does* constitute an illegality or material irregularity within the meaning of this section ? The Courts have taken *Amir Hassan Khan's* case as the key to the solution of this question but as different Judges have put different interpretations upon the case there are many conflicting decisions as to the meaning of the words of which the following are the leading examples —

1 The words acted in the exercise of its jurisdiction illegally or with material irregularity refer only to an *error of jurisdiction* and apply only to cases of the kind contemplated by cls (a) and (b) of this section (m) As against this view it has been said that the words in question did not occur in the Code of 1877 that they were first introduced by the amending Act of 1879 that errors of jurisdiction had already been provided for by the first two clauses of the section and that the words in question must refer therefore to something other than errors of jurisdiction (n)

2 The words refer to *errors of procedure* only as distinguished from errors of law (o) This view proceeds mainly on the word acted In a Calcutta case Jenkins CJ said It appears to me that section 115 can only be called in aid when the failure of justice (if any) has been due to one or other of the faults of procedure indicated in that section If there was an error committed (by the Small Cause Court Judge) it was an error of law and not of procedure and in my opinion Mr Justice Fletcher had no power to interfere (p) This view is supported by the recent decision of the Privy Council that it is a material irregularity to decide a case in the absence of a necessary party (q)

3 The words apply to cases where there is a *willful disregard or conscious violation* by a judge of a rule of law or procedure (r) As against this view it has been said that it engrafts upon the Privy Council ruling a qualification to the effect that the High Court can interfere under the present section if the erroneous decision is the result of *conscious violation* by the lower Court of a rule of law or procedure and that the distinction is in no way warranted by the language of the section (s) To this it is replied that if the section did not apply to cases where a Judge consciously violated a rule of law or procedure a lower Court might with impunity wilfully disregard the decisions of the High Court or even of the Privy Council (t)

4 The words apply to cases where the decision complained of is vitiated by a *gross and palpable error* (u) According to this view a mistake though of law would if

|   |   |
|---|---|
| (j) <i>Shen v. ...</i> 59 I C 713 (1) A B 19          | (p) <i>Shew Prasad v. Panchinder</i> (1914) 41 Cal 333 338 3 I C 977  |
| (k) <i>Il d. ...</i> I C 9 (1) A B 149                | (q) <i>United M. v. Chand Mal</i> (1906) 31 A 71 99 I C 749 (6) A PC 14   |
| (l) <i>S. M. ...</i> 891 103 I C 37 (7) A M 641       | (r) <i>Sh. A. v. Jom</i> (1853) Lom 341 3 83 9 <i>Krista ma v. Chapa</i> (1894) 17 Mad 410  |
| (m) <i>M. J. ...</i> L I m I a v D I (1846) 8 All 111 | (s) <i>A. set ... v. Ch pa</i> (1894) 17 Mad 410  |
| (n) <i>K. P. ...</i> (I pa (1844) 1 V d 410           | (t) <i>I. se v. P. mba</i> (1903) 3 All 509 5 I per Stanl v C.J.  |
| (o) <i>K. ...</i> 414 41                              | (u) <i>M. A. ... v. ...</i> (1896) 1 Cal W 617 <i>Enat Mond v. B. toram</i> (1899) 3 Cal W 501 53 <i>Venku. v. Lakshman</i> (1885) 1 Bom 61 |

gross and palpable give jurisdiction to the Court under this section. But this view runs counter to the Privy Council decision (1)

5 The words *acted illegally* do not merely imply the commission of an error of procedure such as the expression *acted with material irregularity* does. Those words have relation to gross and palpable errors of Subordinate Courts resulting in grave injustice (w)

It will not serve any useful purpose to discuss these conflicting views. Suffice to say as observed by the Judicial Committee in *Balakrishna v. Vasudeva* (x) that the section applies to jurisdiction alone *the irregular exercise of it* or the illegal assumption of it. The section is not directed against conclusions of law or fact in which the question of jurisdiction is not involved. See note above Jurisdiction.

Having noted the different interpretations put upon the words in question we proceed to note some of the decisions reported on the subject.

It is an illegality to frame an issue on a point of fact expressly admitted by the defendant and to dismiss the suit on the ground that the fact is not proved (y). Similar is it an illegality if a Court passes a decree on an unstamped hundi. The Stamp Act expressly provides that an unstamped hundi shall not be acted upon (z) [see Stamp Act II of 1899 s. 35]. It is an illegality if the appellate Court calls in question the admissibility of a document not duly stamped after the same has been admitted in evidence in the Court of first instance such a course is manifestly against the provisions of the Stamp Act by which it is enacted that when an instrument has been admitted in evidence such admission shall not be called in question at any stage of the same suit (a) [see Stamp Act II of 1899 s. 35]. It is also an illegality to pass a decree where there is no evidence at all to support it (b) or where the evidence is obviously valueless (c) or to decide a case on personal inspection of the subject matter of the suit ignoring the evidence on record (d). It is an illegality to attach in execution of a decree the tools of an artisan contrary to s. 60 of the Code (e) or to attach money in a provident fund regulated by the Provident Funds Act (f). It is also an illegality where a Court acts upon a rule invented by itself and not warranted by the law (g).

It is a material irregularity if a decree is passed in a suit in the absence of a party in whose absence it could not possibly be made (h). It is also a material irregularity if a Court taking a mistaken view of the question at issue proceeds to determine an issue which does not really arise in the case and bases its decision of the case on a determination of that issue (i). It is also a material irregularity to treat the delivery of a summons by post to a person who was not shown to be the defendant as good service and to pass a decree ex parte against the defendant on that footing (j) or to attach in execution of a personal decree against a defendant property which he holds as trustee for another (k) or to make an order against a person without hearing him (l). It is also a material irregularity

- (1) *Shew Prasad v. R. M. Chander* (1913) 41 Cal 3-3 240 23 I C 977  
 (w) *Jogendra v. Satish Chandra* (1914) 51 Cal 690 83 I C 438 (1) A C 633  
 (x) (1917) 44 I A 61 267 40 M d 93 799 40 I C 650  
 (y) *Corak v. Ithi* (1887) 11 Bom 435  
 (z) *Chenabappa v. Lakshman* (1893) 18 Bom 369  
 (a) *Shiddappa v. Iyaya* (1894) 18 Lon 737  
 (b) *Shields v. Wilkinson* (1887) 9 All 398 409  
 (c) *Bhatnagar v. Kalidhan* (1913) 33 C W 569 (29) A C 36  
 (d) *Sak v. Bidi v. Stephen* (1916) 4 Rang 2-1 9 I C 10 5, (26) A R 205  
 (e) *R. d. m. v. D.* (1896) 8 All 111 115  
*Dhan v. Singh v. Basant Singh* (1898) 8 All 519 529  
*Singh v. Singh v. Shubhchander* (1896) 13 Cal 2-3 231  
 (f) *Hindley v. Joyram* (1919) 46 Cal 96-.

- 970 973 54 I C 430  
 (g) *Dip Ch. d. v. Shro Prasad* (1919) 7 All L.J 69 (1) A C 593  
 (h) *Um d. Wal v. Chand Mal* (1917) 53 I A 71 1 C 14  
 (i) *Tejpal v. Lalama* (1889) 1 Bom 817 5 M d 1 v. Tricomdas (1915) 4 Cal 96 93 I C 917  
 (j) *Jaganath v. S. oon* (1891) 18 Bom 606  
 (k) *Ab. h. m. v. Donald* (1906) 29 Mad 3 4  
 (l) *Sho d. in the matter of* (1901) 3 Cal 574  
 (m) *Sato Kote v. G. pal S. h.* (1907) 31 Cal 9 933  
*Braja Bha. v. Sra Chandra* (1919) 4 Pat L.J 70 47 I C 719  
*Bachhai v. Ibrahim* (1913) 47 Bom. 11 14 15 69 I C 169 (1) A B 207 But see *Mitchand v. Tarni Prasad* (1919) 4 Pat L.J 614 54 I C 222

for a Court to decline to go into evidence when required to do so and to proceed to dispose of the suit upon the pleadings or upon allegations made in a petition (m) or to refuse to draw up its own decree whether it be preliminary or final (n) or to refuse to grant a certificate for a refund of court fees paid on a memorandum of appeal when a case is remanded under O 41 r 23 (o) [Court Fees Act 7 of 1870 s 13] It is also a material irregularity to apply to a case a section of an Act which is not applicable to it (p) or to disregard the provisions of the Evidence Act and to place the burden of proof on a wrong party (q) or to decide a case on a point of fact not raised in the pleadings (r) Where an application is made to set aside a sale under O 21 r 80 and it is followed by another application which does no more than give additional particulars of irregularity in conducting the sale it is material irregularity to refuse to consider the second application (s)

**Wrong decision of lower appellate Court as to jurisdiction of trial Court —** The question to be considered under this head is whether the High Court has jurisdiction to interfere under this section where the lower appellate Court erroneously decides in the exercise of its admitted jurisdiction as an appellate Court that the Court of first instance had or had not jurisdiction to entertain a suit Cases of this kind arise when a Court of first instance returns a plaint on the ground that it has no jurisdiction to entertain the suit and the lower appellate Court affirms the order of the Court of first instance or sets aside the order Has the High Court jurisdiction in such a case to revise the order of the lower appellate Court? It has been held by the High Court of Allahabad (t) that it has not the reason given being that if the lower appellate Court committed an error it did so in the exercise of its jurisdiction in entertaining an appeal which it was bound to entertain On the other hand it has been held by a Full Bench of the Madras High Court (u) that the High Court has jurisdiction to interfere in revision with the order of the lower appellate Court the reason given being that the case comes either under cl. (b) or cl. (c) of this section In an earlier Calcutta case (v) the High Court took the same view as that taken by the Allahabad High Court but in a later case (w) where the lower appellate Court had confirmed the order of the first Court the High Court entertained an application to revise the order of the lower appellate Court In a Bombay case (x) where the lower appellate Court had confirmed the order of the first Court and the application was for the revision of the orders of both the lower Courts the application was entertained But though the Allahabad High Court holds that the order of the lower appellate Court cannot be revised yet it holds that its jurisdiction to revise the order of the Court of first instance is not excluded by the fact that it was appealable to a subordinate Court It has therefore jurisdiction to set aside that order in revision and the order of the lower appellate Court falls with it (y)

**Ex parte decree —** A Full Bench of the Allahabad High Court has held that the High Court has power to interfere in revision with an appellate order directing the setting aside of an ex parte decree when the Appellate Court had no power under O 9

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>(m) <i>Bajji Bhusan v Sris Chandra</i> (1918) 4 Pat L J 20 47 I C 719</p> <p>(n) <i>Sudhanath v Ganesh</i> (1913) 37 Bom 60 17 I C 67</p> <p>(o) <i>Bhatting v Chaganiram</i> (1915) 42 Bom 363 4 I C 55</p> <p>(p) <i>Sris Bux v Shab Chunder</i> (1886) 13 Cal Jugabundho v Jais (1887) 15 C 1 47 S aprasad v Trico das (1915) 4 Cal 96 931 7 I C 97 <i>Ami v Bubi v R M Mordeen</i> (19 5) 3 Rang 11 80 I C 60 ( 5) A R 00</p> <p>(q) <i>Rasu v Katta</i> (19 1) - Kan 0 8 I C 658 ( 1) A R 349</p> <p>(r) <i>Mra ng Pa v Abdul G</i> (19 6) 4 Rang 20 97 I C 10 3 ( 6) A R 14</p> <p>(s) <i>Pami Sar v Giridha Lal</i> (19 6) 43 All -86 2 I C 507 ( 6) 4 A 30</p> | <p>(t) <i>Badami Ku v Dini Fai</i> (1886) 8 All 111 [F B] <i>Ju la Prasad v East India Railway</i> (1918) 16 All I J 53 46 I C 99 <i>Chandu Lal v Aoka Mal</i> (19 1) 43 All 351 61 I C 36 ( 1) A R 6</p> <p>(u) <i>Atchaya v Sri Seetha an hand a</i> (1916) 39 Mad 19 18 I C 55 [F B] <i>Meeat h v Annanthanarayana</i> (1903) 6 Mad 4 <i>Kattiya v I ma samiya</i> (19 9) 56 M 1 L J 394 ( 9) A M 336</p> <p>(v) <i>Moth ra Veth v Ume h Chand a</i> (1896) 1 Cal W 66</p> <p>(w) <i>Zam an Fateh Ali</i> (190 3) Cal 145</p> <p>(x) <i>Ushantath v Pambhat</i> (1901) 15 Lon 145 <i>Vandath v Kuanal</i> (19 2) 30 Lon I R 1391 11 I C 34 (28) A B 548</p> <p>(y) <i>Buhsnar Prasad v Jaghubar</i> (19 6) 43 All 168 90 I C 353 ( 6) A A 58</p> |
|---|---|

r 13 to direct the case to be reheard (z) In one case the Lahore High Court interfered in revision when the lower Court set aside an ex parte decree even though the application to set it aside was barred by limitation (a)

**Order refusing review**—Where the lower Court refuses to entertain an application for review based on an allegation of fraud the High Court has power to interfere under this section (b) The section however does not apply to an order refusing to grant a review (c) When the lower Court has rightly refused to restore an execution application under O 9 the High Court has no power under this section to direct it to treat the application as one in review (d)

**Order granting review**—An order granting a review may be set aside in revision (e)

**Award**—See notes to Schedule II paras 1 5 15 and 16 under the heading Revision

**Lunacy**—As to the power of the High Court to interfere in lunacy proceedings see the undermentioned case (f)

**No revision from discretionary orders**—The High Court will not interfere in revision with an order which it is in the discretion of the lower Court to make (g)

**Court fee**—See note above Interlocutory order

**Gross miscarriage of justice**—The interference of the High Court under this section in cases where the lower Court has acted illegally or with material irregularity should be confined to cases where the illegality or irregularity was such as had occasioned or might occasion a substantial failure of justice (h) Hence the judgment of a lower Court should not be set aside upon a mere technicality (i)

**Sanction to prosecute**—If a Civil or a Revenue Court acting under s 476 of the Criminal Procedure Code grants or refuses an application to prosecute a party to the suit or witnesses before it its order is a *decision* of a case within the meaning of the *present section* The High Court therefore has no jurisdiction to interfere under s 439 of the *Criminal Procedure Code* and to call for the proceedings of the lower Court under that section But it has power under s 115 of *this Code* as also under section 15 of the High Courts Act 1861 [now s 107 of the Government of India Act 1915] to call for the proceedings and to pass such order as it may deem expedient In other words the application in such cases lies on the *civil* revisional side of the High Court and not on the *criminal* revisional side But the Bench exercising criminal jurisdiction may deal with the matter if authorized to do so by the Chief Justice under section 14 of the High Courts Act 1861 [now s 108 of the Government of India Act 1915] (j) The rule is

(i) *Fam Sarup v Gaya Prasad* (19 6) 48 All 175 90 I C 180 ( 5) A A 610

(a) *Peri Shah v Qarib Shah* (19 6) 7 Lah 161 9 I C 124 ( 8) A L 379

(b) *Khitai Choni v Jagendra Nath* (19 9) 33 C W N 57 (29) A C 513

(c) *Lakshman v Maruti* (19 4) 25 Bom L R 84 80 I C 67 ( 4) A B 344

(d) *Saifannessa v Megh Lal* (19 6) 43 Cal L J 7 83 91 I C 17 ( 26) A C 735

(e) *Nath Lal v Paghob Singh* (19 6) 48 All 160 89 I C 946 ( 6) A A 50

(f) *Singh v Maheendra* (19 7) 51 Cal 836 103 I C 7 25 ( 7) A C 636

(g) *Phanind v Prematha Nath* (19 8) 5 Cal 748 106 I C 880 ( 28) A C 4 1 JA 120  
*Lal v Bisheshwar Das* (1918) 40 All 610

*Hasan Ali v Lachhman* (19 8) 50 All 113

(h) *Per Davies J in Kristamma v Chapa* (1894) 17 Mad 410 at p 41 *Jamali v Marleod* (1907) 31 Bom 139

(i) *Ashraf Lal v Deputy Commissioner of Bha* (1895) Cal 729 I A 90  
*I am God v Chintamon* (19 6) 5 Pat 361 93 I C 939 ( 6) A P 13

(j) *Bhup Kumar in the matter of the prison of* (1901) 26 All 49 57 [F B], *Emperor v Ha Prasad* (1913) 40 Cal 77 10 I C 197 [F B], *Emperor v Kashi* (1916) 4 All 695 36 I C 836 but see *Uttu puru v Emperor* (1910) 33 Mad 48 5 I C 934 [F B], *Abd Ali q v Sheo Ram* (19 7) 49 All 536 100 I C 376 ( 7) A A 334  
*Bismillah v Shah Ali* (19 9) 4 Luck 1 ( 3) A O 491

the same where action has been taken by a Subordinate Civil Court under s 19 of the Criminal Procedure Code (l) See also the undermentioned cases (i)

**Appeal**—By cl 15 of the Letters Patent as amended in March 1919 it is provided that no appeal lies from an order made in the exercise of revisional jurisdiction. Prior to the amendment there was a conflict of decisions as to whether an appeal lay to the High Court under cl 15 of the Letters Patent from the judgment of a single Judge delivered in the exercise of revisional jurisdiction under this section. The matter stood thus it was enacted by cl 15 of the Letters Patent as it stood before the amendment that an appeal shall lie to the High Court from the judgment of one Judge of the High Court or one Judge of any Division Court pursuant to s 13 of the Charter Act. Now s 13 of the Charter Act provides for the exercise by the Judges of the High Court of the original and appellate jurisdiction vested in the High Court. This gave rise to the question whether the division of jurisdiction into (1) original and (2) appellate was exhaustive or not. If the division was exhaustive revisional jurisdiction must be treated as comprised in appellate jurisdiction so that an appeal would lie under cl 15 from the judgment of a single Judge exercising revisional jurisdiction. If the division was not exhaustive so that revisional jurisdiction was something outside the original and appellate jurisdiction the case would not fall within s 13 of the Charter Act and no appeal could therefore lie under cl 15 of the Letters Patent. It was held by the High Courts of Madras (m) and Calcutta (n) that the division of the jurisdiction of High Courts into original and appellate was exhaustive and that revisional jurisdiction was included in appellate jurisdiction and that an appeal therefore lay under cl 15 of the Letters Patent from an order of a single Judge made under the present section, provided such order amounted to a judgment within the meaning of that clause. The contrary was held by the High Court of Bombay (o) it does not however appear that there was any judgment in the Bombay case (p)

**Laches**—An application for revision will not be entertained unless it is made without unreasonable delay (q)

(k) *Saty Ram v Rams Lal* (1906) 9 All 54  
*Chennanagoud in re* (1907) 26 Mad 139

(l) *Pam P asad Mala in re* (1910) 37 Cal 134  
I C 6 *Eni Prasad v Saryu P asad*  
(1911) 33 All 219 I C 93 *Budhu*  
*Lal v Chaitu* (1916) 43 Cal 597 36 I C  
472 &c in appeal (1917) 44 Cal 804 39 I C  
[order made by a Judge of the Presidency  
Small Cause Court] *Paramansingh v*  
*Alamel* (1919) 4 Mad 649 I C 11  
[Madras Estates Land Act] *Emperor v*  
*Chota Lal* (1917) 9 All 367 39 I C  
845 [non specification of statements on  
which charge is brought]

(m) *Chappan v Mowda* (1899) 6 Mad 68 Tw

*garam v Alagappa* (1913) 33 Mad 18 I C  
340 *Srinivasa v Ramaswami* (1916) 89  
Mad 35 3 I C 816

(n) *Sheo Prasad v P m Chunder* (1914) 41 Cal  
33 3 I C 977 *Debendranath v Bibu*  
*dhendra* (1916) 43 Cal 90 33 I C 745

(o) *Hiralal v Bai An* (1893) Bom 891  
See also *Neelal v Ali Ali* (1906) 23  
All 133

(p) See (1914) 41 Cal 3-3 33 3 I C 977  
*supra*

(q) *Durga Prasad v Sheo Charan* (1883) 4 All  
154 *Balmatund v Sheo Jatan* (1884)  
6 All 1



## PART IX

### Special Provisions relating to the Chartered High Courts

**116** [S 631] This Part applies only to High Courts which are or may hereafter be established under the Indian High Courts Act, 1861, or the Government of India Act, 1915

Part to apply only to certain High Courts

The words and figures or the Government of India Act 1915 were inserted in the section by the Amending Act 13 of 1916

**117** [S 632] Save as provided in this Part or in Part X or in rules, the provisions of this Code shall apply to such High Courts

Application of Code to High Courts

Save as provided in this Part —See s 120

Save as provided in Part X —See s 129

Rules — Rules means rules contained in the First Schedule or made under s 122 or s 125 see s 2 (18) see also O 49 r 3

**118** [S 634] Where any such High Court considers it necessary that a decree passed in the exercise of its original civil jurisdiction should be executed before the amount of the costs incurred in the suit can be ascertained by taxation, the Court may order that the decree shall be executed forthwith, except as to so much thereof as relates to the costs,

Execution of decree before ascertainment of costs

and, as to so much thereof as relates to the costs, that the decree may be executed as soon as the amount of the costs shall be ascertained by taxation

**119** [S 635] Nothing in this Code shall be deemed to authorize any person on behalf of another to address the Court in the exercise of its original civil jurisdiction, or to examine witnesses except where the Court shall have in the exercise of the power conferred by its charter authorized him so to do, or to interfere with the power of the High Court to make rules concerning advocates, vakils and attorneys

Unauthorized persons not to address Court

See Letters Patent cla. 9 and 10

120 [S. 638, 639] The following provisions shall not apply to the High Court in the exercise of its original civil jurisdiction, namely, sections 16, 17 and 20

Provisions not applicable to High Courts in original civil or insolvent jurisdiction

As to Rules not applicable to Chartered High Courts see O 49 r 3

Sub-section (2) of this section by which it was provided that nothing in this Code shall extend or apply to any Judge of a High Court in the exercise of jurisdiction as an insolvent Court has been repealed by the Presidency Towns Insolvency Act III of 1909 s 127

---

## PART X

## Rules

**121** [*New*] The rules in the First Schedule shall have effect as if enacted in the body of this Code until annulled or altered in accordance with the provisions of this Part

Effect of rules in First Schedule

The whole of this Part is new except ss 129 130 and 131 which correspond to s 602 para 2 3 and 4 of the Code of 1883

As to annulment and alterations of rules see s 124

**122** [*New Cf S 652, first para*] High Courts established under the Indian High Courts Act, 1861, or the Government of India Act, 1915, and the Chief Court of Oudh, may, from time to time after previous publication, make rules regulating their own procedure and the procedure of the Civil Courts subject to their superintendence, and may by such rules annul, alter or add to all or any of the rules in the First Schedule

Power of certain High Courts to make rules

The words and figures or the Government of India Act 1915 were inserted in the section by the Amending Act 13 of 1916 The words and the Chief Court of Oudh were added by the Oudh Courts Act 4 of 1925

Rules made under this section by the High Courts are set out in Appendices at the end of this work.

Sections 122 to 128 excepting s 125 provide for rules to be made by Chartered High Courts for regulating their own procedure and the procedure of the Civil Courts subject to their superintendence that is Courts subject to their appellate jurisdiction see High Courts Act 1861 s 15 and the Government of India Act 1915 s 107 These rules must not be inconsistent with the provisions in the body of the Code (see s 128) Further they are subject to the previous approval of the authorities mentioned in s 126 Sec 129 provides for rules to be made by Chartered High Courts as to their original civil procedure These rules may be inconsistent with the provisions in the body of the Code but they must not be inconsistent with the Letters Patent establishing those Courts

**Rules and limitation**—None of the Courts empowered under this section to frame rules has power by any rule which it may make to alter the period of limitation prescribed by the Indian Limitation Act (r)

An appellant is entitled as of right under sec 12 of the Indian Limitation Act 1908 to exclude the time requisite for obtaining copies of the decree or order appealed from and of the judgment on which such decree may be or is founded This right is not affected by any rules made by any High Court that such copies need not accompany the memorandum of appeal (s)

123 [New] (1) A Committee, to be called the Rule Committee, shall be constituted at the town which is the usual place of sitting of each of the High Courts and the Chief Court referred to in section 122

Constitution of Rule Committees in certain Provinces

(2) Each such Committee shall consist of the following persons, namely —

- (a) three judges of the High Court established at the town at which such Committee is constituted, one of whom at least has served as a District Judge or a Divisional Judge for three years,
- (b) a barrister practising in that Court,
- (c) an advocate (not being a barrister) or vakil or pleader enrolled in that Court,
- (d) a Judge of a Civil Court subordinate to the High Court, and
- (e) in the towns of Calcutta, Madras and Bombay, an attorney

(3) The members of each such Committee shall be appointed by the Chief Justice or Chief Judge who shall also nominate one of their number to be president

Provided that, if the Chief Justice or Chief Judge elects to be himself a member of a Committee, the number of other Judges appointed to be members shall be two, and the Chief Justice or Chief Judge shall be the President of the Committee

(4) Each member of any such Committee shall hold office for such period as may be prescribed by the Chief Justice or Chief Judge in this behalf, and whenever any member retires, resigns, dies or ceases to reside in the province in which the Committee was constituted, or becomes incapable of acting as a member of the Committee, the said Chief Justice or Chief Judge may appoint another person to be a member in his stead

(5) There shall be a Secretary to each such Committee, who shall be appointed by the Chief Justice or Chief Judge and shall receive such remuneration as may be provided in this behalf by the Governor General in Council or by the Local Government, as the case may be

The words the town which is the usual place of sitting of each of the High Courts referred to in section 122 in sub sec (1) were substituted for the words each of the towns of Calcutta Madras Bombay Allahabad, Lahore and Rangoon by the Amending Act 13 of 1916 The words and the Chief Court after the words High Courts were added by the Oudh Courts Act 4 of 1925

**124 [New]** Every Rule Committee shall make a report to the High Court established at the town at which it is constituted on any proposal to annul, alter or add to the rules in the First Schedule or to make new rules, and before making any rules under section 122 the High Court shall take such report into consideration

Committee to report to High Court

The provisions as to Rule Committees apply to rules to be made under s 122 Rules under that section can only be made after the Chartered High Courts have taken the opinion of the Rule Committee attached to them

**125 [New]** High Courts, other than the Courts specified in section 122, may exercise the powers conferred by that section in such manner and subject to such condition as, in the case of the Court of the Judicial Commissioner of Coorg, the Governor General in Council, and, in other cases, the Local Government, may determine

Power of other High Courts to make rules

Provided that any such High Court may, after previous publication, make a rule extending within the local limits of its jurisdiction any rules which have been made by any other High Court

Rules under this section should not be inconsistent with the provisions in the body of this Code See s 128 and contrast s. 129 As to sanction see s 126

**126 [New]** Rules made under the foregoing provisions shall be subject to the previous approval of the following authorities, namely —

Rules subject to sanction

(a) if the rule is made by a High Court established under the Indian High Courts Act, 1861, or the Government of India Act, 1915, to the approval of the authority prescribed by the proviso to section 107 of the latter Act for rules made under that section,

(b) if the rule is made by any other High Court, to the approval of the Local Government

The word approval in the section was substituted for the word sanction by the Amending Act 13 of 1916

The words and figures or the Government of India Act 1915 were inserted in the section by the Amending Act 13 of 1916 The words and figures the proviso to

section 107 of the latter Act were substituted for the words and figures section 15 of that Act also by that Act

**Approval**—This section requires in the case of rules to be made by Chartered High Courts the same sanction as is required by s 107 of the Government of India Act 1915 the object being that the rule making power should correspond with the power conferred under section 107 of that Act That section empowers the Chartered High Courts to make and issue general rules for regulating the practice and proceedings of Courts subject to their appellate jurisdiction subject to the previous approval in the case of the High Court of Calcutta of the Governor General in Council and in other cases of the local Government

**127 [New]** Rules so made and approved shall be published in the Gazette of India or in the

Publication of rules

local official Gazette, as the case may be,

and shall from the date of publication or from such other date as may be specified have the same force and effect, within the local limits of the jurisdiction of the High Court which made them, as if they had been contained in the First Schedule

The word approved was substituted for the word sanctioned by the Repealing and Amending Act 24 of 1917 sch L

**128 [New]** (1) Such rules shall be not inconsistent with the provisions in the body of this Code, but, subject thereto, may provide for any matter relating to the procedure of Civil Courts

Matters for which rules may provide

(2) In particular, and without prejudice to the generality of the powers conferred by sub section (1), such rules may provide for all or any of the following matters, namely —

- (a) the service of summonses, notices and other process by post or in any other manner either generally or in any specified areas, and the proof of such service,
- (b) the maintenance and custody, while under attachment, of live stock and other movable property, the fees payable for such maintenance and custody, the sale of such live stock and property and the proceeds of such sale,
- (c) procedure in suits by way of counter claim, and the valuation of such suits for the purposes of jurisdiction,
- (d) procedure in garnishee and charging orders either in addition to, or in substitution for the attachment and sale of debts,

- (e) procedure where the defendant claims to be entitled to contribution or indemnity over against any person whether a party to the suit or not (t),
- (f) summary procedure—
  - (1) in suits in which the plaintiff seeks only to recover a debt or liquidated demand in money payable by the defendant, with or without interest, arising—
    - on a contract, express or implied, or
    - on an enactment where the sum sought to be recovered is a fixed sum of money or in the nature of a debt other than a penalty, or
    - on a guarantee, where the claim against the principal is in respect of a debt or a liquidated demand only, or
    - on a trust or
  - (ii) in suits for the recovery of immovable property, with or without a claim for rent or mesne profits, by a landlord against a tenant whose term has expired or has been duly determined by notice to quit, or has become liable to forfeiture for non payment of rent, or against persons claiming under such tenant,
- (g) procedure by way of originating summons,
- (h) consolidation of suits, appeals and other proceedings,
- (i) delegation to any Registrar, Prothonotary or Master or other official of the Court of any judicial, quasi judicial and non judicial duties, and
- (j) all forms, registers, books, entries and accounts which may be necessary or desirable for the transaction of the business of Civil Courts

**129** [S 52, third para] Notwithstanding anything in this Code, any High Court established under the Indian High Courts Act, 1861, or the Government of India Act, 1915, may make such rules not inconsistent with the Letters

Power of Chartered High Courts to make rules as to their original civil procedure

Patent establishing it to regulate its own procedure in the exercise of its original civil jurisdiction as it shall think fit, and nothing herein contained shall affect the validity of any such rules in force at the commencement of this Code

The words and figures or the Government of India Act 1915 were inserted in the section by the Amending Act 13 of 1916

Rules as to original civil procedure of Chartered High Courts — Rules made under a 122 must not be inconsistent with the provisions in the body of this Code Under this section any Chartered High Court may make rules to regulate its own procedure in the exercise of its original civil jurisdiction Such rules may not be consistent with the provisions in the body of the Code but they must not be inconsistent with the Letters Patent establishing it The Letters Patent here referred to are the Letters Patent of 1865 those being the Letters Patent in force when the present Code was enacted, and not the Letters Patent of 1862 (u)

**130** [S 652 second para] A High Court not established under the Indian High Courts Act, 1861, or the Government of India Act, 1915, may, with the previous approval of the Local Government, make, with respect to any matter other than procedure, any rule which any High Court so established might, under section 15 or section 107 respectively of those Acts make with respect to any such matter for any part of the territories under its jurisdiction which is not included within the limits of a Presidency town

The words and figures or the Government of India Act 1915 were inserted in the section by the Amending Act 13 of 1916 The words or section 107 respectively of those Acts were substituted for the words of that Act also by that Act

The word approval was substituted for the word sanction by the Repealing and Amending Act 24 of 1917 sch I

**131** [S 652, fourth para] Rules made in accordance with section 129 or section 130 shall be published in the Gazette of India or in the local official Gazette, as the case may be, and shall from the date of publication or from such other date as may be specified have the force of law

Date of publication — The rules referred to in this section have the force of law from the date of publication (t)

(u) *Uday Chand v. Khetradas* (1911) 51 Cal 905 | (v) *B. J. Ath v. Dulari* (1918) 50 All 56 110 I C 806 911 81 I C 1018 (1) A C 105 | 19 (23) A A OS



## PART XI

## Miscellaneous

**132 [S 640]** (1) Women who, according to the customs and manners of the country, ought not to be compelled to appear in public shall be exempt from personal appearance in Court

Exemption of certain women from personal appearance

(2) Nothing herein contained shall be deemed to exempt such women from arrest in execution of civil process in any case in which the arrest of women is not prohibited by this Code

**Appearance in Court**—This section provides for exemption of purdanashin ladies from personal appearance in Court but not from attendance in Court. The word appearance means that a purdanashin lady shall not be compelled to come forth into view or to become visible to the public gaze. The Court therefore has power to order a purdanashin lady to give evidence in Court provided she is not compelled to come forth into view or to become visible to the public gaze (w). See notes to O 26 r 1. Persons exempted from attending Court.

**133 [S 641]** (1) The Local Government may, by notification in the local official Gazette, exempt from personal appearance in Court any person whose rank, in the opinion of such Government, entitles him to the privilege of exemption

Exemption of other persons

(2) The names and residences of the persons so exempted shall, from time to time, be forwarded to the High Court by the Local Government and a list of such persons as reside within the local limits of the jurisdiction of each Court subordinate to the High Court shall be kept in such subordinate Court

(3) Where any person so exempted claims the privilege of such exemption, and it is consequently necessary to examine him by commission, he shall pay the costs of that commission, unless the party requiring his evidence pays such costs

See O 26 r 1

**134** [New] The provisions of sections 55, 57 and 59 shall apply, so far as may be, to all persons arrested under this Code

Arrest other than in execution of decree

This section is new It supplies an omission

**135** [S 642] (1) No Judge, Magistrate or other judicial officer shall be liable to arrest under civil process while going to, presiding in, or returning from, his Court

Exemption from arrest under civil process

(2) Where any matter is pending before a tribunal having jurisdiction therein, or believing in good faith that it has such jurisdiction, the parties thereto, their pleaders, mukhtars, revenue agents, and recognized agents, and their witnesses, acting in obedience to a summons, shall be exempt from arrest under civil process other than process issued by such tribunal for contempt of Court while going to or attending such tribunal for the purpose of such matter, and while returning from such tribunal

(3) Nothing in sub section (2) shall enable a judgment-debtor to claim exemption from arrest under an order for immediate execution or where such judgment debtor attends to show cause why he should not be committed to prison in execution of a decree

Alterations in the section —

1 The words other than process issued by such tribunal for contempt of Court in sub s (2) have been added to give effect to a Calcutta decision (x)

2 Sub section (3) is new It has been substituted for the words except as provided in section 337A sub section (5) and sections 556 and 643 which occurred at the commencement of sub section (2) in the Code of 1882

Grounds of exemption from arrest—The exemption here conferred is not for the personal benefit of the individual but for the furthering of public interests and the better administration of justice In other words the exemption is not the privilege of the person attending the Court but that of the Court which he attends If therefore a witness does not believe *bona fide* that his attendance was required there is no privilege (y) For the same reason where a writ of attachment for contempt of Court has been issued against a party to a suit he cannot claim privilege from arrest while proceeding to Court for the purpose of attending the hearing of the suit ( )

While going to or attending and while returning from Court—A party to a suit is exempt from arrest under this section while going to or attending the Court before which the suit is pending and while returning from such Court The following are the leading cases bearing on this part of the section —

(1) Where a plaintiff who was a native of Patna and who had instituted a suit in the High Court of Madras left Patna on receiving a letter from his solicitors that

(x) *John v Carter* (1890) 4 B L R 1 O C 90  
(y) *Wooma Churn v T N* (1875) 14 B L R 1  
App 13 *Sama apuri v Fery & Co*

(1890) 13 Mad 150 158 *Omrutalli v the matter of* (1861) 1 Cal. 891

(z) *John v Carter* (1890) 4 B L R O C 90

his presence was required and arrived at Madras on 24th October and the suit having come on for hearing on the 27th of October was adjourned till the 25th of December and he was arrested in execution of a decree against him on the 10th of November it was held by the High Court of Madras that he was privileged from arrest (a) The decision was disapproved by the Allahabad High Court (b) in the case cited in ill (2) below but it is in accordance with the decision of the House of Lords in the under mentioned case (c)

(2) A residing in Bombay goes to Benares to prosecute an application to set aside an ex parte decree passed against him by the Benares Court and puts up at a Dak bungalow in Benares. On the date fixed for the hearing of the application A attends the Court when his application is heard and dismissed. He then leaves the Court returns to the Dak bungalow and thence proceeds to the railway station where he is arrested in execution of the decree while actually seated in the train. It is found on evidence that A had taken a ticket for Allahabad when arrested. On the above facts the High Court of Allahabad held that A's arrest was legal. The Court said. In the present case [A] had left the Court and had returned to the place where [he] was staying in Benares he had then left that place and [was] actually on his way to Allahabad which is not his home. In these circumstances we cannot hold that he at the time of arrest was returning from a tribunal within the meaning of section 135 (d)

(3) The exemption from arrest continues during such period as is reasonably occupied in going to attending at and returning from the place of trial (e). But if there is a deviation the privilege is forfeited. It is not a deviation sufficient to forfeit the privilege if the shortest road home is deviated from and a less crowded and more convenient road adopted (f)

(4) A debtor who is released from jail under an order of the Court on the ground that the order under which he was committed was illegal may be arrested under civil process immediately after he is released. He is not privileged from arrest as returning from Court. It does not follow because imprisonment followed on an order which was illegal that he should be treated when released from jail as returning from Court (g)

(5) A is arrested in execution of a decree obtained against him by B and is brought before the Court. While he is in the custody of the Court's officers he is arrested in execution of a decree obtained against him by C. A is not exempt from arrest in execution of C's decree. It cannot be said that A while he was under arrest in execution of B's decree was voluntarily in Court in connection with the execution of B's decree (h)

**Parties** —A defendant in a summary suit under O. 37 [Code of 1882 chapter 39] is privileged from arrest though he has not obtained leave to defend the suit (i)

**Civil process** —This section applies only to witnesses and parties arrested under writs issued by Courts to which the Code applies. It does not apply where a party is arrested under a writ issued from a Small Cause Court. As there is no provision in the Small Cause Court Act corresponding to this section questions as to exemption from arrest in the case of persons arrested under writs issued from Small Cause Courts must be governed by the principles of the English law on the subject. There are very much the same as those set forth in the present section (j)

(a) *Siva Bux in the matter of* (1881) 4 Mad 317

(b) *Arde Airji v Kalyandas* (1910) 3 All 363 I C 46

(c) *Perriss v Perriss* (1856) 5 H L C 671 Halsbury, Vol. 25 p 818

(d) *Ardesheerji v Kalyandas* (1910) 3 All 363 I C 46

(e) *Appasamy v Goenken* (1868) 4 Mad H C 145

(f) *Soorendra Nath in the matter of* (1890) 5 C I 106 *Emperor v Bhatti* (1904) 46

All 663 84 I C 66 (24) A A 66

(g) *Samarapur v Parry & Co* (1890) 13 Mad 150

(h) *Goenndasamy v The Union Bank Ltd* (1904) 47 Mad L J 58 84 I C 513 (24) A M 900

(i) *Soorendra Nath in the matter of* (1890) 5 Cal 106

(j) *Soorendra Nath in the matter of* (1890) 5 Cal 106

**Appeal**—Where a judgment debtor arrested in execution of a decree claims exemption from arrest under this section but the exemption is not allowed the order is one under s 47 and is appealable (k)

Exemption of members of legislative bodies from arrest and detention under civil process

**135A (1)** No person shall be liable to arrest or detention in prison under civil process—

- (a) If he is a member of either Chamber of the Indian Legislature or of a Legislative Council constituted under the Government of India Act during the continuance of any meeting of such Chamber or Council,
- (b) If he is a member of any committee of such Chamber or Council, during the continuance of any meeting of such committee,
- (c) If he is a member of either Chamber of the Indian Legislature, during the continuance of a joint sitting of the Chambers, or of a meeting of a conference or joint committee of the Chambers of which he is a member,

and during the fourteen days before and after such meeting or sitting

(2) A person released from detention under sub section (1) shall, subject to the provisions of the said sub section, be liable to re arrest and to the further detention to which he would have been liable if he had not been released under the provisions of sub section (1)

This section was added by s 3 of Act 23 of 1925

**136 [S 648]** (1) Where an application is made that any person shall be arrested or that any property shall be attached under any provision of this Code not relating to the execution of decrees, and such person resides

Procedure where person to be arrested or property to be attached is outside district

or such property is situate outside the local limits of the jurisdiction of the Court to which the application is made the Court may, in its discretion, issue a warrant of arrest or make an order of attachment, and send to the District Court within the local limits of whose jurisdiction such person or property resides or is situate a copy of the warrant or order together with the probable amount of the costs of the arrest or attachment

(2) The District Court shall, on receipt of such copy and amount, cause the arrest or attachment to be made by its own officers, or by a Court subordinate to itself, and shall inform the Court which issued or made such warrant or order of the arrest or attachment

(3) The Court making an arrest under this section shall send the person arrested to the Court by which the warrant of arrest was issued, unless he shows cause to the satisfaction of the former Court why he should not be sent to the latter Court, or unless he furnishes sufficient security for his appearance before the latter Court or for satisfying any decree that may be passed against him by that Court, in either of which cases the Court making the arrest shall release him

(4) Where a person to be arrested or movable property to be attached under this section is within the local limits of the ordinary original civil jurisdiction of the High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal or at Madras or at Bombay, or of the Chief Court of Lower Burma, the copy of the warrant of arrest or of the order of attachment, and the probable amount of the costs of the arrest or attachment, shall be sent to the Court of Small Causes of Calcutta, Madras, Bombay or Rangoon, as the case may be, and that Court, on receipt of the copy and amount, shall proceed as if it were the District Court

**Arrest and attachment otherwise than in execution of decree**—This section prescribes the procedure to be followed where a person is to be arrested or where property is to be attached otherwise than in execution of a decree

**Order of arrest for contempt of Court**—It has been held in Calcutta that a Judge of the Calcutta High Court sitting on its original side has no power to direct a mofussil Court to execute a warrant of arrest for contempt of Court. But if he grants an injunction and the order is disobeyed he may direct the arrest and detention of the offender under O 39 r 2 in which case the present section will apply (i)

The Madras High Court has held that when an injunction issued by a Division Bench of the High Court on the Appellate Side is disobeyed by a party residing in the mofussil the Bench has the power to send to the appropriate mofussil Court the warrant of arrest for execution whether this section applies in terms or not and the mofussil Court on receipt of the warrant must proceed as provided in this section (m). In the Madras case the Court treated the disobedience of the injunction as contempt of Court. It is difficult to understand why when an injunction had actually been granted the Court did not proceed under O 39 r 2 in which case there could have been no doubt as to the applicability of the present section to the case

(i) *Salomond v Jogul Kassoore* (19-2) 53 Cal 7 10 1 C 65 (2-3) A C 46—

(m) *Adakkala v Imperial Bank* (19 8) 50 Mad L J 401 9 C 196 (7-8) A M 574

**137 [S 645]** (1) The language which, on the commencement of this Code, is the language of any Court subordinate to a High Court shall continue to be the language of such subordinate Court until the Local Government otherwise directs

(2) The Local Government may declare what shall be the language of any such Court and in what character applications to and proceedings in such Court shall be written

(3) Where this Code requires or allows anything other than the recording of evidence to be done in writing in any such Court such writing may be in English, but if any party or his pleader is unacquainted with English, a translation into the language of the Court shall, at his request, be supplied to him, and the Court shall make such order as it thinks fit in respect of the payments of the costs of such translation

Sub section (3) is new

**138 [S 185A]** (1) The Local Government may, by notification in the local official Gazette direct with respect to any Judge specified in the notification or falling under a description set forth therein, that evidence in cases in which an appeal is allowed shall be taken down by him in the English language and in manner prescribed

(2) Where a judge is prevented by any sufficient reason from complying with a direction under sub-section (1), he shall record the reason and cause the evidence to be taken down in writing from his dictation in open Court

**139 [S 197]** In the case of any affidavit under this Code—

Oath, on affidavit, by whom to be administered

- (a) any Court or Magistrate, or
- (b) any officer or other person whom a High Court may appoint in this behalf or
- (c) any officer appointed by any other Court which the Local Government has generally or specially empowered in this behalf,

may administer the oath to the deponent

The words or other person in cl (b) are new

**140 [S 645A]** (1) In any Admiralty or Vice Admiralty cause of salvage, towage or collision, the Court, whether it be exercising its original or its appellate jurisdiction, may, if it thinks fit, and shall, upon request of either party to such cause, summon to its assistance, in such manner as it may direct or as may be prescribed, two competent assessors, and such assessors shall attend and assist accordingly

Assessors in causes of salvage etc

(2) Every such assessor shall receive such fees for his attendance, to be paid by such of the parties as the Court may direct or as may be prescribed

**141 [S 647]** The procedure provided in this Code in regard to suits shall be followed, as far as it can be made applicable, in all proceedings in any Court of civil jurisdiction

Miscellaneous proceedings

This section does not apply to proceedings in execution—S 647 of the Code of 1882 as it stood when that Code was first enacted ran as follows —

The procedure herein prescribed shall be followed as far as it can be made applicable in all proceedings in any Court of civil jurisdiction *other than suits and appeals*

The question arose under that section whether the words *proceedings other than suits and appeals* included proceedings in execution in other words whether that section had the effect of rendering the provisions of the Code relating to suits applicable to proceedings in execution of a decree On the one hand by the High Courts of Allahabad (n) and Bombay (o) held that that section applied to applications for execution of decrees so that the procedure relating to suits was applicable to applications for execution On the other hand the High Court of Calcutta held that that section did not apply to proceedings in execution (p) In this state of authorities the Legislature intervened and an Explanation was added into the section by the Civil Procedure Code Amendment Act 6 of 1892 which ran as follows —

*Explanation*—This section does not apply to applications for the execution of decrees which are proceedings in suits

The effect of the above Explanation was to supersede the Allahabad and Bombay rulings above referred to and to give legislative sanction to the Calcutta decision

In the meantime one of the Allahabad cases referred to above namely the case of *Fakir-ullah v Thakur Prasad* (q) was taken up to the Privy Council and that tribunal held in the year 1894 that independently of the Explanation s 647 did not apply to applications for execution but only to original matters in the nature of suits such as proceedings in probates guardianships and so forth thus overruling the Allahabad and Bombay cases (r) This decision if it had come three years earlier would have rendered the Explanation unnecessary The Privy Council decision and the recognition of the rule that sec 647 does not apply to execution proceedings render the

(n) *Kifayat Ali v Lam S. gh* (1885) 7 All 359 *S. rja Prasad v Sita Ram* (1889) 10 All 71 *Fakir-ullah v Thakur Prasad* (1890) 1 All 179 *Rodha Charan v Man S. gh* (1890) 1 All 39°  
(o) *Purjade v Purjade* (1885) 6 Bom 681

(p) *Bunke Bihary v Ali Madhub* (1891) 18 Cal 63-  
(q) (1890) 1 All 179  
(r) *Thakur Prasad v Fakir-ullah* (1895) 17 All 106 1 A 44

explanation unnecessary, and it has accordingly been omitted in the present section (s). At the same time two alterations have been made in the section namely (1) the words in regard to suits have been added and (2) the words other than suits and appeals have been omitted. In so doing the Legislature has now done what it could have done as well in 1892.

The reason why the words other than suits and appeals which occurred at the end of s 647 have been omitted in the present section is this. S 647 applied to proceedings other than suits and appeals. The High Court of Allahabad held that applications for the execution of decrees were proceedings other than suits and appeals and that s 647 applied therefore to such applications (t). On the other hand the High Court of Calcutta held that applications for the execution of decrees were not proceedings other than suits and appeals *they being proceedings in suits* and that s 647 did not therefore apply to such applications (u). The Legislature adopted the view of the Calcutta High Court and enacted by way of Explanation to the section that the section does not apply to applications for the execution of decrees *which are proceedings in suits*. It would have been a shorter cut if the Legislature had amended s 647 by deleting the words other than suits and appeals as those were the words that gave rise to the conflict instead of adding into the section an Explanation which certainly was not happily worded. What the Legislature omitted to do in 1892 it did in 1908.

This section we have said does not apply to proceedings in execution (r). Hence the procedure provided in the Code in regard to suits does not apply to applications for execution of decrees. The following are the leading decisions on the subject —

1 The provisions of s 11 relating to *res judicata* in regard to suits do not apply to applications for the execution of decrees. But though these provisions do not in terms apply to applications for execution they are governed by principles analogous to those of *res judicata*. See note to s 11. Orders in execution proceedings on p 77 above.

2 The provisions of O 2 r 2 [Code of 1882 s 43] do not apply to applications for execution. Hence where a decree awards two distinct reliefs an application to enforce one relief is no bar to a subsequent application to enforce the other relief though both reliefs are awarded by the same decree (w).

3 The provisions of O 9 [Code of 1882 ss 96 to 109] do not apply to applications for execution. Hence if the applicant fails to appear at the hearing of the application the Court cannot dismiss the application under O 9 r 8 [Code of 1882 s 103] though it may do so under its inherent power (x). And where in the exercise of this power an application for execution is dismissed the Court has no power to restore it to the file under O 9 r 9 [Code of 1882 s 103] (y) as that rule does not apply to execution proceedings. But though the Court has no power to restore to the file an application which has once been dismissed for default such dismissal is no bar to a fresh application for execution (z). See notes to O 9 r 9 and O 9 r 13. Execution proceedings.

(i) *Hari Charan v Ma matha* (1914) 41 Cal 1 45 19 I C 693. *Bolarubramania v Swarnammal* (1915) 38 M d 199. 11 I C 3.

(j) *Radha Charan v Man Singh* (1890) 1 All 39 at p 30.

(k) *Bunka Behary v Al Madhub* (1891) 18 Cal 63 p 633.

(l) *Hari Charan v Ma matha* (1914) 41 Cal 1 45 19 I C 693. *Bolarubramania v Swarnammal* (1915) 38 M d 199. 11 I C 3. *Bharat v Alakides* (1918) 4 Pat L J 330. 47 I C 154. *Bhola v Pam Lal* (1919) 2 Lah 66. 60 I C 0 (1). A L 67. *Bharat v Asghar* (1919) 45 All

149. 73 I C 453 (3). A A 460. *Na end a v R khoida* (1915) 41 Cal.

L J 46. 9 I C 31 (1). A C 510.

*Basa r Na v Fe rudd n* (1916) 53 Cal.

679. 94 I C 0 (16). A C 73.

(m) *Padma v Padma* (1891) 14 Cal 515. *Sadho v Harat* (1891) 19 All 93.

(n) *Dho Lal v Phalla* (1894) 15 All 84.

(o) *Haj at v Val ul usa* (1894) 18 Bom 49.

*S at En a a v Burewar* (1919) 54 Cal 405. 103 I C 69 (2). A C 534.

(p) *Tha ter Pr d v Fakrudah* (1895) 17 All 106. 11 I A 44. *Bha at v Asghar* (1919) 45 All 143. 5 I C 455 (13). A A 460.



4 The provisions of O 17 r 33 [Code of 1882 ss 157 158] do not apply to applications for execution Hence an order dismissing an application for default is no bar to a fresh application for execution (a)

5 The provisions of O 23 r 1 [Code of 1882 s 373] do not apply to applications for execution Hence the withdrawal of an application though it be without the leave of the Court is no bar to a fresh application for execution (b) See now O 23 r 4

6 See note to s 144 Whether a proceeding under this section is a proceeding in execution

7 See O 22 r 12

Other cases under this section are considered in their proper place

Proceedings in any Court of civil jurisdiction —The proceedings spoken of in this section refer to *original* matters in the nature of suits such as proceedings in probate guardianship and so forth and do not include execution (c) An application under s 18 of the Religious Endowments Act 1863 is a proceeding of this nature Hence it must be verified as required by O 6 r 15 of the Code (d) But an application for settlement of rents made to a *Revenue Officer* under s 105 of the Bengal Tenancy Act 8 of 1885 is not a proceeding in a Court of civil jurisdiction Hence the petition need not be signed as required by O 6 r 14 (e) A petition by a company to the High Court under the Indian Companies Memorandum of Association Act 1890 for the confirmation of a special resolution altering the Memorandum of Association of the Company is a proceeding within the meaning of this section Therefore where the petition was dismissed and the Company applied for leave to appear to the Privy Council the case was dealt with by the Court under s 503 of the Code of 1882 (now s 109) (f) Similarly an application to set aside an *ex parte* payment order made under the Indian Companies Act 6 of 1882 is a proceeding in a Court of civil jurisdiction Hence the provisions of O 9 r 13 apply to the case (g) An application under s 12 of the Guardians and Warda Act 1890 is a proceeding in a Court of civil jurisdiction Hence a receiver may be appointed in such a proceeding under O 40 r 1 (h) But an application for a succession certificate under the Succession Certificate Act 1889 is not such a proceeding Hence a receiver cannot be appointed under O 40 in such a proceeding (i) An application for the appointment of a Common Manager under s 93 of the Bengal Tenancy Act 8 of 1885 is a proceeding of the kind contemplated by this section a receiver therefore may be appointed under O 40 r 1 pending the application (j) Disciplinary proceedings taken under s 14 of the Legal Practitioners Act 18 of 1879 are not proceedings in any Court of civil jurisdiction within the meaning of this section therefore the procedure provided by s 24 of the Code does not apply to those proceedings (k) An application under para 17 of Schedule II to file an agreement to refer to arbitration comes within this section hence where an application is made under that para the applicant may join several causes of action in the application as provided by O 2 r 3 below (l) An inquiry before a Commissioner appointed by a Court to ascertain the amount of mesne profits payable by one party to another is a proceeding within the meaning of this section Hence the provisions of O 18 r 1

(a) *Tirumam v Annappayya* (1895) 18 Mad 131

(b) *Thakur Prasad v Fakirullah* (1895) 17 All 106 2 I.A. 44 *Bu ko Bishary v Al Mahd b* (1901) 18 Cal 635

(c) *Thakur Prasad v Fakirullah* (1895) 1 All 106 111 22 I.A. 44

(d) *Amdoo Miyan v Muhammad* (1901) 4 Mad 635 639

(e) *Hazari L v Ambica* (1904) 3 P.L. 6 79 I.C. 6 (24) A.P. 104

(f) *Bombay Burmah Trading Corporation v D. A. H.* (1903) 7 Bom 415 418

(g) *Hindustan L & C v Mehaj* (1900) 1 Lah

187 55 I.C. 80

(h) *Bal Jann Bai In re* (1911) 36 Bom. 0 11 I.C. 554 *Chandrasekhar v Jagannath* (1905) 7 Lah L.J. 31 90 I.C. 611 (75) A.L. 489

(i) *Kanhaiya v Kanhaiya* (1904) 46 All 3 9 I.C. 363 (74) A.A. 376

(j) *As dal v Mahomed* (1916) 43 Cal. 936 36 I.C. 17 But O 40 r 1 is not confined to "suits"

(k) *In the matter of Janak Kishore* (1916) 1 Pat. L.J. 376 2 I.C. 494

(l) *Dreefus & Co v Gurdial Mal* (1911) Puri Rec. No 35 p 13 9 I.C. 655

apply to the proceeding (m) See also notes to O 9 r 9 Dismissal for default of application to restore suit

The procedure provided in this Code --This section extends the procedure provided in this Code in regard to suits to proceedings in Civil Courts It does not confer any substantive right not expressly given elsewhere by the Code e g a right of appeal (n) Hence no appeal lies from an order passed on a proceeding of the kind contemplated by this section unless the order comes within the purview of O 43 (o) Nor does an appeal lie from an order returning a memorandum of appeal to the proper Court (p) Further the section does not confer upon any Court entertaining such proceedings a power not expressly given elsewhere by the Code e g the power to refer questions to the High Court [s 113] (q)

**142 [S 94]** All orders and notices served on or given to any person under the provisions of this Code shall be in writing

Orders and notices to be in writing

**143 [S 95]** Postage where chargeable on a notice, summons or letter issued under this Code and forwarded by post, and the fee for registering the same, shall be paid within a time to be fixed before the communication is made

Postage

Provided that the Local Government may remit such postage, or fee or both, or may prescribe a scale of court fees to be levied in lieu thereof

**144 [S 583]** (1) Where and in so far as a decree is varied or reversed, the Court of first instance shall, on the application of any party entitled to any benefit by way of restitution or otherwise, cause such restitution to be made as will, so far as may be, place the parties in the position which they would have occupied but for such decree or such part thereof as has been varied or reversed and, for this purpose the Court may make any orders, including orders for the refund of costs and for the payment of interest, damages, compensation and mesne profits, which are properly consequential on such variation or reversal

Application for restitution

(2) No suit shall be instituted for the purpose of obtaining any restitution or other relief which could be obtained by application under sub section (1)

(m) *Ramaila v Veng* 19 4 4 Mad 809  
9-1 C 133 ( 5 ) A M 145  
( ) *P a urama v Se he* (1904) 7 Mad 504  
*Damod ra v Kutappa* (1913) 36 Mad 16  
10 I C 879  
( ) *Cha dar v Du g* (19 4) 46 All 539 9 I C  
3 3 ( 4 ) A 4 64 *Hara v Mur ri*  
(19 ) 6 Cal L J 184 69 I C 1003  
( ) A C 5 *H b bar v Saud ne sa*

(19 3) 33 Cal L J 3 8 7 I C 907  
( 4 ) A C 3 *Cha dra H ti Jag*  
*Nath* (19 ) Lah. L J 51 90 I C 611  
( ) A L 42  
(p) *Ca addy v So o j Kumar* (19-3) 3 C W  
6J3  
(q) *D moda a Kul ppa* (1913) 6 Mad 16 10  
I C 810

The old section —S 553 of the Code of 1852 ran as follows —

When a party entitled to any benefit (by way of restitution or otherwise) under a decree passed in an appeal under this chapter desires to obtain execution of the same he shall apply to the Court which passed the decree against which the appeal was preferred and such Court shall proceed to execute the decree passed in appeal according to the rules hereinbefore prescribed for the execution of decrees in suits

The new section —Sub sec (1) of the present section is s 553 so recast as to give legislative recognition to the practice founded on that section

Sub sec (2) is new See notes below Sub section (—) bar of suit and Where a decree is varied or reversed

**Restitution**—The word restitution in this section means restoring to a party on the variation or reversal of a decree what has been lost to him in execution of the decree or directly in consequence of that decree The section does not apply unless the property was lost in execution of the decree or directly in consequence of that decree (r) The restitution moreover must be properly consequential on the variation or reversal of the decree (s) The granting of restitution however is *not discretionary* The principle of the doctrine of restitution is that on the reversal of a decree in appeal the law raises an obligation in the party to the suit who received the benefit of the erroneous decree to make restitution to the other party for what he has lost (t) The decree of reversal necessarily carries with it the right to restitution of all that has been taken under the erroneous decree and the Court in making restitution is *bound* to restore the parties so far as they can be restored to the same position they were in at the time when the Court by its erroneous action had displaced them from it (u)

The doctrine of restitution contemplates the case where property has been received by a decree holder in execution of a decree and the decree or part thereof is subsequently varied or reversed on appeal by the judgment debtor In such a case the procedure to be adopted by the judgment debtor is to apply under this section to the Court of first instance for restitution of the property and for consequential relief On such application being made the Court *shall* cause restitution to be made to the judgment debtor (the successful appellant) The restitution to be made must be such as will so far as may be place the parties in the position which they would have occupied but for the decree appealed from or such part thereof as has been varied or reversed (v) This principle applies with equal force whether restitution has or has not been directed in the appellate decree (w) For the purpose of making such restitution as aforesaid the Court may make any orders including orders for the refund of costs (x) and for the payment of interest (y) damages (z) compensation and means profits (a) which are

- (r) *Balkuntha Nath v Prosannamoyi* (19 4) 51 Cal 3 4, 81 I C 571 (24) A C 769  
*Nadar Mal v Ratan Lal* (19 7) 8 Lah 356 104 I C 817 (27) A L 625  
 (s) *Jachand v Champs* (19 4) 46 All 767 84 I C 75 (4) A A 713  
 (t) *Dorasmith v Anasami* (1900) 23 Mad 306 311  
 (u) *Hurro Chunder v Shooradhone* (1868) 9 W R 407  
 (v) (1868) 9 W R 407 *supra*  
 (w) *Balramnath v Sadruddin* (1889) 13 Bom 495 *Raja Singh v Koolp* (1894) 21 Cal 989, *Bhagwan v Ummat ul-Hanania* (1896) 18 All 67 263 *Munshi Dinesh Prasad v Shanker* (1904) 9 Cal W 341 *Farbhu Dyal v Ali Ahmad* (1910) 30 All 9 41 C 36  
 (x) *Watkins v Mahomed* (189 1) Cal W.N. cxviii  
 (y) *Fodger v Comptoir d'Escompte de Paris* (1871) L R 3 P C 465 *Forster v Secretary of State* (18 8) 3 Cal 161 173 41 A 137 *Fauz Chand v Shanker* (1896) 20 All 450 *Bhagwan v Ummat-ul-*

- Hanania* (1896) 18 All 67 *Ayyanmyar v Shantram* (1886) 9 Mad 506 *Collector of Ahmedabad v Lari* (1911) 35 Bom 255 10 I C 818 *Land Acquisition Act* *Hurabhai v Maneklal* (19 5) 27 Bom L R 435 87 I C 715 (25) A B 313 (Money paid into Court) *Indra Chand v Forbes* (1917) 2 Pat L J 149 32 I C 1 *Rate of interest discretionary*, *Gokul Prasad v Ram Dori* (19 1) 29 All L J 71 63 I C 613 (21) A A 261 (Interest on costs) *Hanuman v National Bank of India* (19 0) 7 Lah 23 93 I C 954 (26) A L 483  
 (z) *Falcant v Sadruddin* (1889) 13 Bom 495  
 (a) *Raj Singh v Koolp* (1894) 21 Cal 989 *Mookond v Mahomed* (1887) 14 Cal 484 *Kalyanasundram v Fgnaridharan* (1903) 11 Mad 61, *Varadachari Varayana* (1901) 24 Mad 311, *Hardat v Irtan* (1909) 21 All 1 *Prag Varai v Kumakhia Singh* (1909) 35 I A 197, 31 All 531 3 I C 798 *Farbhu Dyal v Ali Ahmad* (1910) 30 All 79 4 I C 3 6 *Fauz Dyal v Kalyan Das* (1916) 43 I A 43 33 All 163 33 I C 505

properly consequential on such variation or reversal. In directing restitution it is to be noted that the parties must be placed in the same position as they were previously in irrespective of any other rights accruing to any of them during the litigation. (b) Where an order is made against a party for restitution but restitution is not made the order may be enforced by sale of his property [s. 36] (c)

*Illustrations*

(1) A obtains a decree against B for possession of immovable property [or a decree for the recovery of movable property say timber or a decree for a sum of money] and in execution of the decree obtains possession of the property [or obtains the timber or recovers the money]. The decree is subsequently reversed in appeal. B is entitled on an application under this section to restitution of the property [or of the timber or of the money] though there may be no direction for restitution in the decree of the appellate Court. *Munshi Dinesh Prashad v Shanker* (1904) 9 Cal W N 381. *Balantrao v Sadrudin* (1889) 13 Bom 45. *Bhagwan v Ummat ul Hasnain* (1896) 18 All 262.

(2) A obtains a decree against B for Rs 5000 and recovers the amount in execution. The decree is subsequently reversed in appeal. B is entitled on an application under this section to a refund of the money together with interest up to the date of repayment though the appellate decree may be silent as to interest see the cases cited in foot note (y) above. In *Rodger v Comploir d Escompt de Paris* (d) which is the leading case on the subject Lord Cairns in delivering the judgment of the Privy Council observed as follows. It is contended on the part of the respondents here [that is A in the present illustration] that the principal sum being restored to the present petitioners [that is B in the present illustration] they have no right to recover from them any interest. It is obvious that if that is so injury and very grave injury will be done to the petitioners. They will by reason of an act of the Court have paid a sum which it is now ascertained was ordered to be paid by mistake and wrongfully. They will recover that sum after a lapse of a considerable time but they will recover it without the ordinary fruits which are derived from the enjoyment of money. On the other hand these fruits will have been enjoyed or may have been enjoyed by the person who by mistake and by wrong obtained possession of the money under a judgment which has been reversed. So far therefore as the principle is concerned their Lordships have no doubt or hesitation in saying that injustice will be done to the petitioners and that the perfect judicial determination which it must be the object of all Courts to arrive at will not have been arrived at unless the persons who have had their money improperly taken from them have the money restored to them with interest during the time that the money has been withheld. These observations apply equally to mesne profits which form the subject of the next illustration.

(3) A obtains a decree against B for possession of certain immovable property and in execution of the decree obtains possession of the property. The decree is subsequently reversed in appeal. B is entitled to possession of the property together with mesne profits during the period of dispossession see the cases cited in foot note (a) on the preceding page. If the property has in the meantime been let out by A to tenants B is entitled to remove any tenant who refuses to vacate. *Pohus Singh v Hodding* (1894) 21 Cal 310.

**Splitting of claim for restitution**—It has been held by the High Courts of Patna and Madras that the provisions of O 2 r 2 do not apply to a proceeding under this section. A obtains a decree against B for possession of certain immovable property and recovers possession of the property pursuant to the decree. A appeals from the

|  |   |
|--|---|
| (b) <i>Gurga Prasad v Broja Nath Das</i> (1903) 1 <sup>st</sup> Cal W N 64 | <i>v Pama</i> (1916) 40 Bom 194 31 LC 305 |
| (c) <i>Paolu Dyal v Kalson Das</i> (1916) 43 I A 43 33 All 163 33 IC 50    | <i>Mahdeo</i> (d) 1 F 3 P C 465           |

decree and the decree is reversed in appeal. *B* then applies for restitution of the property and the property is restored to him. Subsequently *B* applies for mesne profits for the period during which *A* was in possession of the property. Is *B* debarred from claiming mesne profits on the ground that he ought to have included the claim for mesne profits in the application for restitution of the property? No. (e) Similarly a judgment debtor who applies for and obtains restitution of a sum of money on reversal by the appellate Court of the decree pursuant to which he had paid the sum to the decree holder is not precluded from making a fresh application for recovery of interest for the period during which the decree holder had the use of the money. (f)

**Inherent power to grant restitution**—The power of a Court to grant restitution is not confined to the cases covered by the provisions of this section. It extends also to cases which do not come strictly within this section. The reason is that a Court has an inherent power under s. 151 irrespective of this section to order restitution. (g)

In *Jai Berham v. Aadar Nath Marwari* (h) their Lordships of the Privy Council said. It is the duty of the Court under s. 144 of the Civil Procedure Code to place the parties in the position which they would have occupied but for such decree or such part thereof as has been varied or reversed. Nor indeed does this duty or jurisdiction arise merely under the said section. It is inherent in the general jurisdiction of the Court to act rightly and fairly according to the circumstances towards all parties involved. As was said by Cairns L.C. in *Rodger v. Comptoir d'Escompte de Paris* (i)

One of the first and highest duties of all Courts is to take care that the act of the Court does no injury to any of the suitors and when the expression *the act of the Court* is used it does not mean merely the act of the primary Court or of any intermediate Court of Appeal but the act of the Court as a whole from the lowest Court which entertains jurisdiction over the matter up to the highest Court which finally disposes of the case. In *Jai Berham* a case a sale in execution of a decree was set aside on the ground that the sale certificate comprised property different from that which was attached. The property was purchased by a stranger to the decree and the price paid by him into Court was applied towards satisfaction of the decree. The judgment debtor applied for possession. Their Lordships held that both under s. 144 and s. 151 the purchaser was entitled to be paid the excess of the purchase price over the mesne profits. This decision it is submitted is an authority for the proposition that where an application for restitution does not come strictly within the purview of this section e.g. where the sale alone is set aside in execution proceedings but the decree is not varied or reversed or where the decree and the sale are set aside in a separate suit the Court may entertain the application under the inherent power conferred upon it by s. 151. If this view be correct it will be needless for the Courts in future to resort to s. 47 which can only apply if the decree holder himself is the purchaser or where the purchaser is a stranger to the decree he is regarded as a representative either of the decree holder or of the purchaser within the meaning of that section. It is also submitted that a proceeding under this section is not a proceeding in execution.

In the exercise of their inherent power the Courts have applied the principle of this section to cases which were not strictly within the terms of the section. Thus where *A* sued *B* to establish his right to a fund in Court and *B* was allowed to draw the money on giving an undertaking to the Court to repay it if *A* succeeded in the suit and *A*

- (1) *Kruparindhu v. Sh. Hanra* (1918) 3 Pat. L. J. 30 4 I.C. 4  
(f) *Somasulam v. Chakkalaram* (1911) 40 Mad. 80 34 I.C. 806  
(g) *Moolond v. Mahomed* (1899) 14 C. 1 498  
1899 9 J.A. v. 4001 p. 5 n. 4 (1901) 1 Cal. 943 Collector of Meerut v. Kaila Pr. ad (1906) 3 All. 663 *Shyam Sundar Lal v. Kaila Zamani B. Ram* (1907) 9 All.

- 143 J. pr. v. 14 v. Part 4 Cal. ad (1917) Jan. R. C. no. 61 p. 18 41 I.C. 910  
Pat. Ch. a. Deb. Pr. ad (1911) 6 Cal. W. N. 404 64 I.C. 864 (1) A.C. 4  
I. J. 31 I. v. rain. J.A. (1906) 95  
I.C. 808 (6) A.L. 643  
(h) (1907) 40 I.A. 351 353 Pat. 10 14,  
60 I.C. 8 (1) A.I.C. 69  
(i) L.R. 3 C.P. 463 43

succeeded in establishing his title it was held that though the undertaking given by *B* did not provide for the payment of interest the Court had inherent power to order *B* to repay the money with interest (*j*) See notes below Where a decree is varied or reversed

Place the parties in the position which they would have occupied but for such decree as has been reversed — *i* party is not entitled under this section to restitution of property which was not in his possession before suit but was in possession of the opposite party and which therefore could not have been taken out of his possession under any decree of Court *i* applies for letters of administration to the estate of *T* *B* sets up a will of the deceased The movable properties in dispute are in the possession of *B* *B* delivers the properties to a Commissioner appointed by the Court who locks them up in a room under seal The High Court directs probate of the will to be granted to *B* Thereafter on *B*'s application the movables are handed over to her Subsequently the order of the High Court is reversed by His Majesty in Council and letters of administration are directed to be granted to *i* *i* then applies under this section for restitution of the properties to him *i* is not entitled to restitution The case is not one of restitution at all for *i* was never in possession of the properties (*k*) But the fact that the property had been taken from a Receiver appointed by the Court does not affect the right of the true owner to restitution for the Receiver was in possession on behalf of the true owner (*l*)

Who may apply for restitution — Any party entitled to any benefit by way of restitution or otherwise may apply under this section

(1) *Where decree proceeds on a common ground* — The expression any party is not confined to parties to the appeal in which the decree has been reversed or modified It includes every person against whom the decree appealed from was passed though he was not a party to the appeal provided the appeal is in effect and substance in favour of such person (*m*) This would especially be the case where the decree appealed from proceeds on a ground common to all the plaintiffs or to all the defendants (*n*) see O 41 r 4 *A* obtains a decree against *B* and *C* The decree proceeds on a ground common to both *B* and *C* *B* alone appeals from the decree The decree is reversed in appeal *C* is entitled to claim restitution under this section though he was not a party to the appeal

(2) *Transferee of a decree* — Further the expression any party includes the transferee of a decree passed in appeal *i* obtains a decree against *B* for Rs 5,000 *B* appeals from the decree Pending the appeal *i* realizes from *B* Rs 5,000 in execution The decree is subsequently reversed in appeal *B* assigns the decree passed in appeal (in his favour) to *C* *C* is entitled as transferee of *B*'s decree to the benefit of that decree and he may apply under this section for an order directing *i* to pay to him what *B* would be entitled to namely Rs 5,000 and interest (*o*)

(3) *Auction purchaser* — *i* sale in execution of a decree may be set aside in a proper case even against a purchaser who is a stranger to the decree either in execution proceedings or in a separate suit e.g. where the sale certificate comprises property different from that which is attached (*p*) or when a decree is obtained on a mortgage executed by a Hindu father on behalf of him self and his minor son and the decree and

- (*j*) *Alagappa v Mitlumara* (1918) 41 Mad 316 4 I C 850 *Indra Ch d v Forbes* (191 ) 2 Pat L J 149 39 I C 4  
(*k*) *Bakumtha Nath v I r s nam* (1914) 51 Cal 34 81 I C 571 (4) A C 69 See also *Chalber Singh v I r dhu Ram* (1914) 4 Lah L J 333 65 I C 50  
(*l*) 4 A L J 34 (mesne profits)  
(*m*) *B hena* (Chaitan) (1914) Pat 319 108 I C 89 (3) 4 I 60

- (*n*) *Gurga Ir d v Brojo Nath Das* (1909) 12 Cal W N 64  
(*o*) *Eat Madhava v Tegnat Swar pa* (1908) 18 M d L J 32  
(*p*) *See Jagan Nath v Daram Das* (1906) 33 Cal 8 [a case under s 503 of the Code of 1908]  
(*q*) *J. L. Ram v Keda Nath Marwari* (1922) 49 I A 351 Pat 10 69 I C 28 (2) A Pt 69

the sale of the mortgaged property in execution of the decree are set aside in a suit by the minor against the decree holder and the auction purchaser on the ground that the mortgage did not bind the minor (q). But the auction purchaser is entitled in such cases before restoring possession to the judgment debtor to be paid the purchase price by the successful judgment debtor less the mesne profits if the sale is set aside in execution proceeding under this section (r) and if the sale is set aside by a decree in a separate suit under O 47 or s 151 (s). It has been held by the High Court of Rangoon that an auction purchaser who is not a party to the original suit or to the appeal or to the execution proceedings is not entitled to apply under this section (t).

### Against whom restitution may be claimed —

(1) *Transferee of decree reversed on appeal*.—In two Allahabad cases decided under the old section it was held that restitution could not be claimed by application under that section against the transferee of a decree reversed in appeal though the transferee had obtained the full benefit of the decree by execution unless he was joined as a party to the appeal (u). The point of the decision may be explained by an illustration. A obtains a decree against B and assigns the decree to C. C applies for execution of the decree against B and obtains payment of the decretal amount. B appeals from the decree and the decree is reversed in appeal. It was held under the old section that B could not claim restitution against C by summary process under that section unless C was joined as a party to the appeal (v). Those decisions might perhaps be supported on the ground that where a party sought restitution under the old section he had to proceed by an application to execute the decree passed on appeal and that a decree cannot be executed against persons who are not parties to it. The language of the present section is much wider and it is submitted that the Court has power under this section to order C to make restitution to B on an application by the latter in that behalf even if C was not joined as a party to the appeal. See also s 146. It is worth noting that according to the same High Court B could not claim restitution against C even by way of suit the reason given being that B could have no cause of action in such a case against C. But this decision has been dissented from by the High Court of Madras (w).

(2) *Suit on purchaser*.—Except in cases of the kind mentioned in case (3) under the heading Who may apply for restitution, restitution cannot be obtained under this section against a bona fide purchaser for value at an auction sale held by a Court which had jurisdiction to order the sale (x). It is otherwise however where the decree holder himself is the purchaser (y). See note to s 63 above. Effect of reversal of decree upon sale.

(3) *Surety*.—This section applies only to the parties or their representatives and does not apply to sureties. Hence restitution cannot be claimed under this section against a surety (z).

**Sub section (2) Bar of suit**.—This sub section is new. It provides in express terms that where restitution could be obtained by application under this section no

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| (q) <i>Bireshri Prasad v. Nadai Singh</i> (1903) 45 All 369 41 C 873 (3) AA 394 [1 B]   | <i>Zama Begam</i> (1907) 9 All 143   |
| (r) (1900) 40 I A 351 * Pat 10 63 I C 2 8 ( ) A I C 63 supra  | (w) <i>Go udappa v. Ha umanthappa</i> (1915) 33 Mad 34 171 C 40 <i>Reo Subba ayudu v. Ierrem</i> (191) 40 Mad 99 33 I C 32   |
| (s) (1903) 45 All 369 41 C 8 3 (03) A A 394 supra   | (x) <i>Isari Lal v. Ha (f-un) Lala</i> (1916) 33 All 40 34 I C 303   |
| (t) <i>Mia Tok v. Maung Mo</i> (1905) 3 Rang 251 49 I C 603 ( ) A R 15  | (y) <i>Sahiba v. Le oo</i> (1919) 43 Bom 35 43 I C 139 <i>S. gora v. Mahjadd n</i> (1919) 4 Cal W N 50 51 I C 99 <i>Official Receiver v. Chettappa</i> (1906) 48 Mad 6 61 I C 10 (26) A M 8 <i>Za sul</i> 463 n v. <i>Muhammed Arga</i> (1948) 15 I A 1 10 All 166 |
| (u) <i>Sadul Hu v. Lalla Prasad</i> (1893) 40 All 133 <i>Ha prasi v. Jamna Prasad</i> (1897) 19 All 136 commented on and distinguished 1 C ru dh j Prasad v. <i>La ju Mal</i> (1906) 4 All 33 | (z) <i>Raghava S gh v. Jal Indra Bahadur S gh</i> (1919) 46 I A 36 4 All 159 166 5 I C 30  |
| (v) <i>Lalla Prasad v. Sad q H en</i> (1900) 44 All 48 <i>Luttee Shiam Sundar Lal v. Kausar</i>   |  |

separate suit shall be brought in respect of it. The decisions under the Code of 1882 were not uniform: it having been held in some cases that a separate suit for restitution was barred and in others that it was not (a).

Under s. 583 of the Code of 1882, proceedings for restitution had to be commenced by an application for execution of the appellate decree. This was required by the terms of that section. The section further directed that the appellate decree should be executed according to the rules prescribed for the execution of decree in suits. That gave rise to the question whether the rule contained in s. 244 [now s. 47] which provided that all questions relating to execution should be determined by the Court executing the decree *and not by a separate suit* was one of the rules referred to in s. 583. It was held in some cases that it was and that a separate suit for restitution was therefore barred. In other cases it was held that it was not and that a separate suit could be maintained for restitution. The present section simplifies matters by omitting all reference to execution. The position of the section has also been changed: it being transferred from the chapter headed 'Of appeals from original decrees' to Part IV, headed 'Miscellaneous'. A separate suit is now barred by the express terms of the section and the application for restitution is no longer one for execution of the appellate decree. The Court is empowered to make such order as it deems proper for restitution and the order if not obeyed may be enforced as a decree (b) [see s. 36].

*Miscellaneous.* A separate suit is now barred by the express terms of the section and the application for restitution is no longer one for execution of the appellate decree. The Court is empowered to make such order as it deems proper for restitution and the order if not obeyed may be enforced as a decree (b) [see s. 36].

It must be observed that the suit that is barred under this section is a suit to obtain restitution, compensation or other relief which could be obtained by application under this section; further the compensation to be awarded under this section must be consequential on the variation or reversal of a decree. It follows that if the compensation claimed is not consequential on such variation or reversal a separate suit for such compensation will not be barred under this section (c).

**Decree.**—An order for rateable distribution made under s. 73 is not a decree within the meaning of this section (d).

**Where a decree is varied or reversed.**—The old section applied only where the decree of reversal was a decree passed in first appeal or where by virtue of s. 587 [now s. 109] it was one passed in second appeal. It was held not to apply where restitution was claimed on the reversal of a decree in appeal to the Privy Council (e) or in review (f). This was because the words of that section were 'when a party entitled to any benefit by way of restitution or otherwise under a decree passed in an appeal under this chapter that chapter 41 relating to appeals from original decrees'.

As regards the present section there is a difference of opinion. According to one view the section applies in all cases where a decree is varied or reversed; however the variation or reversal is effected even though it be in a separate suit and by whatever Court (g) or even under colour of a decree (h). According to another view the section does not apply unless the decree is varied or reversed by a Court superior to the one that passed it. This view is based on the ground that the words 'Court of first instance' in this section are used to distinguish the Court which is to grant the restitution from

(a) See *Shoodhal v Bhawanis* (190) 9 All 345; *Maturam v Ramkruma* (1904) 35 C 1 265.

(b) *Parbhu D. v Kaljan Das* (1916) 43 I A 43 24 All 163 33 I C 0; *M. Andee v Rama* (1916) 40 Bom 194 31 I C 30.

(c) *Arjun v M. Mammatt P. Rbat* (19) 44 All 687, 69 I C 173 (1) A A 46.

(d) *Farada v Venkataratnam* (19) 42 Mad 1 J 473 67 I C 545 (1) A M 93.

(e) *S. Day Hura v Lalla Prasad* (1893) 10 All 1 9 11.

(f) *C. Hett of Meerut v Kalka Prasad* (1906) 33 All 645.

(g) *S. D. v. S. D. v. J. Ram* (191) 40 Mad 99 300 33 I C 39; *S. H. v. J. Ram* (1919) 43 Bom 35 39 43 I C 130; *H. A. v. J. Ram* 23 93 I C 934 (1) A L 433.

(h) *S. Ram S. v. S. Ram Singh* (19) 8 Lah 41 99 I C 95 (1) A L 37; *Surya Datt v Jamma Datt* (1900) 4 All 563 57 I C 143.



some other Court which has varied or reversed the decree (s) The point of difference between these two views is brought out by the following—

### Illustration

A obtains an ex parte decree against B in Court X. In execution of the decree a house belonging to B is sold by Court X and it is purchased by A. Subsequently on B's application the ex parte decree is set aside by Court X. B then applies to Court X for an order against A for restoring possession of the house to him. According to the former view Court X may direct restitution under this section though the decree was both passed and set aside by that Court (j). According to the latter view restitution cannot be ordered under this section (L) but the Court may grant restitution under s 161 (I) or under s 47 (m).

Does this section apply where the decree is neither varied nor reversed but the sale alone is set aside as under O 21 r 92? It has been held that it does not but that the Court may in such a case grant restitution in the exercise of its inherent power under s 161. Thus where A obtained a decree against B and in execution of the decree purchased certain property belonging to B and took possession of it and the sale was subsequently set aside under O 21 r 92 and possession restored to B it was held on an application by B for mesne profits that as no decree had been set aside this section did not apply but that the Court may in the exercise of its inherent power direct A to pay mesne profits to B during the period A was in possession of the property (n). See note above. Inherent power to grant restitution.

To claim restitution it is not necessary that the original decree should have been entirely reversed. The section also provides for the case where the decree is varied. Thus if A obtains a decree against B for Rs 1,000 and in execution B's property is sold and purchased by A himself and the decree is varied in appeal by reducing the amount to Rs 100 the Court has power under this section to order A to restore the property to B on payment of Rs 100 by B (o).

The Court of first instance—In a suit for ejectment under the Agra Tenancy Act 2 of 1910 [local] the Court of first instance is the Revenue Court which heard the suit and not the Court of Appeal (p). If the Court of first instance has been abolished or has ceased to have jurisdiction the phrase must be interpreted by applying the principle of s 37 above (q).

Pecuniary jurisdiction in awarding damages under this section—The Court of first instance has jurisdiction under this section to award damages even if they exceed the pecuniary limits of its jurisdiction (r).

Whether a proceeding under this section is a proceeding in execution—An application for restitution under s 583 of the Code of 1892 was held to be one by way of execution (s). There is a conflict of opinion whether a proceeding under this section is a proceeding in execution. It has been held by the High Court of Madras (t) and

(i) *Chi taman v Chau i Saku* (1916) 1 Pat L J 43 45 341 C 747

(j) *Shirali v Yeoo* (1919) 43 Bom 35 39 431 C 130

(k) (1916) 1 Pat L J 43 45 341 C 47 *supra*

(l) (1919) 43 Bom 35 39 431 C 130 *supra*

(m) *Sramirao v Valentia* (1900) 44 Bom Dc 571 C 15

(n) *Jagd v Holloway* (1911) 2 Pat L J 66 551 C 63 *Sulbomma v Ahe nayya* (1916) 41 Mad 46 41 C 64

(o) *Mang Pon Gyi v Mang Pon Gyi* (1902) 71 R 10 11 I C 2 (1902) A R 157

(p) *Kashi Prasad v Ballholder* (1901) 4 All 233 233 651 C 67 (1901) A R 1

(q) *Panchap Le v Nal* (1906) 51 Mad L J 161 9 I C 57 (1906) A R 813

(r) *Balestrino v Sedra* (1889) 13 Bom 453

(s) *Prasanna v Kamakshi* (1909) 31 All 1361 A 19 31 C 793

(t) *Somasundar m v Challa* (1916) 40 Mad 89 241 C 806

Bombay (u) that it is while it has been held by the High Courts of Allahabad (t) and Patna (w) that it is not. This distinction is important in the following respects —

- (1) If an application under this section is one by way of execution, it would be governed by art 182 of Sch. I of the Limitation Act and further a 6 of that Act relating to the exclusion of the period of minority would apply to the application (x). If it is not it would be governed by the residuary article 181 (y). If art 181 applies the time is to be counted from the date of the decree of the lower appellate Court varying or reversing the decree of the Court of first instance and not the date of the decree in second appeal dismissing the appeal from the decree of the lower appellate Court (z).
- (2) If an application under this section is one by way of execution the provisions of s 141 would not apply [see notes to s 141]. But they would apply if it is not one by way of execution. In the latter case if the application is dismissed for default it may be restored under O 9 r 9 (a).
- (3) The difference between the two views also affects the Court fee on a memorandum of appeal from an order passed under this section (b). See note below Court fee. See also note above Splitting of claim for restitution.

The Allahabad High Court has held that an application for restitution as a result of a decree of Privy Council is one to enforce an order in Council and that art 183 of sch. I of the Limitation Act 1908 applies (c).

**Limitation**—See note above. Whether a proceeding under this section is a proceeding in execution.

**Applicability of s 141**—See note above. Whether a proceeding under this section is a proceeding in execution.

**Appeal**—The determination of a question under this section is a decree and appealable as such (d) see s 2 cl (-) definition of decree. But the question must be one directly covered by the section and not one incidentally connected with or collateral to the decision of any such question. Thus a decision that an application under this section is time barred is a decision on a question collateral to the question of restitution and hence it is not a decree and not appealable as such (e).

**Court fee**—It has been held by the Allahabad High Court that an appeal from an order made on an application under this section requires to be stamped *ad valorem* under the Court Fees Act 1870 sch I art 1 as an appeal from a decree. This proceeds on the view taken by that Court that an application under this rule is not an application for execution (f).

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>(u) <i>Kurgod gouda v Ning ngouda</i> (1917) 41 Bom 65 41 I C 38 <i>Hamidullah v Ahmed Ali</i> (1915) 45 Bom 113 6 I C 33 (1) A B 6</p> <p>(t) <i>Jisnar m v Nand Pam</i> (19 ) 44 All 407 66 I C 144 ( ) A A 3 <i>Batynath v Balmakund</i> (1915) 47 All 94 8 I C 31 (25) A A 13</p> <p>(w) <i>Balmakund v Basanta Kumari</i> (1915) 3 Pat 31 8 I C 60 ( ) A I 1 [F B] approving <i>Krup m dhu v H h ta</i> (1915) 31 at L J 36 5 I C 4 <i>I mbu Jhauar v Ba key</i> (1918) Pat 94 (5) A P 595</p> <p>(x) <i>Ku godigouda v N ga pouda</i> (191 ) 41 Bom 65 41 I C 38 <i>H m d li v Ahmed li</i> (1915) 45 Bom 113 6 I C 33 (1) A L 67 <i>Nand s has v Ch lias</i> (1916) 1 Luck 40 9 I C 3 (6) A O 199 In <i>Sai bai v I eroo</i> (1919) 43 Bom 3 48 I C 130 the Court applied art 181</p> <p>(y) <i>Krup m dhu v Mada ta</i> (1918) 3 Pat L J 36 4 I C 4 <i>Balmakund v B t Kum ri</i> (1914) 3 Pat 31 4 I C 60 ( ) A I 1 [F B] <i>I am S gh</i></p> | <p><i>v Sha Pa shod</i> (1918) Punj Rec no 67 p 4 44 I C 301 G ) M i v (1918) 98 I C 804 ( ) A L 685</p> <p>(f) <i>Ha s Moh n v J rmeah s</i> (1915) 6 Cal 61 (8) S C 616</p> <p>(a) <i>Jur am v Nand Pam</i> (19 ) 44 All 407 66 I C 144 ( ) A A 3</p> <p>(b) <i>B j D B i land</i> (1915) 4 All 9 30 I C 31 (5) A A 137</p> <p>(c) <i>S b n F ynath</i> (1918) 50 All 6 11 I C 86 (4) A A 93</p> <p>(d) <i>D Nath v J g i</i> (1914) 19 C W 1167 6 I C 690 <i>Adur ta v The A h g o g t o</i> (1913) 5 Cal W 925 84 I C 74 (5) A C 102 <i>Sara Chan d a S ba h s</i> (1916) 56 Cal 500 See <i>Sa m Parshad Pam Chand</i> (1914) Punj Rec no 10 p 61 C 03</p> <p>(e) <i>F m C d Sh m Parshad</i> (1913) Punj Rec no 110 p 409 I C 851</p> <p>(f) <i>Bay th Balmakund</i> (1915) 4 All 93 8 I C 31 (5) A A 13 As to cases arising in Bihar and Orissa see <i>Sulal Pras d Jaydeo</i> (1915) 4 Pat 94 4 I C 44 ( ) A P 57</p> |
|--|--|

Enforcement of liability  
of surety

**145 [S 253]** Where any person has become liable as surety—

- (a) for the performance of any decree or any part thereof, or
- (b) for the restitution of any property taken in execution of a decree, or
- (c) for the payment of any money, or for the fulfilment of any condition imposed on any person, under an order of the Court in any suit or in any proceeding consequent thereon,

the decree or order may, be executed against him, to the extent to which he has rendered himself personally liable, in the manner herein provided for the execution of decrees, and such person shall, for the purposes of appeal, be deemed a party within the meaning of section 47

Provided that such notice as the Court in each case thinks sufficient has been given to the surety

The old section—The corresponding s 253 of the Code of 1882 ran as follows —

Whenever a person has before the passing of a decree in an original suit become liable as surety for the performance of the same or of any part thereof the decree may be executed against him to the extent to which he has rendered himself liable in the same manner as a decree may be executed against a defendant

Provided that such notice in writing as the Court in each case thinks sufficient has been given to the surety

The new section—The present section differs from the old section in the following respects —

- 1 The old section applied only to surety bonds for the performance of a decree. It did not apply to surety bonds for the fulfilment of a condition imposed upon a person under an order of the Court [see cl (c) of the present section]. It was also doubtful whether the old section applied to suretyships for the restitution of property taken in execution of a decree [see cl (b) of the present section]. The present section applies not only to surety bonds for the performances of a decree but also to surety bonds referred to above as also to bonds for the payment of money under an order of the Court. See notes below
- 2 The present section applies to suretyships for the performance of any decree whether original or appellate [see cl (a)]. As to the old section it was doubtful whether it applied to original decrees only, or applied also to appellate decrees
- 3 The word personally has been newly added in the present section

Object of the section—This section provides that where a person has become liable as surety for the performance of a decree [cl (a)] or for any of the purposes specified in cl (b) or cl (c) the party for whose benefit security has been given may enforce the security by executing the decree or order against the surety to the extent

to which he has rendered him self personally liable in the same manner as if the surety was a party to the decree or order and was directed by the decree or order to perform the obligation undertaken by him. It is no longer necessary to institute a regular suit to enforce the security as it was in some cases under the old section. The present section provides a summary remedy in execution and dispenses with the necessity of a separate suit to the extent to which the surety has rendered himself personally liable.

### Security for the performance of any decree —

1 *Ex parte decree* — A obtains an ex parte decree against B. The decree is set aside under O 9 r 13 [Code of 1892 s 108] on C standing surety for the performance of any decree that may be passed against B on a re-hearing. The suit is re-heard and a decree is passed against B. A may enforce the security by executing the decree against C (g). A separate suit is not necessary.

2 *Appellate decree* — The summary procedure contemplated by this section applies to suretyships for the performance of any decree, whether it be an original or an appellate decree. Under the old section there was a conflict of decisions as to whether the summary remedy provided by that section applied to all to suretyships for the performance of appellate decrees it being held by the High Court of Calcutta that it did not (h) and by the other High Courts that it did (i). The present section makes it clear that the summary procedure contemplated by this section applies to security given for the performance of appellate decrees also. The rules that provide for security for the performance of appellate decrees are rules 5 and 6 of Order 41 corresponding to ss 540 and 546 of the Code of 1892. An illustration will make the point clear. A obtains a decree against B and applies for execution. B appeals from the decree and applies for stay of execution under O 41 r 5. Execution is stayed on C standing surety for the due performance of any decree that may be passed against B in appeal. A decree is eventually passed by the appellate Court against B. A may enforce the security against C by executing the appellate decree against him as if C was a party to the decree. According to the Calcutta decisions under the old section A's only remedy was by way of suit against C.

**Security for restitution of property taken in execution of a decree —** A obtains a decree against B for possession of certain lands. B appeals from the decree. Pending the appeal A applies for execution of the decree. The Court allows execution on C standing surety for the restitution of the lands to B in the event of the decree being reversed in appeal or for payment to B of the value of the property (O 41 r 6 Code of 1892 s 546). The decree is eventually reversed in appeal. B may enforce the security by executing the appellate decree against C. According to the Calcutta decisions under the old section B could only enforce the security by a separate suit (j).

**Security for payment of money —** The following are some of the sections and rules providing for security for the payment of money —

S 33 sub (4) [Security on behalf of a judgment debtor who is arrested in execution of a decree and who expresses his intention to apply to be declared an insolvent]

O 20 r 1 [security for costs]

O 38 r 2 [security in cases of arrest before judgment]

O 38 r 5 [security in cases of attachment before judgment]

O 41 r 10 [security for costs of respondent in first appeal]

O 40 r 7 [security for costs of respondent in appeal to the King in Council]

|             |        |                         |         |                        |
|-------------|--------|-------------------------|---------|------------------------|
| (g) So 1    | D      | N 14 (1903) 611         | J 11 13 | L 100 1 (1901) 100 409 |
| (f) Tolp    | Ld     | (1891) 111              | J 11 13 | L 100 1 (1901) 100 409 |
| Da          | L 11 1 | 11 1 (1903) 3 (a) 1 (s) | J 11 13 | L 100 1 (1901) 100 409 |
| 546)        | L 11 1 | 11 1 (1903) 3 (a) 1 (s) | J 11 13 | L 100 1 (1901) 100 409 |
| (i) Ver kap | L 11 1 | 11 1 (1903) 3 (a) 1 (s) | J 11 13 | L 100 1 (1901) 100 409 |
|             | L 11 1 | 11 1 (1903) 3 (a) 1 (s) | J 11 13 | L 100 1 (1901) 100 409 |

Security for fulfilment of any condition imposed on any person—The summary remedy provided by the old section applied only where the security given was for the performance of a decree and for no other purpose. Thus where a defendant produced certain promissory notes in Court and the plaintiff objected to their return to the defendant but they were returned to the defendant on C standing surety for their production when required it was held that the plaintiff could not on non-production of the notes proceed against C by execution the reason given being that the security was not given for the performance of a decree and that his only remedy was by way of suit against C (1). Under the present section the security may be enforced by execution against C. Therefore when a sale in execution is adjourned on a security bond to produce the property attached the bond may on default be enforced against the surety for the value of the property by proceedings in execution (1).

The section applies only where the Court passes an order or decree which is intended to be an order or decree enforceable in execution by one party to a suit or other proceeding against the other party. Therefore a bond passed by a surety under O 3 r 6 (2) cannot be enforced by summary process under this section it can only be enforced by a suit (m). Nor does the section apply to a surety on an administration bond under section 291 of the Indian Succession Act 1925 (n). See notes to O 21 r 43. Security bond for producing attached property.

A is committed to prison in execution of a decree obtained against him by B. A applies to be released from jail to enable him to make a petition in insolvency. A is released from prison on C giving security that A will appear before the executing Court on the day fixed by the Court. The insolvency petition fails and A fails to appear in Court. In such a case P and not the Government is entitled to the security money (o). The money is to be appropriated towards satisfaction of the decree it is not to be given to the decree holder as a solatium or further benefit over and above the decretal amount (p).

To the extent to which he has rendered himself personally liable—A surety (1) may render himself personally liable or he (2) may only give a charge upon his property or he (3) may undertake a personal liability and charge his property as further security.

The provisions of this section apply to the first case the personal liability of the surety may be enforced by attachment and sale of his property. In *Imir v Mahaleo* (q) Banerji J said Under sec 203 of Act XIV of 185 there was a conflict of opinion in the different High Courts as to whether a mortgage made by a surety could be enforced under that section. It seems to me that in order to reconcile the divergency of opinion which arose under the old Code and to remove any ambiguity that might exist on the subject the Legislature in enacting section 146 of the present Code of Civil Procedure added the word personally to the provisions of that section thus clearly enacting that in execution of the decree it is the personal liability of the surety which could be enforced and not the liability of the property hypothecated by him. As pointed out by the learned Chief Justice the enforcement of the mortgage created by the surety would require the provisions of the Transfer of Property Act as regards the array of parties and the form of the decree and other matters to be complied with.

- (1) *Na dora mma v Pannaya* (1892) 22 Mad 64.  
 (2) *Saibu v Varadann* (1905) 51 M d L J 399 I C 74 (6) A M 100.  
 (m) *Kurugolappa v Soopamma* (1918) 41 M d 403 I C 99. *Lafsh of B. Kalapuri v Rpa* (1907) 32 M d L J 4 601 C 134.  
 (n) *Ko Ma v Cyl v D w Tok* (1905) 6 Rang 44 11 I C 4 ( ) A L 49.  
 (o) *P. M. Lal v CAA do v gh* (191 ) 3 Cal 101 16 I C 115. *Abd i H. se n v*

- D J M d i d C* (1900) 46 Bom 02.  
 (p) *O. O. 611 C 614 ( ) A B 310. See 10 I d 5 v M. Hala* (1907) 51 Iat. L J 41 5 I C 303. *SA v Jayal v Mha mm d* (1911) 6 Iah L J 00 P O I C 00 ( ) A I 420.  
 (q) *C. d. a. v. A. A. b. Lal* (1907) 3 C L W N 38 21 C. 8.  
 (r) (191 ) 33 All 22. 34 I C 33 approved by Lankin J. In *V. Purna d v M. Purnam* (1917) 4 C L J 13 93 I C 900 (76) A. C. 642.

This section does not apply to the second case that is the property charged cannot be brought to sale under this section. Where a surety charges his property by way of security the security may be given to the Court itself or to an officer of the Court or any other named individual. Where the security is given to an officer of the Court or any other named individual the property cannot be sold except by a suit on the charge. But where the security is given to the Court the Court not being a juridical person it cannot sue and the only mode of enforcing the liability is by the Court making an order in the suit upon an application to which the surety is a party that the property charged be sold unless before a day named the surety finds the money. It was so held by their Lordships of the Privy Council in *Raghubar Singh v Jai Indra Bahadur Singh* (r). In that case the plaintiff obtained a decree for possession against the defendant. The defendant appealed from the decree. The plaintiff was on his application led into possession in execution of the decree upon furnishing security. The security was furnished by S who entered into a bond whereby he hypothecated the property. The bond was passed to the Court. No obligee was named in the bond. It was argued on behalf of the surety that the liability in the bond could not be enforced except by a suit under O 34 r 14 (Transfer of Property Act 1882 s 90) but this argument was not accepted and it was held that the proper order to make was that the property charged be sold unless before a day named the surety found the money. In that case their Lordships said. In the course of the judgments in India section 145 was referred to but whatever might have been its effect if the sureties had been personally liable it has no application now that their Lordships have construed the instrument as giving only a charge upon property. As to the contention that the liability could only be enforced by a suit on a mortgage their Lordships said that for such a proceeding there must be a mortgagor and a mortgagee but that there was no mortgagee named in the bond and further the Court not being a juridical person cannot assign the property to any person to enable him to file a suit on the mortgage. It must however be observed that the procedure adopted by their Lordships in *Raghubar Singh's* case cannot be followed in cases where the surety has prior to the sale transferred his equity of redemption in the property to a third person (s).

In the third case also where the security is given to the Court the property may be sold by an order of the kind made in *Paglubar Singh's* case. At the same time the applicant may relinquish his interest in the charge and proceed to enforce the personal liability in the bond by attachment and sale of the property charged (t).

Where a security bond charging his property is given by the judgment debtor himself the property can be realised in execution under sec 47 (u).

Notice to surety.—The notice required to be given to a surety under this section is a condition precedent to the validity of an order for execution against him. An attachment is void without such notice being given (v). When a decree is sent by the Court which passed the decree to another Court for execution the notice required by this section may be given by the latter Court (w). For form of notice see App II Form No 13.

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>(r) (1910) 48 I A 964 All 168 166<br/>59 I C 30 approving J n l J a v<br/>C r u p P a (189) 17 All 93 P e t i M a l<br/>l a l J B I S i g h (1934) All 613<br/>74 I C 0 (1) A A 10 S K u a v<br/>M p e r a m (19) 51 Cal 19 I C 908<br/>(6) A C 893 D U j a h (193)<br/>L a g 3 118 I C 63 (3) A R 16<br/>(s) 41 r M a h d o (1917) 39 All 38 I C<br/>33<br/>(t) M k a J s a t M a l (1916) 38 All<br/>3 33 I C 94 I C D e J t L a l<br/>(191) P a t L J 10 39 I C 618</p> | <p>C r u h a t a p p a C u r (1906) 0 Bom<br/>338 95 I C 696 (6) A B J J a v p p a<br/>v S h e r g u d a (1908) 5 Bom 10<br/>I C 10 (3) A B 40<br/>( ) J y t J i A M H P a l a h (191) 51<br/>C 110 81 I C 34 (4) A C 425<br/>S b r m a a P a f i m a d (1914)<br/>41 M d 3 43 I C 187<br/>( ) T a k U j a s (14) P a r t 67 84<br/>I C 99 ( ) A R 13<br/>(w) L k h P a k v P a j u m i (190) 9<br/>Bom 8</p> |
|---|---|

**Discharge of surety**—The liability of the surety depends upon the term of the bond and unless expressly limited to the original Court extend to the Court of appeal (x). The liability may be determined if the Court alters the terms of the security (y). A surety in pursuance of an order giving leave to defend a suit under O 37 is discharged when a consent decree is passed without his knowledge (z). Otherwise the surety is bound so long as the judgment debtor is bound and so the surety is not discharged by a payment which has not been certified under O 21 r 2 of the Code (a). The form which the contract of suretyship takes is immaterial it may be either in favour of the Court or of the decree holder (b).

**Section no bar to a regular suit against surety**—As to the old section it was held that it gave an additional not an exclusive remedy against a surety and that it *did not prevent* the decree holder from bringing a *regular suit* on the surety bond to enforce the security (c). The present section also does not bar a regular suit (d). It simply enables a party for whose benefit security has been given to enforce the surety bond against the surety by way of execution to the extent to which the surety has rendered himself *personally liable* and no more. If the party for whose benefit security has been given proceeds against the surety in execution the surety is to be *deemed for the purposes of appeal* a party within the meaning of s 47. That is to say if an order is made in execution enforcing a claim against the surety the surety may appeal from the order as if he was a party to the suit in which the decree or order sought to be executed was passed (e). In this respect the section gives effect to certain rulings under the old section (f). The reference however to s 47 does not import into this section the provision therein contained which bars a separate suit. A surety under this section is a party to the suit for the limited purpose mentioned in this section (g).

A surety for a deceased defendant is not liable when a decree is passed against a person who has not been adjudged to be the legal representative and he may bring a suit to negative his liability (h).

**Appeal**—An order under this section is appealable as a decree (i). See the penultimate paragraph of the section.

**Limitation**—Where an appeal has been preferred from a decree for the performance whereof a person has become liable as a surety the period of limitation for an application under this section is 3 years from the date of the appellate decree as provided by art 182 cl (2) Schedule I of the Limitation Act and not 3 years from the date of the original decree (j).

**146 [New]** Save as otherwise provided by this Code or by any law for the time being in force, where any proceeding may be taken or application made by or against any person,

Proceeding by or against representative

- ( ) *Ira jwadi v Irabazappa* (19 ) 51 Bom 31  
90 J C 80 ( ) A B 64  
(y) *Hirajal v M I* (19 6) 3 Bom L 1  
51 94 J C 645 ( ) A B 6  
( ) *N I al (oal Co v A Anush B* (19 6) 30  
C W N 40 9 J C 402 ( ) A C 218  
( ) *T ml I ddy v Dori I ddy* (19 6) 49 Mal  
3 3 94 J C 5 ( ) A B 6 4  
(b) *Jovan Ievu v F* (19 6) 3  
Cal 515 95 J C 4 3 (26) A C 218  
( ) *Abdul Kad v Huc* (14 4) 6 All B C  
61  
(d) *Mel I v Thakore* (1911) 6 Bom 4  
1 J C 542 Contra to 144 sub-a ( )

- (e) *Sr ibah Py t A sh Prasad* (1911) 35  
C 1 4 d 93 ( ) b 6  
(f) *Sh k d ler* (19 6) 1 Bom 1  
Akhong Alm d (18 1) J W B 538  
(g) *Fam A A* (19 6) 51 All  
316 11 J C 31 ( ) A A  
F mo th v D Ircami (19 0) 43  
M d S J C 63  
(h) *Pulla of v Jams i* (19 7) 60 Bom 20 100  
J C 1 5 ( ) A B 63  
( ) *Sup dda v Pul* (1914) 19 C W N 10  
30 14 654  
(j) *Chalappa v Fama hand e* (19 0) 44 Bom  
34 52 J C 15

then the proceeding may be taken or the application may be made by or against any person claiming under him

**Proceeding by or against representatives**—The proceeding contemplated by the section includes an appeal. The expression claiming under is wide enough to cover cases of devolution etc mentioned in O 22 r 10. *A* sues *B* to establish his right to certain property. Pending the suit *B* mortgages the property to *C*. The suit is decided in *A*'s favour. *B* does not appeal from the decree. *C* as a person claiming under *B* may appeal from the decree (k).

This section does not enable the legal representative of a deceased transferee decree holder to be substituted on the record to continue an execution proceeding (l).

See notes to O 9 r 13 under the head Application by legal representative of deceased defendant. Other cases to which the section applies have been considered in their proper place.

**147 [New R S C, O 16, r 21]** In all suits to which any person under disability is a party, any

Consent or agreement by persons under disability

consent or agreement, as to any proceeding shall, if given or made with the express leave of the Court by the next friend or guardian for the suit, have the same force and effect as if such person were under no disability and had given such consent or made such agreement.

**Rules of the Supreme Court O 16 r 21**—This section is new. It is taken from O 16 r 21 of the rules of the Supreme Court with some alterations.

**Any person under disability**—The section applies to consent given on behalf of persons under disability such as minors and lunatics. See O 32 below.

**As to any proceeding**—The words do not refer to the conduct of a suit or appeal. A next friend or guardian ad litem has undoubtedly the conduct of a suit or appeal in his hands. But if he does anything in the action beyond the mere conduct of it e.g. consents not to appeal the person under disability is not bound by it unless it is done with the express leave of the Court (m).

**Express leave**—The leave must be express. In this respect the present section differs from the English rule.

**148 [New R S C, O 64, r 7]** Where any period is fixed or granted by the Court for the doing of any act prescribed or allowed by

Enlargement of time

this Code, the Court may, in its discretion from time to time enlarge such period, even though the period originally fixed or granted may have expired.

**Act prescribed or allowed by this Code**—The present section empowers the Court to extend the time fixed by it even after the expiry of the period originally fixed. It is a legislative recognition of the rule laid down in the Bombay case of *Bhagwan Das v Haji Abu Ahmed* (n) and the cases on which that rule was based (o). In

(k) *Suaram v Lakshmi* (1914) 41 Mad (m) *Rhodes v Swinbank* (1891) 15 Bom 63  
 510 43 I C 840 (n) (1891) 15 Bom 63  
 (l) *Palanappa v F Hanuman* (19 ) 50 Mad (o) *Dew* 4m Na 27 J (1910) 14 C W  
 192 I C 6 (7) A M 154 N 85 284 6 I C 44



the Bombay case it was held that it was competent to the Court to extend the time fixed under s. 54 of the Code of 1852 (now O 7 r 11) even after the expiry of the time originally granted. It must however be noted that the section applies only where time is fixed for the doing of an act *prescribed or allowed by this Code*. Code includes rule and prescribed means prescribed by the rules [secs 2 cls (1) and (16)]. See for instance the following rules —

- 1 O 6 r 18 (amendment of pleadings)
- 2 O 7 r 11 (b) (requiring plaintiff to correct valuation of suit)
- 3 O 7 r 11 (requiring plaintiff to supply requisite stamp paper where the plaint is written upon paper insufficiently stamped)
- 4 O 8 r 9 (requiring written statement or additional written statement from a party)
- 5 O 21 r 17 (amendment of application for execution)
- 6 O 20 r 2 (security for costs of suit)
- 7 O 41 r 10 (security for costs of appeal)

**Act directed or allowed by a decree of Court**—This section does not apply where time is allowed for doing an act by a *decree* in a suit (p). It was accordingly held by the Allahabad High Court in *Saranyan v Ram Bahai* (q) that a Court has no power under this section to extend the time fixed by its decree under O 20 r 14 for payment of purchase money in a suit for pre-emption. The Allahabad decision has been approved by the Madras High Court (r). The High Court of Patna has however held that the Court has power under this section to extend the time fixed by a decree passed under O 20 r 14 (s). The attention of the Patna Court was not drawn to the Allahabad decision. In a later case however the Allahabad High Court held that where an *ex parte* decree is set aside on condition that the defendant should pay a certain sum of money to the plaintiff within a certain time and payment is not made the Court has power under this section to enlarge the time for payment. As to *Saranyan's* case the Court observed that it related to a decree in a suit for pre-emption (t). In a still later case where a decree was passed in favour of the plaintiff conditional upon her paying an extra court fee of Rs. 20 within a week, but the amount was not paid within that period the High Court of Allahabad held that the Court had no power under this section to extend the time, but that the plaintiff might proceed by an application for a review under s. 114 read with O 47 r 1. The Court said: There is no distinction between a pre-emption decree and any other decree which embodies certain conditions and provides for the suit being dismissed if those conditions are not complied with (u). The Patna High Court has held that where a Court permits the plaintiff to withdraw a suit under O 23 r 1 with liberty to bring a fresh suit on payment of costs within a prescribed period the Court has power under this section to extend the time (v). The Oudh Court while holding that this section does not allow enlargement of time where the time is fixed by a *decree* in a suit holds that if an appeal is preferred from the decree the Appellate Court may extend the time prescribed by the decree not under sec. 148 but under O 41 r 3<sup>a</sup> by varying the decree of the lower Court in that behalf. It has thus been held that if a decree is passed for pre-emption on payment of a certain sum in Court within a prescribed time and an appeal is preferred from the decree the Appellate

(p) *Dharmdaja v Sri Venka* (1918) 39 Mad 86, 31 I C 40; *Bala Sharada v Mahomed* (1911) 15 Cal. W.N. 65 690 10 I C 145; *Hukim Chand v Har* (1911) 11 Ind. J. C. no. 92 p. 313 15 I C 941; *Qazi v Lam* A. A. (1907) 2 Ind. J. 453 101 I C 58 (2s) A O 3.

(q) (1913) 35 All. 28 11 I C 56

(r) (1916) 39 M. 1 66 31 I C 240 *supra*

(s) *Abu Muhammad v M. Kul Pertap* (1916) 1 Pat. L. J. 9<sup>a</sup> 34 I C 84

(t) *Jayaram v A. M. Prasad* (1914) 36 All. 7 3 I C 135

(u) *Gajinder Lal v Laxman* (1918) 40 All. 5 9 47 I C 4; see also *Falahi v Laxman* (1907) 53 Mad. L. J. 494 105 I C 121

(v) A. M. 154  
(1) *Qazi v Laxman* (1906) 5 Pat. 306 95 I C 942 101 A 1 40

Court has the power to extend the time for payment (w) The section does not in any case empower a Court to interfere with or modify its decree after an appeal has been filed from the decree (x) See note below Court to which etc

An application for extension of time fixed by the decree in a *redemption suit* for payment of the mortgage debts does not fall under this section but under O 31 r 8 (y)

Period of limitation—This section does not empower a Court to extend the period prescribed by the law of limitation ( ) nor the period of one month fixed by sec 55 (4) of the Code (a)

Consent order—Where the time for doing an act has been fixed by a consent order it cannot be enlarged except by consent (b)

Court to which application should be made for extension of time—Where a decree is passed against a defendant requiring him to execute a *kabuliat* in favour of the plaintiff within two months and an appeal is preferred from the decree the only Court that has power to extend the time assuming the case is one under this section is the appellate Court and not the Court which passed the decree (c)

Appeal—No appeal lies from an order under this section The order is not a decree nor is it one of the appealable orders mentioned in s 104 (d)

**149 [New]** Where the whole or any part of any fee prescribed for any document by the law for the time being in force relating to court-fees has not been paid, the Court may, in

Power to make up deficiency of court-fees

its discretion, at any stage, allow the person, by whom such fee is payable, to pay the whole or part as the case may be, of such court fee, and upon such payment the document, in respect of which such fee is payable, shall have the same force and effect as if such fee had been paid in the first instance

Scope of the section—This section is new It is an enabling section It empowers the Court to allow a party to make up the deficiency of court fees payable on plaints memoranda of appeal applications for review of judgment etc even after the expiration of the period of limitation prescribed for the filing of these documents The section enables a defective document to be *retrospectively* validated if the insufficiency of the stamp is subsequently made up with the leave of the Court The power however to make up the deficiency of court fees is *subject to the discretion of the Court* and is *not claimable as of right by a party* (e) See notes below Appeals and applications for review of judgment

Plaints—As to the case where a plaint is written upon paper insufficiently stamped see notes to O 7 r 11 under the head Clause (c)

- (w) *Q v P m Kushen* (19 7) Luck 4 5 101  
1 C 2 8 (3) A O 3  
(x) *Parmanand v Kripasindhu* (1910) 3 Cal.  
545 61 C 75  
(y) *He Singh v Tika Ram* (191 ) 34 All 388 14  
1 C 240  
( ) *Dukh o v Munshi Salu* (1919) 4 Pat. L. J  
4 8 56 1 C 439  
(a) *Na arimda v Pa gacharu* (1908) 50 Mad  
L. J 4 7 95 1 C 448 (26) A M 689

- (b) *Austiana Automatic Weighing Machine*  
Co v Walter (1911) W N (Eng) 10  
( ) *P rmanand Das v Kripasindhu* (1910) 37  
Cal. 544 61 C 2 5  
(d) *Sara Jan v Fam Bahal* (1913) 35 All 58.  
1 C 535  
(e) See *Falla v Mahmud* (1914) 16 Bom. L. R.  
63 66 66 1 C 746 *Erj Lufkan v*  
*Tota Eam* (19 ) 50 All 900 118 1 C  
2-3 (2) A 4 5

Appeals and applications for review of judgment --As to these it was provided by s 582A of the Code of 1882 as follows --

If a memorandum of appeal or application for a review of judgment has been presented within the proper period of limitation but is written upon paper insufficiently stamped and the insufficiency of the stamp was caused by mistake on the part of the appellant or applicant as to the amount of the requisite stamp the memorandum of appeal or application shall have the same effect and be as valid as if it has been properly stamped provided that such appeal or application shall be rejected unless the appellant or applicant supplies the requisite stamp within a reasonable time after the discovery of the mistake to be fixed by the Court

The above section was introduced into the Code of 1882 by Act 4 of 1892 to supersede a Full Bench ruling of the Allahabad High Court That ruling was to the effect that if a memorandum of appeal is not when tendered properly stamped it is not at that time a memorandum of appeal and the subsequent affixing of the proper stamp cannot have a retrospective effect so as to validate the original presentation unless it has been done by order of the Court and that such an order can only be made where the defective memorandum has been received through a mistake on the part of the Court or its officers and not where the insufficiency of the stamp was due to a mistake on the part of the appellant (f)

S 582A applied only to appeals and applications for a review The present section is general in its terms and applies to all documents chargeable with court fees under the Court fees Act such as plaints memoranda of appeal or of cross objections applications for review of judgment written statements pleading a set off or counter claim

The words and the insufficiency of the stamp was caused by mistake on the part of the appellant or applicant as to the amount of the requisite stamp which occurred in s 582A have been omitted in the present section It has accordingly been held by the High Court of Bombay that the concession provided for by this section should not be restricted to cases where there is a bona fide misunderstanding of the law as to valuation a it was under s 582A and that inability on the part of the appellant to pay the requisite stamp is a good ground for admitting the memorandum of appeal though presented on the last day of limitation and for extending under this section the time to pay the requisite stamp (g) According to the Patna High Court the Court should not give time to make good the deficiency if a litigant has deliberately and to suit his own convenience paid an insufficient court fee Time according to that Court may be given when the amount of the court fee payable is open to doubt or the amount of the court fee cannot be ascertained by the Court till the record is received or if it appears that the party has made an honest attempt to comply with the law (h) The Lahore High Court has taken a similar view (i) and held that if the insufficiency of the court fee is due to gross negligence on the part of the appellant or his pleader the negligence cannot be condoned (j) The Allahabad High Court has held that where an insufficiently stamped memorandum of appeal is accepted by inadvertence time may be given to the appellant to supply the deficiency but if the Court is aware at the time of the insufficiency of the stamp it ought to return the memorandum to the appellant in order that he may if the case admits re-present it properly stamped and apply for an extension of time under sec 5 of the Indian Limitation Act (k)

(f) *Balk an Rai v Gob d Nath* (1890) 1 AH 19

(g) *Ach v Nagappa* (1914) 33 Bom 41 1 IC 33

(h) *Pamshay v K mar Lachmi* (1918) 3 Pat L.J. 44 1 IC 65 Am v Mohan (1924) 31 T 337 80 IC 1030 (24) A.P. 663

(i) *Lekh Ram v Jamf* (1920) 1 Lah 34 57 IC 35 (no bona fide mistake) *P guber v M t Sol n* (1925) 6 Lah 33 86 IC 1 (5) A.L.J. 1 *Sattov Am r Singh* (1919) 1 Lah

L.J. 69 *Dai p Singh v Um o Singh* (1913) 1 unj Rec no 55 p 13 10 IC 84 (no res onable delay) *Sahib Ji v P r* (1919) 1 unj Rec no 10 p 19 49 IC 184 (mistake of pleader)

(j) *Guraran Das v Th D strict Board* (1920) 1 Lah L.J. 290 107 IC 615 (7) A.L. 844 dissenting from 24 Bom 41 supra

(k) *B yankhan v Tota Ram* (1928) 50 All 940 118 IC 24 (2) A.A. 75 dissenting from 24 Bom 41 supra

**Revision**—It has been held by the High Court of Allahabad that an order refusing to give time to a party to make up the deficiency in court fee is not capable of revision as such an order does not amount to a decision of a case within the meaning of s 115 of the Code (g)

Transfer of business as

(D) Achut v. Nagarappa (1914) 38 Bom 41 21 IC  
337

(m) P. masalay v. Kumar Lachmi (1918) 3 Pat  
L J 442 I C 675

( ) 8 4 of the Court Fees Act forbids a High Court to receive a memorandum of appeal unless the proper court fees have been paid.

tains a similar provision with regard to other Courts.

(d) 8 cases cited in (c)

(p) Narayana v. Venkatasubramanian (1914) 10 M.L.J. 677, 26 I.C. 33

(f) *Chā Ekan Lal v Kaula ya Lal* (1923) 45 All.  
\*15 691 C 91 (1-3) A.A. 113

Madras that it has O 9 r 13 does not say that the Court that passed the decree is the only Court that can set it aside (r)

**Transferred** —In two cases decided by the High Court of Madras it was held that the word transferred in this section is not confined to transfer of the business of one Court to another but includes cases where a new Court is given part of the territorial jurisdiction of an old Court and is authorized to try all the business arising within it (s) The High Court of Calcutta differs (t) and in a more recent case the Madras High Court has dissented from its two previous decisions and holds that the section refers to cases where certain specified business has been actually transferred by the order of a competent Court and does not apply to any other case (u)

See notes to s 37 above See also the undermentioned cases (t)

**151 [New]** Nothing in this Code shall be deemed to limit or otherwise affect the inherent power of the Court to make such orders as may be necessary for the ends of justice or to prevent abuse of the process of the Court

Saving of inherent powers of Court

**Inherent powers of Court**—The Code of Civil Procedure is not exhaustive (w) The Court has therefore in many cases where the circumstances require it acted upon the assumption of the possession of an inherent power to act *ex debito justitiae* and to do that real and substantial justice for the administration of which alone it exists (x) The law cannot make express provisions against all inconveniences so that their dispositions shall express all the cases that may possibly happen and it is therefore the duty of a Judge to apply them not only to what appears to be regulated by their express provisions but to all the cases to which a just application of them may be made and which appear to be comprehended either within the express sense of the law or within the consequences that may be gathered from it (y) This section does not confer any powers but only indicates that there is a power to make such orders as may be necessary for the ends of justice and to prevent an abuse of the process of the Court (z) At the same time it is to be remembered that a Court has no inherent power to do that which is prohibited by the Code Thus a Court has no power after the judgment is signed to alter or add to it as to do so would be in direct contravention of the provisions of O 20 r 3 (a) Further this section does not invest the Court with jurisdiction over matters which are excluded from its cognizance Thus a Court cannot under this section entertain a suit relating purely to caste questions such a suit not being one of a civil nature (b) See s 9 above Nor can the Court ignore the provisions of the law of limitation by appealing to this section (c) Inherent jurisdiction must be exercised subject to the

- (r) *Rangaatha v Ha umantha* (19 3) 46 Mad 1 65 I C 7 (2) A M 10 *Guruswami v Mahomm d'u* (19 3) 46 Mad 83 86 I C 650 (3) A M 9 10 39 r (3)—[temporary injunction]
- (s) (19 3) 46 Mad 1 *sup a* (19 3) 46 Mad 83 *supra*
- (t) *Munshi v Munshi* (19 1) 6 Cal W N 216 70 I C 10 ( ) A C 41
- (u) *Subrama a v Swaminath* (19 3) 28 Mad 1 L W 885 (A S) A M 46 *See also* *Si a kanda v Raja of Jeypore* (19 1) 50 Mad 88 103 I C 4 (2) A M 6
- (v) *Seeni Nandan v Muthusamy* (1919) 4 Mad 8 1 83 53 I C 213 *Aniruddh v Ataram* (19 0) 4 Cal W N 809 57 I C 8 9
- (w) *Durga Dihal D v A oraj* (189 1) 17 All 79 31 *Jog nd a Ch d a Sen v Wazirdu* (18 4) 100 I C 34 Cal 860
- (x) *Hutum Cl d v Kamala* 34 (1906) 33

- Cal 927 931 3
- (y) *Hurre Chander I ay v Shooradhone Debis* (1808) 9 W R 402 406
- (z) *H rmand Lal v Chaturdhaj* (19 6) 45 All. 356 9 I C 785 (A S) A A 31
- (a) *Ramesh v v Lala* (19 4) 3 Pat 778 84 I C 30 ( ) A P 6 *Adul Fra ad v Jamharakh* (19 5) 4 Pat 180 91 I C 213 (25) A I 43
- (b) *Jethabha v Chaprey* (1910) 34 Bom 46 41 C 108
- (c) *Tota F m v Pa na Lal* (19 4) 46 All. 631 91 C 99 (A S) A A 668 *Krishnasamy v Che gal ja* (19 4) 47 Mad 171 6 I C 838 (A S) A M 114 *Bissa Mal v Kesar S ngh* (19 0) 1 Lah 363 58 I C 789 *Ajodhya v Musammal Fzul Koer* (19 1) 11 lat 6 I C 341 (A S) A P 479 *Du v Prilam Das* (19 5) 7 Lah L J 13 86 I C 56 (A S) A L 5 1

rule that if the Code does contain specific provisions which would meet the necessities of the case in question such provisions should be followed and the inherent jurisdiction should not be invoked (d) A Court cannot make use of the special provisions of this section where the applicant has his remedy provided elsewhere in the Code and has neglected to avail himself of it (e) And further no order should be made under this section unless it is necessary for the ends of justice or to prevent abuse of the process of the Court (f) The mere fact that there is no other remedy would not attract the application of this section (g) The first case in which this section was considered by the Privy Council is *Sabitri v Sata* (h) In that case the High Court of Calcutta dismissed an appeal under O 41 r 10 which provides that upon a failure to comply with an order for security for costs the Court shall dismiss the appeal On appeal to the Judicial Committee it was contended that the Court had inherent power under this section to give the appellant an opportunity of making an application for leave to continue the appeal in forma pauperis Referring to this contention their Lordships said A further point is taken that s 151 of the Code of Civil Procedure 1908 preserves the inherent powers of the Court to make such orders as may be necessary for the ends of justice and to this general saving section appeal is made to take the case out of the operation of the orders and rules if they are applicable to Letters Patent appeals How far a mere general saving clause gives power in effect to refuse to apply an appropriate rule made in the exercise of other powers of the Court and having statutory force is another question but for present purposes it is enough to say that in the terms of the section the inherent powers saved are such as are used to secure the ends of justice In the end their Lordships came to the conclusion on the materials before them that justice did not require that the appellant should be assisted in prosecuting the appeal before the High Court and they confirmed the order of the High Court The Bombay High Court has said that the section should be applied with great caution and that a Court could not under this section restore an application under O 21 r 89 which had been dismissed for default of appearance (i) But where the ends of justice require it the Court has an inherent power to make such order as it may deem proper It has thus been held that although the Code contains no express provision on the matters hereinafter mentioned the Court has an inherent power—

- (a) to consolidate suits and appeals (j) including appeals to His Majesty in Council (k)
- (b) to postpone the hearing of suits pending the decision of a selected action (l)
- (c) to stay on the ground of convenience cross suits (i)

- (d) *Ghunos v The Allahabad B & Ltd* (1917) 41 Cal 9 9 936 937 41 I C 598
- (e) *Joshi v Jhinguria* (19 4) 46 All 144 8 I C 416 (24) A A 446 *Fallahabhas v Chhotai* (19 7) 51 Bom 26 100 I C 154 (27) A B 79
- (f) *Ganesh v Purushottam* (1910) 34 Bom 135 41 C 595
- (g) *Amit v Mangal* (1905) 4 Pat 704 91 I C 433 (26) A F 27
- (h) (1901) 45 I A 9 48 Cal 491 60 I C 4  
*Kojo Pon v Aita Fua* (19 8) 47 Cal I J 3-8 107 I C 319 (27) A C 264
- (i) *Bhagv n v Dattatraya* (19 6) 50 Bom 54
- 98 I C 411 (-6) A B 377
- (j) *Hukum Chand v Kamalanand* (188 22 Cal 9 932 *Nandu Kishore v Kam Gidam* (191 4) 40 Cal 955 959 960 13 I C 2-2
- (k) *Chaudhry Ha Prasad v Brij Kishore Das* (1913) 3 Pat. L J 444 4 I C 1  
*Qazi v Manikumar* (1922) 2 Pat. 11 97 I C 1000 (22) A P 24 *Kishore v Su of Auma* (1917) 1 Cal W 3 2 15 I C 897
- (l) *Hukum Chand v Kamalanand* 188, 22 Cal 9 932 *Nandu Kishore v Kam Gidam* (1913) 40 Cal 9 4 9 4 1 I C 2/1  
*Sved Abdul v Kalamullah* (1912) 2 Cal W 4 295 84 I C 1222 (-2) A C 7

- (d) to ascertain whether the proper parties are before it (m)
- (e) to enquire whether a plaintiff is entitled to sue as an adult (m)
- (f) to entertain the application of a third person to be made a party (m)
- (g) to allow a defence *in forma pauperis* (m)
- (h) to decide one question and to reserve another for investigation the Privy Council pointing out that it did not require any provision of the Code to authorize a Judge to do what in this matter was justice and for the advantage of the parties (m)
- (i) to remand a case to which neither O 41 r 23 nor O 41 r 25 applies (m) See notes to O 41 r 23 Remand in case of error omission or irregularity and notes to O 42 r 1 Inherent power of High Courts to remand in second appeal
- (j) to stay the drawing up of the Court's own orders or to suspend their operation if the necessities of justice so require (m)
- (k) to stay proceedings in a lower Court pending appeal and to appoint a temporary guardian of a minor upon such stay (m)
- (l) to apply the principles of *res judicata* to cases not falling within section 11 of the Code (m) see notes to s 11 Section not exhaustive on p 77 above and Orders in execution proceedings on p 77 above
- (m) to add a party (n) or to transpose parties (o)
- (n) to punish summarily by imprisonment contempts of Court committed by the publication of a libel out of Court (p)
- (o) to decide questions of jurisdiction though as a result of its inquiry it may turn out that the Court has no jurisdiction over the suit (q)
- (p) to stay proceedings pursuant to its own order in view of an intended appeal (r)
- (q) to direct a party who has applied for leave to appeal to the King in Council to pay costs on the dismissal of his application (s)
- (r) to take cognizance of questions which cut at the root of the subject matter of controversy between the parties *e.g.* whether a deed of mortgage is attested as required by s 59 of the Transfer of Property Act (t)
- (s) to amend decrees and orders in cases not covered by s 152 (u) see notes to s 152 Inherent power to amend decrees and orders
- (t) to set aside an order obtained by fraud practised upon the Court *e.g.* when a pleader not engaged by the defendant at all consents to a decree on behalf of the defendant (t)
- (u) to restore a suit dismissed for default in cases not provided for by O 9 r 9 see notes to O 9 r 9 Inherent power of Court to restore suits on other grounds

- (m) 33 C L 97 93 40 Cal 94 99 980 18 I C 907 *supra* Gnanendra v Prof Bana da (1927) 3 C W N 101 106 I C 51 (18) A C 81<sup>n</sup>
- (n) Lal/mich d v Kachubhai (1911) 35 Bom 303 11 I C 59 Sra Math Hema gi v Haridas (1914) 3 Pat L J 409 46 I C 398 [adding a respondent in an appeal]
- (o) S rya Aa ta v Tarak Nath (19<sup>n</sup>) 46 Cal L J 43 98 I C 8 (2) A C 37
- (p) S re d Nath B nerj a v The Ch of Justice and Judge of the High Court of Bengal (1884) 10 Cal 109 10 I A 11
- (q) H rree I er d v Koonjo B hary (186 ) M r et al, 99

- (r) Lucmi Na am in the goods of (1901) 5 C W N 81
- (s) Jogend a Chandra v Waridun issa Khat a (190 ) 34 Cal 860
- (t) Sh mu Jatter v Abd i Khat r (191 ) 35 MaJ 607 39 I A 118 16 I C 20
- (u) Mahab r v Cha d a (1914) 19 C W N 101 18 I C 304
- (v) Ba angorda v Churchigirigorda (1910) 34 Bom 408 51 C 965 I ary Choudhury v So oo Das (1914) 19 C W N 419 71 C 69 Shreemat v Sa i (1) 16 Pt 108 105 I C 271 (7) A P 34 Derendra Nath v Ram i a Apal (19<sup>n</sup>) 1 Luck 341 93 I C 30 (6) A O 315

- (v) to cause restitution to be made on reversal of decree see notes to s 144  
Inherent power to grant restitution
- (w) to restrain by injunction a person from proceeding with a suit in another Court see notes to O 39 r 1 Powers of Chartered High Courts to restrain a party from proceedings with a suit pending in another Court
- (x) to rehear a matter before the order passed by the Court at a previous hearing is drawn up and sealed (u)
- (y) to order a stay of execution in view of an application by a judgment debtor to the Judicial Committee for special leave to appeal to His Majesty in Council (z)
- (z) to set aside an order of dismissal made under O 9 r 8 for non appearance of the plaintiff when the non appearance was owing to the plaintiff's death and the fact of the plaintiff's death was not brought to the notice of the Court dismissing the suit (y)
- (zz) to set aside an order dismissing without independent inquiry an application asking for an inquiry under O 32 r 1 as to the mental infirmity of a party (z)
- (aa) to vacate an order obtained by fraud as where an order is made recording the adjustment of a decree [O 21 r 2] and the adjustment has been brought about by fraud practised by one party upon another (a)
- (bb) to direct an auction purchaser in a case where he has paid the purchase money and subsequently withdrawn it from the Court on the sale to him being set aside under O 21 r 91 to pay back the money into Court on the sale being confirmed in appeal (b)
- (cc) to restore a suit as held by the Allahabad High Court (c) where the decree passed in the suit is set aside on the ground that the minor against whom the suit was filed was not properly represented by a guardian ad litem and to proceed with the appointment of a fit and proper person as guardian ad litem of the minor defendant according to the Madras High Court the decree is a nullity and the Court has no inherent power to restore the suit (d)
- (dd) to interfere where its decree is being executed in a manner manifestly at variance with the purport and intent of the decree (e)
- (ee) to stay execution of a decree obtained by A against B pending not only the decision of a suit by B against A but also the decision of an appeal by B against A from a decree passed against B in B's suit (f) See O 21 r 29
- (ff) to stay a suit brought by A against B in Court X in a case where substantially the whole cause of action arose at another place and the material witnesses and their books of account are at that place if no injustice is caused to the plaintiff thereby and if the defendant would be subjected to such injustice in defending the suit as would amount to vexation and oppression to which he would not be subjected if the suit were brought in another and accessible Court where substantially the whole cause of action arose (g)

- (w) *Padalatis v Padalati* (1910) 3 Cal 59 6
- (v) *Nanda Kishore v F. M. G. M.* (191) 40 Cal 9 5 181 C 707
- (y) *Devi Bakshi v Habib Sah* (1913) 3 All 331 401 A 161 191 C 5 6
- (z) *Chatterjee v H. S. S. S.* (1913) 50 All 33
- (aa) *P. J. v. A. A. A.* (1913) 6 Bom 148
- (bb) *L. J. 1 v. L. J. 1* (1914) Mad L J 1 v. L. J. 1
- (cc) *Sukdeo Das v. F. to S. S. S.* (191) 2 Pat

- L J 361 391 C 63
- (c) *EA. G. v. J. A. M. S. S. A. Das* (1917) 33 All 8 361 C 366
- (d) *Arum. G. v. J. S. S. S. S. S. S.* (1914) 46 Mad L J 344 81 C 76 11 A M 459
- (e) *K. S. S. S. S. S. S. S. S. S.* (1918) 3 L J 433 431 C 10
- (f) *S. S. S. S. S. S. S. S. S.* (1910) Punj Rec no 6 p 233 71 C 1017
- (g) *Jethabhai v. Amarchand* (1913) 5 Bom L R 13 6 1 C 85- (4) A B 20



- (gg) to reconstruct its records as where they are lost by accident (h)
- (hh) to stay criminal proceedings started under s 476 of the Criminal Procedure Code against a defendant in a suit pending an appeal filed by the defendant from the decree (i)
- (ii) to strike off the defence and proceed ex parte where a suit is adjourned on the condition that the defendant should pay the costs of the adjournment within a prescribed period and he fails to do so (j)
- (jj) to review an order of dismissal of an application under O 9 r 9 (k)
- (kk) to dismiss in appeal a suit on the ground that it is premature even if the point was not taken in the Court below (l)
- (ll) to order a refund of stamp duty in an exceptional case (m)
- (mm) to stay a suit even if it does not come within sec 10 of the Code (n)

**Prevent abuse of process of Court.**—A Court has inherent jurisdiction to stay any suit which is an abuse of the process of the Court (o) See notes to O 16 r 1 Whether witness summons may be refused. See also the undermentioned case (p)

Where the Court is bound to grant an application and has no discretion to refuse it it has no power to dismiss it on so treacherous a ground of decision as an abuse of the process of the Court (q)

**Appeal**—No appeal lies from an order made under this section (r) But though no appeal lies the High Court has power under s 107 of the Government of India Act 1915 to correct subordinate Courts if they have wrongly exercised their inherent powers (s)

**Limitation**—It has been held by the High Court of Patna that an application for restitution either under s 144 or s 151 is governed by the Limitation Act Sch I Art 181 (t) See note to s 144 Limitation

## 152 [New R S C O 28 r 11 Cf S 206] Clerical

Amendments of judgments decrees or orders

or arithmetical mistakes in judgments, decrees or orders, or errors arising therein from any accidental slip or omission, may at any time be corrected by the Court either of its own motion or on the application of any of the parties

**Amendment of decrees and orders**—This section has been taken from O 23 r 11 of the Rules of the Supreme Court

There are only two cases in which the Court can amend or vary a decree or order after it is drawn up and signed namely—

- (i) under its inherent powers when the decree or order does not correctly state what the Court actually decided and intended and
- (ii) under this section where there has been a clerical or arithmetical mistake or an error arising from an accidental slip or omission.

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>(h) <i>Marakarulla v Ferran</i> (1933) 46 Mad 679 3 I C 10 0 (23) A M 647</p> <p>(i) <i>Harnam Singh v Ditta</i> (1957) 7 Lah L J 73 68 I C 6 6 (25) A L 23</p> <p>(j) <i>East Indian Paper Co v Jit Lal</i> (1955) 47 All 538 86 I C 86 (25) A A 280</p> <p>(k) <i>Sarat Chandra v Binodini</i> (1977) 64 Cal 405 103 I C 69 (-7) A C 531 <i>See end of</i></p> <p><i>Nath v Jatinendra Nath</i> (1938) 3 C W 811 115 I C 3 7 (-7) A G 17</p> <p>(l) <i>Muhammad v Abdullah</i> (1972) 2 Luck. 731 104 I C 8 8 (-7) A O 455</p> <p>(m) <i>Carty Firm v A. J. Coy</i> (1997) 7 Ranw 88 117 I C 58 (-9) A K 158</p> <p>(n) <i>A. N. Jai v Tulak Ram</i> (1938) 10 Lah L J 470 113 I C 783 (29) A L 1</p> | <p>(o) <i>Hind Tan Assurance Ltd v P. N. Mitra</i> (1914) 27 Mad L J 645 65 2 I C 455</p> <p>(p) <i>Shah v Ichand v Lieut. Linton</i> (1914) 35 Bom 638 5 I C 3 1</p> <p>(q) <i>Chhatrapati Singh v Ahir Singh</i> (1911) 44 I A 11 14 44 Cal 53 540 541 39 I C 789</p> <p>(r) <i>Suldeep Das v P. N. Singh</i> (1911) 2 Pat L J 391 39 I C 763 <i>Paghnanda v Jaduna das</i> (1915) 3 Pat L J 53 54 43 I C 959</p> <p>(s) <i>L. J. P. v Sri Chandra</i> (1910) 4 Pat. L J 0 4 I C 719</p> <p>(t) <i>Balmakund v Bhatia Kumari</i> (1904) 3 Pat. 371 78 I C 00 (-5) A P 1 (F B)</p> |
|--|---|

If a decree or order is sought to be amended or varied in any other case it can only be done by a review of judgment under O 47 r 1 or by an appeal under s 96 (u). It is doubtful whether a decree or order can be varied even by consent of parties after it is drawn up and signed (1) *see* O 20 r 3.

**Inherent power to amend decrees and orders**—Every Court has an inherent power to vary or amend its own decree or order so as to carry out its own meaning. In so doing it does nothing but exercise a power to correct a mistake of its ministerial officer by whom the decree or order was drawn up (w) it only insists that the decree drawn up in the office of the Court should correctly express the judgment given by the Court (x). It would be perfectly shocking if the Court could not rectify an error which is really the error of its own minister (y). I cannot doubt said Lord Penzance in *Laurie v Lees* (z) that under the original powers of the Court independent of any order that is made under the Judicature Act every Court has the power to vary its own orders which are drawn up mechanically in the office of the Court—to vary them in such a way as to carry out its own meaning and where language has been used which is doubtful to make it plain. I think that power is inherent in every Court. In *Hutton v Harris* (a) Lord Watson said: When an error of that kind has been committed it is always within the competency of the Court if nothing has intervened which would render it inexpedient or unjuitable to do so to correct the record in order to bring it into harmony with the order which the Judge obviously meant to pronounce.

It will be seen from the above that the Court has no power to vary or amend its decree where it is in conformity with the judgment (b) not even if the judgment is erroneous in law (c) though the error be apparent on the face of the judgment (d).

A decree has been defined in s 2 as the formal expression of an adjudication which completely determines the rights of the parties with regard to the matters in controversy in a suit. O 20 r 6 provides that a decree shall be in conformity with the judgment. Where a decree is at variance with the judgment the Court has power to set right the decree and to bring it into conformity with the judgment (e).

#### Illustrations

(1) A sues B for Rs 5 000 and interest. The judgment is for Rs 4 000 with out more. The decree is drawn up in accordance with the judgment. A then applies to amend the decree by adding an order for payment of interest. The application must be refused for the decree is not at variance with the judgment. If A is aggrieved by the decree the proper course for him is to apply for a review of judgment or to appeal from the decree. *Hasan v Shoo Prasad* (1893) 15 All 121. *Abdul v Chumia* (1886) 8 All 377.

(2) A and B enter into an agreement for partition of certain properties. B fails to convey to A the properties of A's share. A sues B for specific performance of the agreement and a decree is passed declaring only that A is entitled to specific performance of the agreement. The usual form is to declare that the agreement ought to

- (u) *Lachman v Mohan* (1880) 411 40  
*Falshmi v Bhatiya* (1977) 3 Mad  
 L J 38 103 I C 89 (7) A M 20  
 (v) *A neworth v Wilding* (1896) 1 Ch 673 674  
 (w) *Mellor v Swire* (1885) 30 C D 38 46  
 (x) *In re St. Nazaire Co* (1879) 12 C D 83  
*First Bank of Co v Allway* (1835) 1  
 Ch 141  
 (y) *Melior v Swire* (1885) 30 C D 33 47  
 (z) (1881) App 19 34 35  
 (a) (1881) A C 517 60  
 (b) *Parimashya v Seeharappa* (1859) 40  
 M d 364 *Shahab Din v Sufi-ud Din*  
 (1913) Punj Rec. no 4 p 145 17 I C

- 418 *Harihar v M. Keswar* (1914) 3 P t  
 854 8 I C 813 (1901) A 1 47  
 (c) *Lakho v S. Ramat* (1890) 20 All 337  
 (d) *Charles Bright & Co Ltd v Selar* (1904)  
 1 K B 6  
 (e) *Karim Mahomed v Rajooma* (1883) 1 Bom  
 174 *Irapp v Lakshappa* (1901) 4 Bom  
 L R 909 *Brigman v J. Yarnall* (1910)  
 37 Cal 419 7 I C 876 *Mamag S. S. S.*  
*v. Pam. Gopal* (1914) 0 Cal. L. J 18  
 31 I C 419 *Chandra Kumar v Suddha*  
 (1914) 3 Cal W N 8 3 50 I C. 55  
 (1914) A C 895 [partition] *Pudal v*  
*Chathayya* (1891) 14 Mad 150

be specifically performed and the Court doth order and decree that the same be specifically performed [i.e. both by A and B]. The decree may be amended so as to put it in the usual form *Karim Mahomed v. Pajooma* (1883) 12 Bom 174. [In the above case the amendment was necessary for the decree as drawn up did not contain any direction to A to convey to B the properties of B's share but declared only that A was entitled to specific performance.]

(3) A sues B and C for Rs. 5000. The judgment awards Rs. 5000 to A as prayed [i.e. as against B and C]. The decree is drawn up so as to render the amount payable by B alone. The decree may be amended and brought into conformity with the judgment *Chalthappan v. Pydel* (1892) 15 Mad 403. *Phero sha v. Sun Mills Ltd* (1898) 22 Bombay 370.

**Accidental omission.**—This section enables the Court to correct errors arising from an accidental omission (f). Thus where directions as to costs were inadvertently omitted the decree was set right by adding the directions (g). Similarly where the date from which payments ordered to be made were to run was inadvertently omitted the decree was perfected by adding the date (h).

**Accidental slip.**—The Court has power under this section to correct accidental slips (i). A bona fide error as to the amount of interest due to the defendant may be corrected under this section (j). And so also an error as to the period for which an injunction is to continue (k).

**May.**—In a recent case the High Court of Calcutta said. The word may in the section does not make it discretionary with the Court to order the amendment but merely enlarges the power of the Court by providing that such correction may be made at any time or in other words the section simply emphasizes that no lapse of time would disentitle the Court to make the correction (l). The correct view it is submitted is the one taken by the High Court of Allahabad namely that under this section there is no right in any party to have a clerical or arithmetical mistake corrected. The matter is left to the discretion of the Court and the discretion has to be exercised in view of the peculiar facts of each case (m).

**At any time.**—A decree may be amended under this section at any time although the time for appealing from the decree has expired (n). There is no limitation for an application to amend the decree (o). Under the corresponding English rule an error in a decree was in one case amended after 39 years (p) and in another case after 10 years (q). In a Bombay case an application was made to the High Court to rectify a decree in the exercise of its inherent powers 10 years after the date of the decree and the application was allowed (r). But no amendment should be allowed by the Court either under this section or in the exercise of its inherent powers if it is inexpedient or inequitable to do so as where third parties have acquired rights under the erroneous decree without a knowledge of the circumstances which would tend to show that the

(f) *Ram Chand v. Chh. b. Pam* (1909) 11 Lah L. J. 37 (29) A. L. 317

(g) *Re I. d. (195) W. N. 21* *Pe Poper* (1890) 45 C. D. 10 *Chestrum and Sons v. G. ridan* (1901) 1 K. B. 694

(h) *E. v. F.* (1903) F. 89

(i) *H. K. m. S. v. S. Rajpal* (1909) 7 All. L. J. 505 (10) A. A. 34

(j) *Barker v. I. rous* (1886) 56 L. T. 131

(k) *Shipwright v. Clements* (1890) 38 W. R. (Eng.) 46

(l) *Chandra A. ma v. Sulha ou* (1914) 3 Cal. W. N. 83 63 60 I. C. 5 (4) A. C. 893

(m) *A. Ishori v. Chh. ga* (1905) 47 All. 44 49

8 I. C. 1030 ( ) A. A. 18 *Puan Lal v. Balwant S. gh* (19 ) 3 All. L. J. 518 519 89 I. C. 306 (5) A. A. 556

(n) *Barke v. P. rous* (1886) 56 L. T. 131 *Pydel v. Ch. th. ppa* (1891) 14 Mad 150 [Amendment after Court sale]

(o) *Shivepa v. Ship. neh* (18 ) 11 Bom. 34 *Kalu v. Lutu* (1893) 21 Cal. 39 *J. rous v. Frogg* (18 ) 10 Mad. 51 *Lia bo v. Kesko* (1887) 9 All. 364

(p) *H. Hon v. Harr s* (189 ) A. C. 547 564

(q) *Shipwright v. Clements* (1890) 38 W. R. (Eng.) 46

(r) *Karim Mahomed v. Raj. oma* (1885) 1 Bom. 1 4 163

decree was erroneous (s) Further laches may in the particular circumstances of a case di entitle a party to relief under this section (t)

**Amendment and limitation**—An amendment of a merely clerical error does not furnish a fresh starting point of limitation for executing the decree (u)

**By which Court amendment could be made**—The Court to amend a decree is the Court that passed it Where an appeal is preferred from a decree of a Court of first instance the appellate Court may—

- (1) dismiss the appeal under O 41 r 11 (1) without issuing any notice to the respondent or it may
- (2) confirm reverse or vary the decree of the Court of first instance [O 41 r 32]

In case (1) it has been held by the High Courts of Calcutta Madras Allahabad and Pangoon that it is the appellate Court alone that can amend the decree (v) On the other hand it has been held by the Bombay High Court that it is the Court of the first instance and not the appellate Court that can amend the decree the reason given being that a dismissal under O 41 r 11 leaves the decree of the lower Court untouched (w) See notes to s 36 above

In case (2) the appellate Court alone can amend the decree (x)

The Court which passed the decree has power to amend it even after an appeal is filed it is only when the appellate Court passes a decree which operates to supersede the decree of the trial Court that its power to amend ceases (y)

When an appeal is withdrawn the decree of the lower Court is left intact and that Court alone has power to amend ( )

An arithmetical error in the decree of the lower Court repeated in a confirming decree of the appellate Court may it is submitted be corrected by the appellate Court

Where an application for revision of a decree of a Provincial Small Cause Court is rejected by the High Court *in limine* the proper Court to amend the decree is the Small Cause Court and not the High Court (a)

**Revision**—A decision under this section granting an application for amendment is an order and not a decree The decision may therefore be the subject of revision under s 110 but it cannot be the subject of an appeal (b) It has been so held by the High Courts of Calcutta Allahabad and Bombay in cases under the corresponding s 906 of the Code of 189. A different view has been taken by the High Court of Madras According to that Court where a decree is amended the aggrieved party has the right to appeal from the decree as amended Hence if no appeal is preferred within the period of limitation he cannot afterwards apply for a revision of the order allowing the amendment (c)

- (1) *Hutton v Harris* (189 ) A C 547 559  
*Stewart v Rhode* (1900) 1 Ch. 388 394  
39 *Pa du a g v Verhar* (19 ) 7  
Dom L R 67 89 I C 569 (5) A B  
389 *Ya ay a v Bisari* (19 ) 43 Mad  
L J 5 9 69 I C 97 ( ) A M 5
- (2) *Khorri v Chhanga* (19 5) 47 All 44 49 8  
1 C 1030 (2) A A 18
- (3) See Limitation Act Sch I Art 1<sup>st</sup> cl 4  
and *Imchand v J v Mal* (19 ) 0  
All L J 640 641 I C 109 ( ) A A
- (4) *Umardand v Bis du* (1897) 1 Cal. 759  
*Muni v v Munia* (1899) 2 Mad  
93 *As bib v Ahm I Hussain* (1908)  
30 All 90
- (5) *Bapu v Jay* (189 ) 1 Hon 548 *Sara I v*  
*Ilam d* (19 0) 4 R 34 93 I C  
99 ( ) A B 5
- (6) *Muhammad v Muhammad* (1899) 11 All.  
67 *G Jad'a v Kusa* (191 ) 39 All.

- 611 4 I C 93 *Eris Nara n v Tejpal*  
(1910) 3 All 29 3 I A 0 61 I C  
669 *St vial v Jumakial* (1894) 18 Bom  
4 *Uchurayya gar v S Shanmyangar*  
(189 ) 18 Mad 14 *Chettyr F rm v*  
*Aslam Gy* (19 0) 7 Ran 85 117 I C  
58 ( ) A A 159
- (7) *I c n Regis th* (19 6) 48 All. 1  
9 I C 64 ( ) A A 304
- (8) *Mist D oki v Jurala f usaa* (19 5) 50 All.  
604 104 I C 564 ( ) A A 69
- (9) *Khuda f ak h v Allah Ditta* (19 0) 2 Lah.  
34 58 I C 60
- (10) *Nal alshya v Masfukha* (1901) 23 Cal.  
17 *Surtia v Ganga* (188 ) 7 All 8 5  
*Ilam v Shoo Fra ad* (189 ) 13 All 11  
*Ja Shri Lakuba v As sangi* (190  
31 Bom 44
- (11) *Manathan v F manathan* (1901) 1 Mad  
646

Where a case is one of accidental slip within the meaning of this section but the Court which passed the decree refuses to amend it on the ground that the case does not fall under this section the refusal amounts to a failure to exercise a jurisdiction vested in the Court within the meaning of s 115 and the High Court has power to interfere in revision (d). Similarly where the lower Court amends a decree in a case in which according to its own view the amendment should be refused stating as a reason for the amendment that it was bound under this section to bring the decree into conformity with the judgment the High Court is entitled to interfere in revision under s 115 (e) of the Code (e).

**Amendment when to be refused**—Where the order as drawn up represents the real decision of the Court the Court has no jurisdiction to rehear or alter it (f).

Even when the order has been obtained by fraud the Court has no jurisdiction to rehear it. If such a jurisdiction existed it would be most mischievous (g).

**Consent decree**—Where a decree found on a compromise does not embody the true terms of the compromise the only remedy is by an independent suit to set aside the decree either on the ground of mistake or fraud or some other ground *ejusdem generis* with it (h). See note to s 96. Procedure for setting aside consent decrees.

**Successive applications for amendment**—*Res judicata*—See notes to s 11. Applications for amendment of decree on p 79 above.

**Code of 1882 s 206**—The third paragraph of s 206 of the Code of 1882 ran as follows—

If the decree is found to be at variance with the judgment or if any clerical or arithmetical error be found in the decree the Court shall of its own motion or on that of any of the parties amend the decree so as to bring it into conformity with the judgment or to correct such error. Provided that reasonable notice has been given to the parties or their pleaders of the proposed amendment.

The above paragraph enabled the Court to amend its decree in the following two cases namely—

- (1) Where the decree was at variance with the judgment and
- (2) Where any clerical or arithmetical error was found in the decree.

The present section corresponds with the second part of the above paragraph. The first part of the paragraph which empowers the Court to amend its decree so as to bring it into conformity with the judgment has been omitted. An application to amend a decree so as to bring it into conformity with the judgment must now be made to the Court in the exercise of its *inherent power*. This power has been saved by s 151.

**Appeal**—No appeal lies from an order directing an amendment either under the Code (s) or under the Charter (j). In a case however where the whole method of calculation adopted by the first Court was challenged in the plaintiff's application which purported to be an application under s 152 and the first Court allowed the amendment it was held that the order allowing the amendment must be regarded as one made under O 47 and that the order was therefore appealable (k).

It has been held by the High Court of Madras that though no appeal lies from an order of amendment an appeal would lie from the *amended decree* (l).

- (d) *Salad v Deo Dutt* (1915) 37 All. 373 9  
1 C 50  
(e) *Pitamb Lal v Balwant Singh* (19-5) 23 All.  
L J 518 88 1 C 396 (5) A.A. 5 6  
(f) *Pratt v B. H. C. v William Allsup and*  
*Co* (189) 1 Ch. 141  
(g) (193) 1 Ch. 141 143 *supra*  
(h) *Tom Lag v Ram Burch* (1919) 4 Pat. L.  
J. 55 50 1 C 49

- (i) *Val nak Bys v M fak har* (1900) 29 Cal.  
17 *Naras nas mi v Natesa* (1897) 19  
Mad 4 4 5  
(j) *Muhammad v Ihsan-ullah Khan* (1897) 14  
All. 26  
(k) *Rams v Gai* (1901) 3 Lab. L. J 341 68  
1 C. 997 (1) A. L. 20  
(l) *Iskandari v Jamanathan* (1901) 4 Mad  
646

## 153 [New R S C, O 28 r 12] The Court may at

any time, and on such terms as to costs or otherwise as it may think fit, amend any defect or error in any proceeding in a suit, and all necessary amendments shall be made for the purpose of determining the real question or issue raised by or depending on such proceeding

**General power to amend**  
R S C O 28 r 12—This section is new. It is taken from the Rules of the Supreme Court O 29 r 12. The words "in a suit" after the word "proceeding" do not occur in the English rule.

**Scope of the section**—O 6 r 17 is confined to amendments of pleadings and s 152 to correcting errors in judgments decrees or orders. The present section confers a general power on the Court to amend defects and errors in any proceeding in a suit and to make all necessary amendments for the purpose of determining the real question at issue between the parties to the suit. This power is vested in the original as well as the appellate Court (m). In *Australian Steam Navigation Co v Smith and Sons* (n) their Lordships of the Privy Council said: "Their Lordships are strong advocates for amendment whenever it can be done without injustice to the other side and even where they have been put to certain expense and delay yet if they can be compensated for that in any way it seems to their Lordships that an amendment ought to be allowed for the purpose of raising the real question between the parties."

**Any proceeding in a suit**—The following are some of the cases under the corresponding English rule and the present rule—

**Answers to interrogatories**—Where it was admitted by the defendant a solicitor in answer to interrogatories that his partner had paid into the banking account of the firm money received by the latter for investment the defendant was allowed to amend the answer it being shown that the admission had been made by mistake (o). In another case where the defendant charged the plaintiff (his manager) with misconduct and the plaintiff exhibited interrogatories of which the substance was to ask the defendant to specify the acts of misconduct on which he relied it was said by Tiesiger L.J. that if the defendant answered the interrogatories and it was subsequently discovered by him that there were other acts of misconduct on which he could rely there was nothing to prevent his being allowed to amend his answers to the interrogatories (p). See also to interrogatories O 11 rr 1-11 below.

**Particulars**—An application to amend particulars if made a reasonable time before the trial will generally be allowed on terms (q). But leave to amend particulars when it is applied for at the trial will as a rule be refused (r).

**Notice of motion**—A notice of motion in an action for the rescission of an agreement for the sale of land was allowed to be amended at the hearing by asking for the appointment of a receiver (s).

**Title of appeal**—If an appeal is presented against a person who is dead at the date of presentation the Court may under this section permit the title of the appeal to be amended (t).

( ) *Mukunda L v Joy Sh Chandra* (1916) 1 P & L J 393 397 35 I C 30  
( ) (1889) 14 App Cas 319 320  
(e) *Hill v Ertio* [189] 3 Ch 26  
(p) *Sunder v Jones* (18 ) C D 435 45

(e) *Bank of Prudential Co v Gurnett* (189 ) Q B 145  
(r) *Moss v Madge* (1886) 33 Ch D 603  
( ) *Cook v Anderson* (1897) 1 Ch 66  
(t) *Gopal Lal Ahnana F o* (1906) 49 Mad 80  
( ) 5 A M 1

**154** [S 3, third para] Nothing in this Code shall affect any present right of appeal which shall have accrued to any party at its commencement

Saving of present right of appeal

Any present right of appeal —There is a conflict of decisions as to the meaning of the words any *pre ent* right of appeal which occur in this section According to the Chief Court of the Punjab the words any present right of appeal refer to a right which had actually come into existence at the commencement of this Code by virtue of the decree or order sought to be appealed from having been passed before this Code came into force (u) According to the Madras High Court those words refer to a right which had become vested in a litigant before this Code came into force (v) Thus there are cases in which a second appeal lay under the old Code from certain orders made in execution (the orders being treated as decrees) while no such appeal lies under the present Code According to the Chief Court of the Punjab no second appeal would lie in such a case from the order made in first appeal unless the *latter order was made* while the old Code was in force According to the Madras High Court a second appeal would lie if the *first appeal* from the order made by the Court of first instance was preferred when the old Code was in force though the order made in first appeal was not made until after the new Code came into force (t) Similarly there are cases in which an appeal was allowed from certain orders under the old Code from which no appeal is allowed under the pre ent Code According to the Chief Court of the Punjab no appeal would lie from the order in such a case unless the *order was made* when the old Code was in force (x) According to the Madras High Court it would seem that an appeal would lie if the *suit* in which the order was made was instituted when the old Code was in force See s 96 sub s (3) and ss 97 and 104 See also notes to s 1

**155** [New] The enactments mentioned in the Fourth Schedule are hereby amended to the extent specified in the fourth column thereof

Amendment of certain Acts

**156** [S 3, first sentence] *The enactments mentioned in the Fifth Schedule are hereby repealed to the extent specified in the fourth column thereof*

Repeals

This section and the Fifth Schedule to the Code have been repealed by the Second Repealing and Amending Act 17 of 1914 s 3

**157** [S 3, second sentence] Notifications published, declarations and rules made, places appointed, agreements filed, scales prescribed, forms framed appointments made and powers conferred under Act VIII of 1859 or under any Code of Civil Procedure or any Act amending the same or under any other enactment hereby repealed shall

Continuance of orders and repealed enactments

(u) *Gula Mal v. Jandutta* (1913) Punj. Rec. no 1 p 1 15 1 C 5  
(v) *Kalaga v. N. Simha* (1911) 1 Mad. L.J. 631 9 1 C 937

(w) (1911) 1 Mad. L.J. 631 9 1 C 93 *supra*  
(x) (1913) Punj. Rec. no 1 p 1 15 1 C 5 *supra*

so far as they are consistent with this Code, have the same force and effect as if they had been respectively published, made, appointed, filed prescribed, framed and conferred under this Code and by the authority empowered thereby in such behalf

**158** [S 3 second para] In every enactment or notification passed or issued before the commencement of this Code in which reference is made to or to any Chapter or section of Act VIII of 1859 or any Code of Civil Procedure or any Act amending the same or any other enactment hereby repealed such reference shall so far as may be practicable, be taken to be made to this Code or to its corresponding Part, Order, section or rule

Reference to Code of Civil  
Procedure and their repeal  
ed enactment

---



# THE FIRST SCHEDULE

## ORDER I

### *Parties to Suits*

1 [S 26, R S C, O 16, r 1] All persons may be joined in one suit as plaintiffs in whom any right to relief in respect of or arising out of the same act or transaction or series of acts or transactions is alleged to exist, whether jointly, severally or in the alternative, where, if such persons brought separate suits any common question of law or fact would arise

Who may be joined as plaintiffs

**Scope of the Order**—This order deals with joinder of parties and to a certain extent with joinder of causes of action (y) O 2 r 3 deals exclusively with joinder of causes of action Rule 4 of this Order is to be read with rule 1

**General rules**—Before considering the present rule it may be as well to note the general rules relating to the joinder of parties and of causes of action According to the Code the essentials of a suit are—(1) opposing parties (2) a subject in dispute (3) a cause of action and (4) a demand of relief (z) [see O 7 r 1] All these essentials must concur in every suit properly framed Order 1 deals with the joinder of parties Order 2 deals with the frame of suits In framing a suit the following three kinds of misjoinder must be guarded against —

(i) *Misjoinder of plaintiffs*—Where there are more plaintiffs than one the provisions of the present rule apply This rule relates to the joinder of plaintiffs It provides in effect that two or more persons may be joined as plaintiffs in one suit if the right to relief alleged to exist in each plaintiff arises from the same act or transaction and there is a common question of law or of fact If not they cannot be joined as plaintiffs in one suit and they must bring separate suits If two or more persons are joined as plaintiff in one suit in a case not covered by O 1 r 1 the result is a misjoinder of plaintiffs The objection on the ground of misjoinder of plaintiffs shall be taken at the earliest possible opportunity if not it will be deemed to have been waived [O 1 r 13] Where such objection is taken and the Court finds that it is well founded the Court should not dismiss the suit [O 1 r 9] but the plaintiff may be amended [O 6 r 17] by striking out the names of such persons as have been improperly joined as plaintiffs [O 1 r 10 sub r (7)] and the suit may then be proceeded with [O 1 r 9] In other words an objection on the ground of misjoinder of plaintiff is not fatal to the suit (a)

(ii) *Misjoinder of defendants*—Where there are more defendants than one the provisions of rule 3 of this Order apply That rule relates to the joinder of defendants It provides in effect that two or more persons may be joined as defendants in one suit if the right to relief alleged to exist against each of them arises from the same act or transaction and there is a common question of law or of fact If not they cannot be joined as

(y) *Bullock v. London General Omnibus Co* (1907) 1 K. B. 68 — *Compagnie la Sûr et end v. Ho Li I others & Co* [1910] K. B. 354 365 36 *Harindra v. A v Ima Chand &* (1935) 55 Cal 184 192 1 C

5 (23) A C 103

( ) *Krishnappa v. Shicappa* (1907) 31 Bom 393 395

( ) *Jasokth v. Famr* (1897) 4 Cal 649

defendants in *one* *suit* and *separate suits* must be brought against them. If two or more persons are joined as defendants in one suit in a case not covered by O 1 r 3 the result is a *misjoinder of defendants*. As in the case of plaintiffs so in the case of defendants the objection on the ground of misjoinder should be taken at the earliest possible opportunity; if not it will be deemed to have been waived (O 1 r 13). Where such objection is taken and the Court finds that it is well founded the Court should not dismiss the suit (O 1 r 9) but the plaint may be amended (O 6 r 17) by striking out the names of such persons as have not been properly joined as defendant [O 1 r 10 sub r (2)] and the suit may then be proceeded with (O 1 r 9). In other words an objection on the ground of misjoinder of defendants is not fatal to the suit.

(iii) *Misjoinder of causes of action*—As to the meaning of cause of action see notes to O 20 under the head Cause of action. A misjoinder of causes of action may be coupled with a misjoinder of plaintiffs or it may be coupled with a misjoinder of defendant. There may again be a misjoinder of claim founded on several causes of action. Accordingly this subject may be considered under the following three heads:—

(a) *Misjoinder of plaintiffs and causes of action*—Where in a suit there are *two or more plaintiffs* and *two or more causes of action* the plaintiffs should be *jointly interested* in all the causes of action. If the plaintiffs are not *jointly interested* in all the causes of action the case is one of *misjoinder of plaintiffs and causes of action*. O 2 r 3 read with O 1 r 1 forbids such a misjoinder. The objection on the ground of misjoinder of plaintiffs and causes of action should be taken at the earliest possible opportunity (O 2 r 1). As to the procedure to be followed in the case of misjoinder of plaintiffs and causes of action see notes to O 2 r 3. Procedure in case of misjoinder of plaintiff and causes of action. See also s 99 above.

(b) *Misjoinder of defendants and causes of action* *Multifariousness*—Where in a suit there are *two or more defendants* and *two or more causes of action* the suit will be bad for misjoinder of defendants and causes of action if different causes of action are joined against different defendants separately (O 2 r 3 and O 1 r 3). Such a misjoinder is technically called *multifariousness*. The objection on the ground of multifariousness should be taken at the earliest possible opportunity (O 2 r 7). As to the procedure to be followed in the case of multifariousness see notes to O 2 r 3. Procedure in case of multifariousness. See also s 99 above.

(c) *Misjoinder of claims founded on several causes of action*—See O 2 rr 4 5

*Non joinder of parties*—Where a person who is a necessary party to a suit is not joined as a party to the suit the case is one of *non joinder*. A suit should not be dismissed on the ground of non joinder (b). The objection for non joinder should be taken before the first hearing (O 1 r 13) and the plaint may be amended by adding the omitted party either as plaintiff or as defendant bearing in mind that no person can be added as a *plaintiff* though he may be added as a defendant without his consent (b). See notes to O 1 rr 9 and 13.

*Relation of this rule to O 2 r 3*—O 2 r 3 is to be read subject to the provisions of this rule (c).

*Changes effected in the law*—Before considering O 1 r 1 in detail it should be noted that under the corresponding s 20 of the Code of 1882 all persons could be joined in one suit as plaintiffs provided that the right to relief alleged to exist in each plaintiff arose from the *same cause of action*. The present rule is much wider. It is a

(b) *M. Phabala v. Kunha* a (1898) 21 Mad 33 | (c) *Pamendra Nath v. Brajendra Nath* (1914) 45 Cal 111 41 LC 914

production almost verbatim of O 16 r 1 of the English rules. It enables several plaintiffs though they have *separate causes of action* to join in one suit if—

- (1) the right to relief alleged to exist in each plaintiff arises out of the *same act or transaction* and
- (2) there is a *common question of law or fact*

The expression *act or transaction* used in this rule is more comprehensive than the expression *cause of action* used in the old section for the same act or transaction may give rise to different causes of action as when several persons are injured by the same act of negligence on the part of a railway company. Under the old section such persons could not join as plaintiffs in one suit the *causes of action being different*. Under the present rule it seems they can as the right to relief arises out of the *same act*.

The old section—The corresponding s. 26 of the Code of 1882 was as follows—

All persons may be joined as plaintiffs in whom the right to any relief claimed is alleged to exist whether jointly severally or in the alternative *in respect of the same cause of action*.

The decisions on the meaning of *cause of action* in the old section were not uniform. In some cases it was held that the expression *cause of action* meant facts constituting the infringement of a right *plus* facts constituting the right itself (*d*) while in others it was held that it referred to facts constituting the *infringement of the right* but not necessarily all of those *constituting the right* (*e*).

The following are some of the cases decided under the old section. It was held in those cases that the plaintiffs could not all join in one suit and that they should bring separate suits. Under the present rule it is submitted the plaintiffs may in each one of the following cases all join in one suit—

1. In *Idridge v Barrow* (*f*) the defendant the editor and proprietor of a news paper published articles which referred to the Calcutta Police without naming individuals. The plaintiffs six of the members of the Calcutta Police Force jointly sued the editor for damages alleging that the articles were directed against them and that they constituted a libel. Here the libel was in the same words and in the same documents but of different persons. It was held that the plaintiffs could not all be joined in one suit. The Court said: "It is true that the injury may have been caused by *one act* of the defendant as for instance in the case of a railway accident causing injury to several passengers or as is here alleged, of a collective libel on several individuals. The cause of action of the persons injured will none the less remain separate and distinct. There cannot in such cases be said to be *one or the same cause of action*."

2. In *Fajjo Kuar v Debi Dial* (*g*) several creditors to each of whom separate debts were owing by the same debtor jointly sued the debtor to avoid a deed of gift executed by the debtor in favour of his daughter on the ground that it was made fraudulently with intent to defeat their claims. The Court held that they could not join as plaintiffs in one suit on the ground that the causes of action were *separate and distinct*. Such a suit could now be properly brought by one or more creditors on behalf of themselves and others under O 1 r 8.

- (d) *Serica ji v Gordon* (188) 6 Lam 466  
 775 *I ma ija v Deyanajaka* (1885) 8  
 Mal 361, *Li gammal v I nkala am i*  
 (1893) 6 Mad 39 *Bu ma B bi v Sheti*  
*Mah mma i* (1896) 18 All 131 *Fahim*  
*Haksh v Am an Dibi* (1896) 18 All 119  
*I njo Kuar v Debi D S* (190) 18 All 43  
 ( ) *Haramo i v Har Ch r* (1895) Cal

- 533 839 *Alldridge v Barrow* (190) 31  
 Cal 66 664 *F k rapa v I uir pa (I r)*  
 16 Bom 119 *I a njal v I andat* (190)  
 6 L-081 9 6 *I napai v I nnapet*  
 (1903) 26 Mad 64 647  
 (f) (190) 31 Cal 66  
 (g) (1896) 18 All 43

3 In *Parajal v Rimdat* (h) A and B were assaulted by C at an interview in C's house. A and B jointly sued C for damages for assault. It was held that the assaults on A and that on B constituted *two distinct causes of action* and the suit was therefore bad for misjoinder of plaintiffs. The Court said: "We may go further and say that as the blows on each plaintiff were inflicted at the same time and place and must be proved by the same evidence it would be more convenient if the law permitted the trial of the two suits together than that it should be necessary to try them separately. But this is a matter for the consideration of the Legislature."

4 In *Ali Serang v Beadon* (i) thirteen firemen who were engaged on board a steamer were all arrested under one warrant on a charge of desertion and they were all tried together and sentenced to one month's imprisonment. The term of imprisonment expired on 5th May but they were not released on that date. Thereupon all the thirteen brought a suit against the superintendent of the jail for damages for wrongful detention. It was held that the causes of action were *distinct and separate* and could not be joined in one suit.

5 In *Ramanuja v Deivanayala* (j) several trustees of a temple were removed from the office of trustees by the District Temple Committee. A suit by the trustees for a declaration that their removal was without just cause was held to be bad for misjoinder on the ground that the dismissal of each trustee gave rise to a *distinct cause of action*.

**The new Rule**—In all the cases cited above it was held that the plaintiffs having *distinct causes of action* they could not join in one suit and that the proper course for them was to bring separate suits. The present rule covers such cases and allows the plaintiffs to join in one suit (k). Under the present rule several persons may join as plaintiffs in one suit though their causes of action be *separate and distinct* provided that—

- (1) the right to relief alleged to exist in them arises out of the *same act or transaction or series of acts or transactions* and
- (2) the case is of such a character that if such persons brought separate suits any *common question of law or fact* would arise.

Both these conditions must be fulfilled to enable two or more persons to join as plaintiffs in one suit. The two conditions are *not alternative* (l).

#### Illustrations

(1) A publishes a series of books under the title of "The Oxford and Cambridge Publications" so as to induce the belief that the books are publications of the Oxford and Cambridge Universities or either of them. The two Universities may join as plaintiffs in one suit to restrain A from using the title because the publication and the belief induced are *common questions of fact* arising out of the *same series of transactions* (m).

(2) A, a shareholder in a company, sues B, C and D, the directors, to recover damages on his own behalf for fraudulently inducing him to purchase shares by declaring an illegal dividend, and he joins in the same suit a claim on behalf of himself and all other shareholders (see r 8 below) for repayment by the defendants to the company of the amount of the dividend paid out by them. A is not entitled to join both causes of action in one suit because the right to relief claimed in his personal capacity and the right to relief claimed by him as representing the shareholders *do not arise out of the same transaction or series of transactions* (n).

(A) (1901) 8 Bom. 59

(G) (1885) 11 Cal. 54

(H) (1885) 8 M. 1301

(I) *H. v. Ali v. Nath v. Purna Chandra* (1935) 55 Cal. 184, 109 J. C. 5 (1935) A. C. 109

(J) *Q. v. L. v. L. v. L.* [1894] 2 Q. B. 415, 54

(K) *The U. v. L. v. L. v. L.* [1899] 1 Ch. 55

(L) *Q. v. L. v. L.* [1894] 2 Q. B. 41

(3) Four persons each of whom separately took debentures on the faith of certain statements in a prospectus issued by the directors of a company joined as co plaintiffs in one suit against the directors claiming damages for misrepresentations contained in the prospectus. *Held* that as the several causes of action arose out of the same transaction and the case would involve common questions of fact the suit was properly framed (o)

(4) In a suit instituted by A B and C jointly for an injunction against D E and F it is alleged that all three defendants as officers of several associations of workmen conspired to prevent all persons not belonging to the associations from obtaining employment in place of the members of the associations. To constitute the overt acts alleged to have been committed in furtherance of the conspiracy it is averred that D F and F caused A B and C to be molested that E used threatening language to A and that F assaulted C. It is proved that D was not a party to the conspiracy. As the claim arises out of the same series of transactions and involves the common question of fact and law whether the overt acts were committed in furtherance of the conspiracy A B and C may join in the suit notwithstanding that an injunction is granted against E and F only (p). See r 4 (a) below.

The illustrations given above are all English cases decided under the new English rule 1 of Order 16. That rule came into operation on the 26th of October 1896. The present rule is in the main a reproduction of the English rule. The old English rule corresponded with s 26 of the Code of 1880 except that the words "in respect of the same cause of action" did not occur in that rule. But though the words did not occur in that rule it was held that two or more persons could not join as plaintiffs in one suit unless the cause of action was the same. Thus in *Smurthwaite v Hannay* (q) it was held by the House of Lords that several shippers of different shipments of cotton on the same ship for the same voyage could not jointly sue the shipowner for damages for short delivery the causes of action being distinct and separate. For the same reason it was held that persons injured by the same act of negligence could not join in one action as plaintiffs for damages against the wrong doer (r). But since the test under the new English rule as well as the present Indian rule is no longer the identity of the cause of action but the identity of the act or transaction such a joinder of plaintiffs would now be perfectly legitimate both in England and India (s). In *Thomas v Moore* (t) Pickford J J said "Whatever the law may have been at the time when *Smurthwaite v Hannay* was decided joinder of parties and joinder of causes of action are discretionary in this sense that if they are joined, there is no absolute right to have them struck out but it is discretionary in the Court to do so if it thinks right."

**Plaintiffs having different interests**—Under the old section there was a conflict of decisions as to whether where the plaintiffs were entitled to different interests in a property they could join in one suit to recover possession of the property from a third party if the ground on which the relief was claimed was common to all the plaintiffs. According to the Allahabad decisions they could not (u) according to the Madras and Calcutta decisions they could (v). Under the present rule there is no doubt that such persons may be joined in one suit as plaintiffs.

(o) *Drinogbier v Wood* [1899] 1 Ch 393 and *re Frankenburg & Co v Mosses & Co* [1900] 1 Q B 304.

(p) *Waters v Goss* [1899] Ch 696.

(q) [1891] A C 494.

(r) *London & North Western Ry Co v Ingham* [1895] A C 661. *Carl v Fagan* [1906] Q B 113 (action by representatives of fifty miners drowned by the flooding of a mine).

(s) *Mohd & Co v Knight Stevedoring Co* [1910] 1 K B 107, 113.

(t) [1919] 1 K B 535. *Pay v B. B. & T. Co* [1911] 1 K B 141.

(u) *Sulman v. S. S. & S. S. Muhammad* (1906) 19 All 131. *Islam v. B. B. & T. Co* [1906] 19 All 219.

(v) *Muthu Jeyar Chockalingam* (1896) 19 M J 335. *S. S. & S. S. Muhammad* (1906) 19 M J 33 Cal 36.

*Illustration*

*A* succeeds to *B*'s estate by inheritance and assigns a portion thereof to *C*. *D* is in possession of the estate and disputes *A*'s right of succession to it. *A* and *C* may under the present rule jointly sue *D* for recovery of possession of the portions of the estate to which they are entitled as their claims in respect thereof are based on a common ground. It does not matter that *A* claims by right of inheritance and *C* under an assignment from *A*. Both the conditions required by the rule are present in the case.

Further having regard to the comprehensive language of this rule plaintiffs may sue in a double capacity if the conditions prescribed by this rule are complied with. Thus where plaintiffs were trustees of a house part of which was let out by them and the rest occupied by them as tenants and they sued both as trustees and tenants for an injunction to restrain the defendant from committing a nuisance it was held that there was no objection to their suing as trustees to protect the reversion and as tenants to enjoy the property free from the nuisance (x). See notes below. Jointly

**Any right to relief** —The words any right to relief are wider than the words the right to any relief which occurred in the old section (x).

**Severally** —Where a right to relief in respect of the same act or transaction is alleged to exist in two or more persons severally they may join as plaintiffs in one suit or they may at their option bring separate suits. The rule does not necessitate one suit. A Hindu priest raises a masonry structure upon a certain platform round a sacred tree on which every member of the community has an individual right to perform religious rite. Here every member of the community has individually a cause of action and any one member may therefore sue the priest for the removal of the structure. But it is not necessary that all the members should join as plaintiffs in one suit. They may so join if they choose but the law does not say that they should all so join (y). The same rule applies when two or more persons are entitled to the same relief in the alternative see notes below under the head in the alternative. The rule however is different when two or more persons are jointly entitled to the same relief in respect of a transaction.

**Jointly** —Where two or more persons are jointly entitled to the same relief in respect of a transaction they must all join as plaintiffs in one suit. Thus if *A*, *B* and *C* are joint owners of a property they must all be joined as plaintiffs in a suit to recover the property (z). So in a suit to recover joint family property all the members of the joint family must as a general rule be joined as plaintiffs (a). In a suit to recover trust property all the trustees must join as plaintiffs (b). In a suit to recover the estate of a deceased person all the executors who have proved the will of the deceased must be joined as plaintiffs (c). If any one of them does not consent to join as plaintiff he may be joined as a defendant [r 10 sub r (2)]. The proper course is first to ask him to join as plaintiff and if he refuses to join him as defendant. But the suit should not be dismissed merely because he is joined as defendant without being first called upon to join as plaintiff (d).

A Hindu dies leaving a widow, an adopted son and a separate brother. A dispute arises between the widow and the adopted son on the one hand and the brother on the other as regards certain lands. The widow and the adopted son allege that the lands form part of the estate of the deceased. The brother, on the other hand, alleges that the

(w) *I. Rishi v. P. P. v. P. P.* (1916) 40 Bom 401, 408, 33 I L R 19.

(z) See *Hanay & C. v. S. Rishi* (1903) 2 Q B 41, 130, 1 Qor v. I. v. v. (1896) 1 Q B D 65, 63.

(y) *P. v. P. v. P. v. P.* (1891) 3 M L R 38.

(c) *A. v. A. v. A. v. A.* (1891) 3 M L R 38.

(d) *Collector of M. v. P. v. P.* (1890) 3 Cal 45.

(b) *S. v. S. v. S.* (1922) 4 Mad L J 133, 81 C 645 (1923) A M 31.

(c) *M. v. M. v. M.* (1923) 44 Mad L J 49, 21 C 63 (1923) A M 33.

(d) *P. v. P. v. P.* (1901) 6 C L 409, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677, 678, 679, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 696, 697, 698, 699, 700, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 747, 748, 749, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 767, 768, 769, 770, 771, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 784, 785, 786, 787, 788, 789, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 798, 799, 800, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 809, 810, 811, 812, 813, 814, 815, 816, 817, 818, 819, 820, 821, 822, 823, 824, 825, 826, 827, 828, 829, 830, 831, 832, 833, 834, 835, 836, 837, 838, 839, 840, 841, 842, 843, 844, 845, 846, 847, 848, 849, 850, 851, 852, 853, 854, 855, 856, 857, 858, 859, 860, 861, 862, 863, 864, 865, 866, 867, 868, 869, 870, 871, 872, 873, 874, 875, 876, 877, 878, 879, 880, 881, 882, 883, 884, 885, 886, 887, 888, 889, 890, 891, 892, 893, 894, 895, 896, 897, 898, 899, 900, 901, 902, 903, 904, 905, 906, 907, 908, 909, 910, 911, 912, 913, 914, 915, 916, 917, 918, 919, 920, 921, 922, 923, 924, 925, 926, 927, 928, 929, 930, 931, 932, 933, 934, 935, 936, 937, 938, 939, 940, 941, 942, 943, 944, 945, 946, 947, 948, 949, 950, 951, 952, 953, 954, 955, 956, 957, 958, 959, 960, 961, 962, 963, 964, 965, 966, 967, 968, 969, 970, 971, 972, 973, 974, 975, 976, 977, 978, 979, 980, 981, 982, 983, 984, 985, 986, 987, 988, 989, 990, 991, 992, 993, 994, 995, 996, 997, 998, 999, 1000.

lands belong to him *If the widow does not dispute the adoption* a suit may be brought by her and the adopted son as *co plaintiffs* against the brother to recover the property from him for the plaintiffs are *jointly* interested in disproving the defendant's title (e) But what *if the adoption is not admitted by the widow* and she asks the Court to decide the question of adoption *as between her and the adopted son* and prays that if the adoption is proved the property may be delivered to the adopted son or if not proved to herself? In such a case it has been held by the High Court of Madras that a suit by the widow and the adopted son as *co plaintiffs* to recover the property from the brother is defective on the ground of *misjoinder of plaintiffs* for the plaintiffs having *antagonistic claims* it cannot be said that the right to relief exists *jointly* in them (f)

In the alternative —If in the case put above the adoption is disputed not by the widow but by the brother a suit may be brought by the widow and the adopted son as *co plaintiffs* against the brother claiming *in the alternative* to recover the property from the widow if the adoption is not valid or for the adopted son if the adoption is valid (g) Here there is no misjoinder of plaintiffs for the validity of the adoption is not disputed by the *co plaintiff* as in the preceding case but by the *defendant* See O 1 r 4 (a) below

Plaintiff transferred to category of defendants —See notes to O 1 r 10 under the same head

Appeal —See notes to O 1 r 3 Appeal

**2** [Aen R S C, O 16, r 1] Where it appears to the Court that any joinder of plaintiffs may embarrass or delay the trial of the suit, the Court may put the plaintiffs to their election or order separate trials or make such other order as may be expedient

Power of Court to order separate trials

This rule refers to a suit brought by several plaintiffs in respect of the same act or transaction but the causes of action are so distinct that it is not convenient to dispose of them at one trial (h) The Court may put the plaintiffs to their election as to which of them will proceed with the suit or may order separate trials or may make such other order as may be expedient A suit by several creditors joining as *co plaintiffs* in a creditor's action or a suit by several market gardeners claiming certain preferential rights as to stands in the market is not a suit where the joinder could embarrass or delay the trial (i) Where plaintiff sued for possession of several properties some in his personal capacity and some as shebait of an idol the Calcutta High Court ordered the plaint to be treated as comprising two suits (j)

**3** [S 28, Cf R S C O 16 r 4] All persons may be joined as defendants against whom any right to relief in respect of or arising out of the same act or transaction or series of

Who may be joined as defendants

- (e) *Pallapa v Firdapa* (189) 16 Bom 119  
*Vingaua v R m pa* (1904) 18 Bom 94  
 (f) *L. gammal v Venkatammal* (1883) 6 Mad 233  
*Ba j Vath v Chhasea o* (1904) 26 All 118  
 (g) *ee l napal v Pinapala* (1903) 16 Mad 64  
*Haramoni Dass v Hari Churn* (189) — Cal 833  
*Lakshmakka v Nagi* (190) — 3 Mad 500  
*Pukman D rti Si b Dera* (1916) Punj Rec no

- 10 p 34 I C 641  
*Relappa v Ch dambara* (19) 43 Mad L J 77  
 O I C 684 (2) A M 174  
 (h) See for an example *Arnison v Smith* (1839) 41 C D 93 10<sup>th</sup> per Lindley L J  
*Arnison v Smith* (1860) 41 C D 349  
 (i) *B dford v Ellis* (1901) A C 1 1<sup>o</sup>  
 (j) *H end a v Fur a* (19 8) 55 Cal 164 109  
 I C 755 (8) A C 199

acts or transactions is alleged to exist, whether jointly, severally or in the alternative, where if separate suits were brought against such persons any common question of law or fact would arise

**Misjoinder of defendants**—This rule is the converse of rule 1. It deals with joinder of defendants. See notes to O 1 r 1. Misjoinder of defendants. Rule 4 of this Order is to be read with this rule.

**Relation of this rule to O 2 r 3**—O 2 r 3 is to be read subject to the provisions of this rule (k).

**Jurisdiction**—This rule contains a provision as to joinder of parties. It assumes the existence of a suit in a proper forum, the Court having jurisdiction to try the suit. If the Court has such jurisdiction then this rule may come into play. Hence if in a suit brought against two defendants A and B the Court has jurisdiction against A but none against B this rule does not confer jurisdiction upon the Court to try the suit against B *altogether* merely because the conditions of this rule are satisfied (l).

**The old section**—The corresponding s 98 of the Code of 1882 ran as follows—

All persons may be joined as defendants against whom the right to any relief is alleged to exist whether jointly, severally or in the alternative in respect of the same matter.

In some cases under that section it was said that the expression same matter was equivalent to same cause of action, in others that it was equivalent to same act or transaction.

**New Rule**—Under the present rule all persons may be joined as defendants against whom any right to relief in respect of the same act or transaction is alleged to exist where if separate suits were brought against such persons any common question of law or fact would arise. A plaintiff is entitled under this rule to join several defendants in respect of several and distinct causes of action subject to the discretion of the Court to strike out one or more of the defendants on the analogy of O 1 r 2 if it thinks it right to do so (m). Whatever the law may have been at the time when *Smurthwaite v Hannay* (n) was decided joinder of parties and joinders of causes of action are discretionary in this sense that if they are joined there is no absolute right to have them struck out but it is discretionary in the Court to do so if it thinks right (o). As a general rule where claims against different parties involve or may involve a common question of fact bearing sufficient importance in proportion to the rest of the action to render it desirable that the whole of the matters be disposed of at the same time the Court will allow the joinder of defendants subject to its discretion as to how the action should be tried (p) [see ill (3) below]. See notes to O 2 r 3. Joinder of defendants and causes of action.

### Illustrations

1. A riding in an omnibus belonging to B is injured by a collision between the omnibus and a cart belonging to C. A sues B and C for damages for personal injury charging the defendants jointly with joint negligence and alternatively charging separate negligence against each defendant. The suit is not bad for misjoinder of defendant because the injury to the plaintiff arose from the same transaction or series of transactions.

(k) *Premises in the City of London v. The London & North Western Railway Co.* (1918) 45 Cal 111 43 I C 944

(l) *First National Bank v. North West Py. Co. v. Sada* (1919) 39 Cal 89 41 I C 99 (n) A C 90

(m) *London & North Western Ry. Co. v. The London & North Western Ry. Co.* (1911)

(n) *K. B. 1. Harindra Nath v. Purna Chand* (1905) 55 C 1 161 109 I C 7

(o) *A. C. 191*

(p) [1904] 4 C 494

(q) *Thomas v. Moore* [1918] 1 K B 55 63

(r) [1911] 1 K B 1 supra



and the case involves *common questions of fact* (g) It is otherwise if the injury arises from *distinct acts* as in the next illustration

2 A sued B for damage done to his house by B's negligence B denied negligence and alleged that the damage was caused by the negligence of C Thereupon A applied for an order to join C as defendant Held that the order could not be made Collin L J said When we analyse this case we find we are dealing with it upon the assumption that the *two acts* which were done the one by [B] and the other by [C] are entirely disconnected torts each of them a separate injury—if it be injury at all—*quite distinct one from the other* The one was done recently by [B] by excavation and the other at a much earlier date by [C a water company] by allowing water from its main to weaken the soil in front of the plaintiff's property *Thompson v London County Council* (r) *Sadler v Great Western Railway Company* (s) Referring to these two cases, Scrutton L J said in *Payne v British Time Recorder Co* (t) that neither of them would now be decided in the way they were In that case P entered into a contract with B Co to supply them with certain printed cards which should conform to certain specimens supplied to him by them In order to carry out that contract P entered into a contract with W Co to supply him with the cards and paid for them The cards were duly sent to B Co but B Co refused to accept them on the ground that they did not conform to the specimens P sued B Co and W Co claiming, as against B Co the price of the goods sold and in the alternative as against W Co damages for breach of contract in not supplying the cards in accordance with the specimens It was held that as there was a common question of fact to be tried namely whether the cards were in accordance with the specimens supplied the Court would in the exercise of its discretion allow the two defendants to be joined in one action

3 M mortgages certain property to A After A's death A claiming to be the adopted son of X sues M on the mortgage and a consent decree is passed in the suit Subsequently B alleging that she is the sister and heir of X sues A and M (1) for a declaration that the adoption of A was not validly made and (2) that the consent decree (to which she was not a party) is not binding on her Held by the High Court of Bombay that the suit is bad for misjoinder (u) This decision it is submitted, is wrong and it has been disented from by the Calcutta High Court (v)

4 The mere fact that the relief claimed against the several defendants *differs in detail* is no ground for objection that the suit is bad for misjoinder of defendants provided that the suit against the defendants is in respect of the *same act or transaction* A applies for shares in a Company on the faith of a prospectus The shares are allotted to him and he pays up Rs 5 000 thereon A then sues the Company and the directors alleging that the prospectus was false and calculated to mislead claiming as against the Company cancellation of the allotment to him of his shares and the return of Rs 5 000 with interest and as against the directors Rs 5 000 by way of damages Here the relief claimed against the Company is *rescission and repayment of the purchase money with interest* and that claimed against the directors is *damages* The fact that the relief claimed against the two sets of defendants *differs in detail* does not render the suit bad for misjoinder of defendants for the suit is in respect of *one transaction* namely the issue of a false and fraudulent prospectus In substance the shareholder has one grievance call it a cause of action or what you like and in substance he has *one complaint* and all the persons he sues have according to him been guilty of conduct which gives

(g) *Bullock v London General Omnibus Co* [1907] 1 K B 61 *Frankenburg v Cret Horde & Carrage Co* [1900] 1 Q B 504  
( ) [1889] 1 Q B 840  
(s) [189 ] 2 Q B 688 affirmed [1896] A C 40 (where two defendants had independently though simultaneously obstructed

the access to the plaintiff's house)  
(t) [1901] 1 K B 115  
(u) *Um Bai v Bhau Balwant* (1910) 34 Bom 358 31 C 165  
(v) *Pamendra Nath v Brajendra Nath* (1915) 45 Cal 111 134 13 41 C 944

him a right to relief in respect of *that one thing* which they have done namely the issuing of a prospectus. The remedy is different as against the several defendants but not so much in substance as in form (w) See r 5 below

5 A is an exporter of frozen meat. B is the owner of a line of steamers. By a contract between A and B B agrees to carry from Argentina to Europe frozen meat in steamers belonging to him or in other suitable steamers. It is subsequently agreed that frozen meat should be shipped by A on a steamer called the *Deion* procured by B and belonging to C. It is accordingly shipped on the *Deion* and the master of the *Deion* signs a bill of lading in respect of it and hands it to A. A sues B and C in respect of damage to the meat alleged to have been caused by the unseaworthiness of the *Deion* claiming against B on the terms of the before mentioned contract and against C upon the bill of lading. The suit is not bad for misjoinder of defendants (x)

6 A sues B, C, D, E and F for the recovery of certain documents of title and the goods covered thereby and in the alternative for damages. It is alleged in the plaint that the goods belonged to A that B obtained from A the documents of title relating thereto by fraud and made them over to C that C knowing that B had no title either to the documents or to the goods wrongfully dealt with them and sold the goods to D and E that D and F wrongfully claimed to retain the goods and the documents of title and, lastly that one of the documents of title namely a railway receipt was pledged by B to F though the goods covered by it were in the possession of D. The suit is not bad for misjoinder of defendants and causes of action (y). The foundation of the case on which the rest of it depends is the alleged fraud of B. If such fraud is proved the question is did the defendants who all claim under B obtain any title? If the plaintiff fails to prove fraud on the part of B the case fails against all the defendants. If he proves fraud it may be that the defendants may have a different answer by way of defence but that does not make the case any the less one of a common question of law and fact. The same act or transaction which concerns all the parties is the alleged fraud of B and this involves a common question of law or fact. All defendants have derived title from a person who is alleged to have obtained the goods by means of fraud. By reason of this the possession of all is alleged to be wrongful. Should it however be convenient the Court may (*Umabai v. Lalal* (1)) direct the successive trial of the issues separately affecting different defendants. The question of the alleged fraud of B touching all the defendants may be tried first. If it fails there is an end of the case (z).

No misjoinder where some reliefs merely ancillary.—Where the relief claimed against some of the defendants is merely ancillary to the relief claimed against others the suit is not bad for misjoinder provided the suit is not in respect of distinct causes of action. A and B are co-shrivers of certain lands in the occupation of C and D. A is entitled to two thirds of the lands and B to one third. A sues B, C and D claiming as against C and D that they may be ejected from his share of the lands and as against B that the lands may if necessary be partitioned between him and B. The suit is not bad for misjoinder for though the relief claimed as against C and D is for possession and as against B is for partition the latter relief is auxiliary to the primary relief which is for possession. The inclusion of B in this suit is merely as that of a proper party to the proceeding in the circumstances of the case and not as a litigant against whom a separate claim having no necessary connection with the claim of C and D is made. B in fact is a necessary party to the suit for the determination of C and D is made. B in fact is a necessary party to the suit for the determination of C and D is made. B in fact is a necessary party to the suit for the determination of C and D is made.

(w) *Frazer v. G. & C. of H. & C. Carrying Co.* (1900) 1 Q. B. 504.  
(x) *Comja v. Anuranga v. Ho. L. & B. Brothers & Co.* (1910) K. B. 321.  
(y) *Jamendra Nath v. Braganza Nath* (1918) 45 Cal. 111 41 I. C. 941.

(z) (1909) 33 Com. 221.  
(a) (1918) 4 Cal. 111.  
(b) *G. v. Faye Simkins v. F. & S. J. & S.* Mad. 99.

**Ship**—A ship is a person within the meaning of this rule so that a suit may be instituted against a ship as a defendant (c)

**Any right to relief**—The words any right to relief are wider than the words the right to any relief which occurred in the old section (d)

**Jointly**—(1) *B* and *C* simultaneously assault *A* in pursuance of a conspiracy *A* may sue *B* and *C* in one suit for damages see *Varajlal v Ramdat* (1902) 26 Bom 259 264 Cf *O Keefe v Walsh* [1903] 2 I R 681

(2) *A* obtains a lease of certain lands from *B* (landlord) and enters into possession of the lands *B* then lets the lands in separate portions to *C* *D* and *E* Subsequently *B* *C* *D* and *E* forcibly dispossess *A* of the land *A* may sue *B* *C* *D* and *E* in one suit for ejectment The plaintiff being entitled to claim possession of the land as a whole the mere fact that *C* *D* and *E* hold specific and distinct portions of the land under different demises from *B* does not make the suit bad for misjoinder of defendants *Vundo v Banomali* (1902) 29 Cal 871 *Raghunath v Sarosh* (1899) 23 Bom 266

(3) *Walters v Green* [1899] 2 Ch 696 given as ill (4) in the notes to Order 1 under the head The new Rule is also an illustration under this head

**Joint wrong doers**—Joint tortfeasors may be sued jointly or severally Thus where more persons than one are concerned in the commission of a wrong the person wronged has his remedy against all or any one or more of them at his option But if the person wronged elects to sue only one of several joint tortfeasors he cannot afterwards bring a suit against the rest even though the judgment may remain unsatisfied (e)

**Severally**—(1) Certain property held by *A* is sold under the Madras Rent Recovery Act in separate lots for arrears of rent and purchased by *B* *C* and *D* respectively *A* sues *B* *C* and *D* to set aside the sale on the ground that proper notice of sale was not given The suit is not bad for misjoinder of defendants merely because the property was sold to different purchasers The proceeding under which the various items [of the property] were sold was one and the ground upon which the validity of the sale was impugned is the same in each case (f) To use the words of the present rule the right to relief claimed is in respect of the same act or series of acts and there is a common question of fact and law

(2) A suit is brought by a reversionary heir on the death of a Hindu widow to recover from *A* *B* and *C* three separate properties sold by the widow to *A* *B* and *C* respectively by three separate deeds of sale on the ground that the sales were made without legal necessity According to the Madras decision the suit is not bad for misjoinder (g) according to the Bombay and Allahabad decisions it is (h) These were decisions under the old section The question under the present rule would be whether if separate suits were brought against *A* *B* and *C* any common question of law or fact would arise In a recent case under the old Code similar to the one above their Lordships of the Privy Council said Their Lordships think it is at least very doubtful whether upon the strictest construction to be placed upon the Procedure Code it can properly be said that there was any misjoinder in this case (i) In a suit brought by a reversioner claiming a third share of the estate against another reversioner who was in possession of some of the property and against three other persons two of whom were

(c) *The Bombay Perna Steam Company v Shephard* (1888) 1 L Bom 37

(d) See *Hanny & Co v Smurthwaite* [1893] Q B 412 *Fuscount Gort v Rosemary* (1836) 17 Q B D 63 *Unverses of Oxford and Cambridge v George Gull & Sons* [1899] 1 Ch 5

(e) *Brimmond v Harris* (18 2) L R C P 547 *P Amubhoy v T rne* (1890) 14 Bom 408

(f) *Do amay v Muthusamy* (1904) 7 Mad 91

(g) *Vasudeva v Kulandi* (1874) 7 M H C 990

*Mahomed v Arushai* (1888) 11 Mad 106

*Coradraya v Alayappa* (19 6) 49 Mad 836

*Karkar v Bai Rathore* (1883) 7 Bom 29

*Ganesh v Ahai* (1894) 16 All 9

(i) *Lala R p v san v Gopal Ders* (1909) 36 Cal 780 at p 98 36 I A 103 3 I C 38

purchasers and one a mortgagee from the widow the Allahabad High Court said that under the new Code in any event there was no misjoinder of defendants (3)

(3) In a suit for partition of joint family property by a minor against his father the Madras High Court held that vendees and mortgagees and others who had obtained decree against the father which were said to be collusive and fraudulent were proper parties (2)

In the alternative —(1) A executes a lease of his land to B for a period of two year At the end of the first year A sells the land to C C demands rent for the second year from B B alleges payment of the whole rent for two years to A in advance C may sue A and B praying for a decree against A if it be found that B paid the rent to A as alleged or in the alternative against B if it be found that B did not pay the rent to A *Madan Mohan v Holloury* (1886) 12 Cal 500 *Mouji v Kuterji* (1907) 31 Bom 516

(2) A purchases certain land from B and enters into possession Subsequently he is dispossessed by C who claims to be the owner of the land A may sue B and C praying for a decree against B for a refund of the purchase money if it is found that C is the owner or a decree in the alternative against C for possession if it is found that C is not the owner *Serajul Hug v Abdul Pahanan* (1902) 29 Cal 257

(3) A alleging that his agent B lent Rs 1000 to C and that C had denied receipt of the money from B sues B and C praying for a decree against B if it is found that the amount was not paid to C or in the alternative against C if it is found that the amount was paid to him The suit is properly framed for the transaction in respect of which the relief is claimed is the same *Meyappa v Perianan* (1906) 29 Mad 50 *Arnnabhella v Venkataswami* (1884) 7 Mad 123

(4) A mortgages his property to B B assigns the mortgage to C who gives notice of the assignment to A and demands payment from A of the amount secured by the mortgage A says he paid Rs 200 part of the mortgage debt to B before the assignment of the mortgage and that he is not therefore liable for more than the balance B denies the alleged payment C sues A and B praying for a mortgage decree in the first instance against A for the whole of the mortgage debt if the Rs 200 has not been paid and in the alternative if the Rs 200 have been paid for a mortgage decree against A for the amount of the mortgage debt less the Rs 200 and for a decree against B for Rs 200 by way of damages The suit is not bad for misjoinder of defendants for the right to the relief claimed is in respect of the same transaction *Aiyathurai v Muhamad Messa* (1908) 31 Mad 252 *Kotturi v Tallapragadha* (1910) 33 Mad 39 8 I O 107 See notes above New Rule III (4)

Costs where relief is claimed against defendants in the alternative—Where a suit is brought by A against B and C in the alternative and a decree is passed against B with costs but the suit as against C is dismissed the Court has jurisdiction in a proper case to order B (the unsuccessful defendant) to pay in addition to the costs payable by him to A (the plaintiff) the costs of C (the successful defendant) The rule has thus been stated by Vaughan Williams LJ The proper way is not to join any defendant unreasonably if the facts are such that it is reasonable to put them both and reasonable to be in a state of uncertainty as to which of the two is really guilty one then it is part of the reasonable costs of the action that the costs of the unsuccessful party you have launched against one of the defendant and who has succeeded in defeating himself should be borne by the man who is to blame (1) In *Child v Manning* (1911) 11 Ch. D. 80, 7

(1) *Bal Krishna Das v Hira Lal* (1911) 36 All

400 211 C 9

(2) *Sham Lal v Trinacholum* (1911) 45 Mad

194 69 I C 961 (2) A M 33

(3) *Besterman v British India Co Ltd* [1914] 3 K B 181 187 *Bullock v The London*

*Central Omnibus Co* [1911] 1 K B 271  
*Santero v P & A Thomas* [1911] 2  
 K B 533 *London v St. George* (1911)  
 30 Com L R 111 111 C 141 (2)  
 A B 91  
 (m) (1911) 11 Ch. D. 80, 7

Jessel MR dealing with a similar question said It appears to me on principle that he who was the person who caused the litigation or whose error or representation caused it ought to be the person to pay the costs of it

A representing that he is B's agent enters into a contract with C on B's behalf C demands performance of the contract from B B denies that he employed A as his agent and refuses to perform the contract C sues A and B for damages and claims relief against them in the alternative The Court finds that A untruly represented himself to be B's agent A decree is passed against A for damages but the suit against B is dismissed with costs If the Court is of opinion that C reasonably (n) took proceedings against B the Court may direct the cost payable by C to B to be included in the damages payable by A to C (o)

**Appeal**—An appeal lies under cl 15 of the Letters Patent from an order refusing to allow the plaintiff to proceed in one suit against several defendants on the ground of misjoinder and requiring the plaintiff to elect against which of the defendants he will proceed Such an order is a judgment within the meaning of cl 15 for it is in substance a decision that the suit does not lie as framed with the result that if the plaintiff insists the suit must be dismissed (p)

Court may give judgment for or against one or more of joint parties

**4 [Ss 26, 28]** Judgment may be given without any amendment—

(a) for such one or more of the plaintiffs as may be found to be entitled to relief, for such relief as he or they may be entitled to ,

(b) against such one or more of the defendants as may be found to be liable, according to their respective liabilities

Cl (a) of this rule is to be read with r 1 above and cl (b) with r 3 above (q)

**5 [New R S C O 16, r 5]** It shall not be necessary that every defendant shall be interested as to all the relief claimed in any suit against him

Defendant need not be interested in all the relief claimed

This rule is to be read with r 3 above It provides in effect that where a suit is brought against several defendants the fact that every defendant is not interested in all the relief claimed in the suit does not imply misjoinder of defendants See notes to r 3 above

**6 [S 29, R S C, O 16, r 6]** The plaintiff may, at his option, join as parties to the same suit all or any of the persons severally, or jointly and severally, liable on any one

Joinder of parties liable on same contract

contract, including parties to bills of exchange, hundis and promissory notes

( ) See *Pow v Davis* (1861) 1 B & S 20 121 R R 530

(o) *Speed v Verell* (1869) L R 4 C P 41  
*H ghe G eame* (1861) 33 L J Q B 41  
 See Indian Contract Act 1872 s 235

(p) *Ramendra Nath v Brajendra Nath* (1913) 45 Cal 111 41 I C 614

(q) See *Harendra Nath v Purna Chandra* (1908) 55 Cal 164 109 I C 155 ( 8 ) A C 199

**Several liability on a contract**—This rule is confined to suits on *contracts*. The liability on a contract may be either (1) several or (2) joint and several or (3) joint. *A* and *B* each for himself agrees to pay Rs 5000 to *C*. Here *A* and *B* are severally liable on the contract. *C* may therefore bring one suit against *A* and *B* or he may bring a separate suit against *A* and a separate suit against *B*. These suits may be brought simultaneously or they may be brought successively one after the other. But if the suit is brought against *A* and a decree is obtained against him and the decree is satisfied *C* cannot subsequently sue *B* on the contract. But if the decree remains unsatisfied *C* is not precluded from suing *B*.

**Joint and several liability on a contract**—The legal consequences of a joint and several liability on a contract are the same as those of several liability. Thus if *A* and *B* give a bond to *C* for Rs 1000 and the bond provides that *A* and *B* shall jointly and severally pay the amount to *C*, *C* may sue *A* and *B* jointly or he may sue them separately, as in the case where the liability is several.

**Joint liability on a contract**—The present rule does not provide for the case of a joint liability arising on a contract or negotiable instrument. The reason is that so far as liability on a contract is concerned s 43 of the Indian Contract Act 1872 makes all joint contracts joint and several. It allows a promisee to sue one or more of several joint promisors as he chooses and excludes the right of a joint promisor to be sued along with his co-promisors (r). A partnership firm consisting of two persons *A* and *B* purchases from *C* goods worth Rs 5000. The liability of partners is joint and *A* and *B* are therefore jointly liable to pay the price to *C*. But under s 43 of the Contract Act *C* may sue either *A* or *B* at his option. It is not incumbent upon *C* to join both *A* and *B* defendants. If *C* sues *A* alone and a decree is passed against *A* he cannot according to English law afterwards sue *B* even though the decree against *A* remains unsatisfied. The reason is that there is in the case of a joint contract a single cause of action which can only be sued on once. The same view has been taken by the High Courts of Calcutta, Madras and Bombay. On the other hand, it has been held by the High Court of Allahabad that the effect of s 43 of the Indian Contract Act 1872 is to make all joint contracts joint and several. Therefore where *C* obtained a judgment against *A* upon a joint bond executed by *A* and *B* and afterwards as the judgment was not satisfied sued *B* for the same money the Allahabad Court held that the suit against *B* was not barred. See Pollock and Mulla's Indian Contract Act notes to s 43. Effect of decree against some only of joint promisors.

It may be added here that if in the case put above *C* sues *A* alone *A* may apply under O 1 r 10 (2) to have *B* joined as a defendant and the Court may make such order as it thinks proper. In England it has been held that in an action on a joint contract against one only of the joint contractors the Court has jurisdiction without obtaining the consent of the plaintiff to make an order requiring the plaintiff to add the other joint contractor as a co-defendant and that where the defendant has set up a reasonable case of joint contract he has in the absence of special circumstances negating it a *prima facie* right to an order requiring the plaintiff to add the other contractor as co-defendant (s).

**Parties to bills of exchange**—*A* draws a bill of exchange upon *B* payable to *C* or order. The bill is accepted by *B*. *C* then endorses the bill to *D*. *D* endorses it to *E* and *E* to *F*. If the bill while in the hands of *F* is dishonoured, *F* may at his option sue *A* (the drawer) or *B* (the acceptor) or *C* (the endorser) or *D* (the endorser) or *E* (the endorser) or *F* may bring one action against all or any of them (t).

(r) *Hemendra v F & J Indralal* (1878) 3 C.L.J. 333  
360 *L. Amaras v Parashottam* (188 ) 6  
Dom 701 701 *Duck v Dhunys* (1901) 5  
Dom 38 886 *Motilal v Chellabhai*  
(182 ) 17 Dom 6 11 *Mukhammad v*  
*I. de laam* (1900) All 307 315

*Varayana v Lakshmi na* (1898) 1 Mad 56

(s) *Abbas v Lakshmi & Co v G. P. Jais* [1915] 4 A.B. 63

(t) *Pestonjee v Mirza* (18 5) 3 Cal 541

7 [New R S C, O 16, r 7] Where the plaintiff is in doubt as to the person from whom he is entitled to obtain redress, he may join two or more defendants in order that the question as to which of the defendants is liable, and to what extent, may be determined as between all parties

When plaintiff in doubt from whom redress is to be sought

Scope of the rule—This rule applies only where the plaintiff is in doubt as to the person from whom he is entitled to obtain redress. It does not enable a plaintiff to join separate causes of action against different defendants in one action in a case where he could not do so under r 3 above (u). Thus if damage is caused to A's house and he is in doubt as to whether it was caused by excavation works carried on by a County Council or by Water Company, allowing water from its mains to weaken the soil in front of the house A cannot join the Council and the Company in one action for these are two distinct torts. It does not matter that the resulting damage is the same in each case for it is not the damage that constitutes the cause of action but the injury or the wrong done by a tortfeasor (1). In such a case the present rule does not apply. The following however is a case to which the rule has been held to apply. M purporting to act as agent for C enters into a charter party with B for loading B's vessel with a cargo. The cargo is not loaded and B sues M for damages alleging that M had no authority to enter into the charter party as agent for C. Subsequently B finds upon discovery of documents that it is probable that C did give authority to M to bind him [C] with the charter party and applies to add C as a defendant. The case is one within this rule and C may be added as a defendant (w).

Costs where relief is claimed against defendants in the alternative—  
See notes to O 1 r 3 under the same head

8 [S 30 S 32, fourth para Cf R S C, O 16, r 9]

(1) Where there are numerous persons having the same interest in one suit, one or more of such persons may, with the permission of the Court, sue or be sued, or may defend, in such suit, on behalf of or for the benefit of all persons so interested. But the Court shall in such case give, at the plaintiff's expense, notice of the institution of the suit to all such persons either by personal service or, where from the number of persons or any other cause such service is not reasonably practicable, by public advertisement, as the Court in each case may direct.

One person may sue or defend on behalf of all in same interest

(2) Any person on whose behalf or for whose benefit a suit is instituted or defended under sub rule (1) may apply to the Court to be made a party to such suit

(u) *Thompson v London County Council* [1899] 1 Q B 840 844

(v) *Fra Lenzburg v C & T H Reliance Carriage Co* [1900] 1 Q B 504 510 explaining *Thompson*

*son v London County Council* [1899] 1 Q B 840

(w) *De n te & Co v McIlhenny & Co* [1896] 2 Q B 464

**Object of the rule**—This rule is an exception to the general rule that all persons interested in a suit ought to be made parties thereto (x) Convenience requires that in suits where there is a community of interest amongst a large number of persons a few should be allowed to represent the whole (y) so that trouble and expense may be saved (z)

**Application of the rule**—The provisions of this rule apply only if (1) the parties are numerous (2) they have the same interest and (3) the necessary permission is obtained and notice given

**Representative suit**—A suit filed by one or more persons under this rule on behalf of themselves and others having the same interest in the suit is called a representative suit. The provisions of Explanation VI to s 11 [res judicata] apply to such a suit But that Explanation is not controlled by O I r 8 and if the Court allows a suit to proceed in a representative capacity for the benefit of numerous parties all those parties will be bound by the decree although the procedure prescribed by the rule was not followed (a) See notes below Decree in a representative suit

**Numerous parties**—**Fluctuating body**—Thirty defendants were held to be numerous (b) The High Court of Madras has held that a suit cannot be brought under this rule on behalf of the *general public* (c) Following this decision the High Court of Calcutta held in one case that this rule did not apply unless the parties were capable of being ascertained and a suit could not therefore be brought under this rule on behalf of the *Hindu community* as the whole Hindu community is incapable of ascertainment (d) This decision has been dissented from by the same High Court in later cases where it was held that it was not necessary to the application of this rule that the parties should be capable of being ascertained (e) In this connection it may be observed that property may be owned by a fluctuating body of persons like the inhabitants of a village (f) or the Dhobi community of Varanasi (g) and a suit may be brought on their behalf under this rule It has also been held that a person may render himself liable to a community like the Vaisya community of Vagarala by agreeing to pay a certain sum of money to it and a suit to recover it may be brought by the community in the name of one or more members of the community under this rule (h)

**Same interest**—It is essential that the parties should have the *same* interest in the suit Thus where there are numerous legatees under a will any one legatee may sue the executors on behalf of himself and the other legatees for a discovery of the estate of the deceased come into their hands as they have all the same interest in having the will proved (i) Similarly where a person dies leaving numerous creditors any one creditor may sue on behalf of himself and the other creditors as they all have the same interest in representing the estate of the deceased to be as large as possible (j) On the same principle of the community of interest any one *rayat* of a village may sue the proprietor of the village for himself and the other rayats for a declaration of their general rights against the proprietor (k) Similarly a villager may bring a suit on behalf of himself and his fellow villagers for a declaration of a right of way and for an injunction against the defendant for obstructing the way (l) Likewise any one tax payer may

(x) Ch *Itari v Port Trust* (1904) 3 Bom

(y) *Chitambar v Indupuram* (1866) 3 Mal H C

(z) *Hill v Fiddon* (1883) 48 60 S C

(a) *So v Ram v Ram* (1900) 3 M L J

(b) *And v Ram* (1900) 3 M L J

(c) *And v Ram* (1900) 3 M L J

(d) *And v Ram* (1900) 3 M L J

(e) *And v Ram* (1900) 3 M L J

(f) *And v Ram* (1900) 3 M L J

(g) *And v Ram* (1900) 3 M L J

(h) *And v Ram* (1900) 3 M L J

(i) *And v Ram* (1900) 3 M L J

(j) *And v Ram* (1900) 3 M L J

(k) *And v Ram* (1900) 3 M L J



7 [New R S C, O 16, r 7] Where the plaintiff is in doubt as to the person from whom he is entitled to obtain redress, he may join two or more defendants in order that the question as to which of the defendants is liable, and to what extent, may be determined as between all parties

When plaintiff in doubt from whom redress is to be sought

Scope of the rule—This rule applies only where the plaintiff is in doubt as to the person from whom he is entitled to obtain redress. It does not enable a plaintiff to join separate causes of action against different defendants in one action in a case where he could not do so under r 3 above (u). Thus if damage is caused to A's house and he is in doubt as to whether it was caused by excavation works carried on by a County Council or by Water Company, allowing water from its mains to seep into the soil in front of the house, A cannot join the Council and the Company in one action for these are *two distinct torts*. It does not matter that the resulting damage is the same in each case for it is not the damage that constitutes the cause of action but the *injuria* or the wrong done by a tortfeasor (v). In such a case the present rule does not apply. The following however is a case to which the rule has been held to apply. M purporting to act as agent for C enters into a charter party with B for loading B's vessel with a cargo. The cargo is not loaded and B sues M for damages alleging that M had no authority to enter into the charter party as agent for C. Subsequently B finds upon discovery of documents that it is probable that C did give authority to M to bind him [C] with the charter party and applies to add C as a defendant. The case is one within this rule and C may be added as a defendant (w).

Costs where relief is claimed against defendants in the alternative—  
See notes to O 1 r 3 under the same head

8 [S 30 S 32, fourth para Cf R S C, O 16, r 9]

(1) Where there are numerous persons having the same interest in one suit, one or more of such persons may, with the permission of the Court, sue or be sued, or may defend, in such suit, on behalf of or for the benefit of all persons so interested. But the Court shall in such case give, at the plaintiff's expense, notice of the institution of the suit to all such persons either by personal service or, where from the number of persons or any other cause such service is not reasonably practicable, by public advertisement, as the Court in each case may direct.

(2) Any person on whose behalf or for whose benefit a suit is instituted or defended under sub rule (1) may apply to the Court to be made a party to such suit

(u) *Thompson v London County Council* [1899] 1 Q B 840 844

(v) *Frith v G & Co v Horseshoe Carriage Co* [1900] 1 Q B 504 510 explaining *Thompson*

*son v London County Council* [1899] 1 Q B 840

(w) *Frith & Co v Mellerau & Co* [1896] Q B 464

**Object of the rule**—This rule is an exception to the general rule that all persons interested in a suit ought to be made parties thereto (x) Convenience requires that in suits where there is a community of interest amongst a large number of persons a few should be allowed to represent the whole (y) so that trouble and expense may be saved ( )

**Application of the rule**—The provisions of this rule apply only if (1) the parties are numerous (2) they have the same interest and (3) the necessary permission is obtained and notice given

**Representative suit**—A suit filed by one or more persons under this rule on behalf of themselves and others having the same interest in the suit is called a representative suit. The provisions of Explanation VI to s 11 [res judicata] apply to such a suit But that Explanation is not controlled by O 1 r 8 and if the Court allows a suit to proceed in a representative capacity for the benefit of numerous parties all those parties will be bound by the decree although the procedure prescribed by the rule was not followed (a) See notes below Decree in a representative suit

**Numerous parties**—**Fluctuating body**—Thirty defendants were held to be numerous (b) The High Court of Madras has held that a suit cannot be brought under this rule on behalf of the *general public* (c) Following this decision the High Court of Calcutta held in one case that this rule did not apply unless the parties were capable of being *ascertained* and a suit could not therefore be brought under this rule on behalf of the *Hindu community* as the whole Hindu community is *incapable of ascertainment* (d) This decision has been dissented from by the same High Court in later cases where it was held that it was not necessary to the application of this rule that the parties should be capable of being ascertained (e) In this connection it may be observed that property may be owned by a fluctuating body of persons like the inhabitants of a village (f) or the Dhobi community of Haraina (g) and a suit may be brought on their behalf under this rule It has also been held that a person may render himself liable to a community like the Vysia community of Mogarala by agreeing to pay a certain sum of money to it and a suit to recover it may be brought by the community in the name of one or more members of the community under this rule (h)

**Same interest.**—It is essential that the parties should have the *same* interest in the suit Thus where there are numerous legatees under a will any one legatee may sue the executors on behalf of himself and the other legatees for a discovery of the estate of the deceased come into their hands as they have all the same interest in having the will proved (i) Similarly where a person dies leaving numerous creditors any one creditor may sue on behalf of himself and the other creditors as they all have the same interest in representing the estate of the deceased to be as large as possible (j) On the same principle of the community of interest any one *rayat* of a village may sue the proprietor of the village for himself and the other rayats for a declaration of their general rights against the proprietor (k) Similarly a villager may bring a suit on behalf of himself and his fellow villagers for a declaration of a right of way and for an injunction against the defendant for obstructing the way (l) Likewise any one tax payer may

(x) *Cf id* a v *Parlappa* (1904) 8 Bom

(y) *See* *Kla t v Indupram* (1900) 3 Mal H C

( ) *See* *Al l v Bha on* (1893) 5 All 60 *Sr*

(a) *See* *Al l v Bha on* (1900) 23 Mal 4

(b) *See* *Al l v Bha on* (1900) 23 Mal 4

(c) *See* *Al l v Bha on* (1900) 23 Mal 4

(d) *See* *Al l v Bha on* (1900) 23 Mal 4

(f) *See* *Al l v Bha on* (1900) 23 Mal 4

(g) *See* *Al l v Bha on* (1900) 23 Mal 4

(h) *See* *Al l v Bha on* (1900) 23 Mal 4

(i) *See* *Al l v Bha on* (1900) 23 Mal 4

(j) *See* *Al l v Bha on* (1900) 23 Mal 4

(k) *See* *Al l v Bha on* (1900) 23 Mal 4

(l) *See* *Al l v Bha on* (1900) 23 Mal 4

bring a suit against a Municipality on behalf of himself and the other tax payers to restrain the Municipality from misapplying its funds (m)

In *Templeton v Russell* (n) a case under the corresponding English rule it was held that the rule applies *only* to persons who have or claim *some beneficial proprietary right* which they are asserting or defending in the suit. But this meaning of the word *interest* was disapproved by the House of Lords in *Bedford (Duke of) v Ellis* (o). In the last mentioned case Lord Macnaghten said. It seems to me that there is no reason whatever for so restricting the rule. *Given a common interest and a common grievance a representative suit was in order if the relief sought was in its nature beneficial to all whom the plaintiff proposed to represent.* To limit the rule to persons having a *beneficial proprietary interest* would be opposed to precedent and not I think in accordance with common sense. Take the case of a creditor's suit which perhaps was the earliest instance of plaintiffs being allowed to sue in a representative character. It can hardly be suggested that a creditor has a *proprietary interest* in the real or personal estate of his deceased debtor. Thus the disciples of a mutt have sufficient interest within the meaning of this rule to maintain a representative suit to declare alienations made by the Mahant invalid and to have the property alienated handed over to the Mahant for the time being (p). Similarly worshippers of a temple have sufficient interest to maintain a representative suit for a declaration that a permanent lease of temple property granted to the defendants in possession is invalid (q) or for recovering temple property from a trespasser (r).

The expression *same interest* must be distinguished from the expression *same transaction*. What is required under this rule is that the parties should have the *same interest* it is not sufficient that their interests arise from the *same transaction*. Therefore where goods of several persons are shipped under separate bills of lading the mere fact that the goods of all the persons are lost by the same cause does not entitle any one or more of them to bring a representative suit on behalf of themselves and others against the owner of the ship (s). But they may all join in one suit under O 1 r 1.

When the meeting of a caste at which plaintiff was appointed to file a suit was irregularly convened and numerous members of the caste were opposed to the suit O 1 r 8 was held not to be applicable (t). But if the plaintiffs have been validly appointed to represent the community the fact that some members of the community subsequently side with the defendant will not affect the representative character of the suit under this rule (u).

**Different interests**—Where the parties have not the *same interest* they must all be on the record. Thus in a partition suit all co parceners must be brought before the Court (v). Similarly in a suit for contribution brought by a promisor all the co promisors bound to contribute must be brought before the Court (w). Numerous persons interested in equity of redemption should all be joined as party defendants (x).

**Clubs and other associations**—The secretary of a club or other association cannot sue alone in respect of a matter in which the association is interested even if he is authorised so to do by a resolution of the members of the association. The suit must be brought by all the members of the association or by the secretary on his own behalf

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>(m) <i>I amon v Municipality of Sholapur</i> (1898) 2 Bom 646</p> <p>(n) [1893] 1 Q. B. 43</p> <p>(o) [1901] A. C. 18</p> <p>(p) <i>Chidambanatha v Vallabha</i> (1918) 41 Mad 142 1 C 366</p> <p>(q) <i>Ve ramachan v Sona</i> (1904) 43 Mad 410 59 I C 585</p> <p>(r) <i>Pa gaswami v Krishna swami</i> (1934) 41 Mad L J 110 71 I C 463 (3) A M - 6</p> | <p>(s) <i>M. It. &amp; Co v Knight Steamship Co</i> [1910] 2 K. B. 101</p> <p>(t) <i>H. Iswandas v Chhaganlal</i> (1916) 40 Bom 158 33 I C 54</p> <p>(u) <i>Purna v Vohi</i> (1908) 48 Cal. L J 6 (28) A C 741</p> <p>(v) <i>Falika Jay Gours</i> (1890) 17 Cal 908 <i>Sadu v Ram</i> (1891) 16 Bom 608</p> <p>(w) <i>Ibn H v Ramd</i> (1890) 12 All 110</p> <p>(x) <i>Griffith Found</i> (1899) 45 Cal D 53</p> |
|---|--|

*and on behalf of the other members under this rule (y)* So if the treasurer of an association misappropriates the funds of the association no one member can sue alone to recover the amount misappropriated though he may be authorised so to do by a resolution of the association The suit must be brought by all the members or by any one member on his own behalf *and on behalf of the other members ( )* The secretary of a club cannot unless he has expressly accepted a *personal liability* be sued personally on a contract entered into by him on behalf of the club nor can the members of a club collectively be sued through the secretary (a) The same remarks apply to an unregistered company (b) A suit to eject tenants from property belonging to the caste cannot be brought by the president of the managing committee of the caste though he may be authorised to do so by a resolution of the committee The suit must be brought by him on behalf of all the members of the caste (c) But no suit can be brought under this rule at all if the caste or association is divided into two parties one party being for the suit and the other against it In such a case it cannot be said that on behalf of all the members of a caste the members of the caste have the same interest in the suit within the meaning of this rule (d) See notes above Numerous parties

**Trade Union**—A trade union may be sued in its registered name or some of its members can be sued under this rule (e)

**Fraudulent transfer**—A suit to set aside a deed of gift or of trust on the ground that it is in fraud on creditors must be brought by or on behalf of all the creditors. Such a suit cannot be entertained if it is brought by only some of the creditors (f)

Suit by a member of a community in his own right—This rule is an enabling rule. It does not debar a member of a community from maintaining a suit in his own right though the act complained of may also be injurious to the whole community. Thus if Mahomedans belonging to a particular sect are not allowed to use a mosque for prayer any member of the sect entitled to use the mosque may sue as plaintiff to enforce the right. It is not necessary that the suit should be brought by him on behalf of himself and all other members of the sect entitled to use the mosque. A Mahomedan entitled to worship in a mosque may sue for a declaration that certain property alienated by the mutawalli is wakf property and for possession thereof from the alienes (g). Similarly any member of a community may bring a suit to set aside unauthorized alienations of endowed property or of property belonging to the community or for the removal of encroachments upon such property (h) or for maladministration of property belonging to the community (i).

**When rule does not apply**—The rule does not apply to an action of libel (j)

- (v) *Moh mamin As oc at on v B lshst* (1984) 3 All 84 *Mishael v Briggs* (1991) 14 Mad 36 (debt due from a member), *He da/ Na'h v Alhdi Candra* (19 9) 49 Cal L J 3 7 ( ) A L 445 (suit for possession of land)
- (2) *M homed v Hu en* (1898) Born 9
- (4) *North W I Cl en v Saidullah* (1898) 20 All 49
- (b) *C e ha v Mund Foret Co* (1899) 1 All 316
- (c) *Almaran v Na a j n* (19 ) 46 Bom 13 64 I C 555 ( ) A B 103 See in this con ne tion *probat v H s* (1919) 24 Cal W N 06 54 I C 74
- (d) *H his ds v Hlaga Lal* (1916) 40 Bom 158 164 331 I C 61
- (e) *Taff l la l w j Co Amalgamated Soc ety of F ray v a s* [1901] A C 401 4 6 443 *Larr v Lawe A sa d Che h re M ne s Fide to* (1917) 143 366
- (f) *T r o j v D h da* (19 ) 12 Bom 1 *I sh ar Deva* (1903) 7 Bom 146 CA the put v *Mah r v Lah d* (190 ) 3 Cal 104 ( ) I ( ) *I h m Lal v Mfoorah v Sal* (190 ) 34
- (at 929)
- (g) *Mafau v Jagat* (19 3) Pat 391 4 I C 403 ( ) A F 4 5 *Sh akarial v D kore Temple Committee* (18 6) 23 Bom L R 309 94 I C 47 ( ) A B 179 Abd *I ah m v Mafomel L skat ti* (19 3) 5 I A 06 5 Cal 519 105 I C 361 ( ) A I L 16
- (h) *Zafarjeb Ah v Bakhtawar d gh* (19 3) 5 All 497 *Jai l a v Akbar li e n* (1945) All 18 8 *Giba v Easa ta* (1910) 3 All 24 5 I C 51 *Da onduh v Mfah mm d* (1911) 32 All 800 111 I 38 *F m Chand a v Ah* (1913) 3 All 19 18 I C 9 *Lw ju Lal v Is lak Lal* (189 ) 4 Cal 3 5 *Mw ju wld v Sayyidul* (1 93) 0 Cal 810 See also *Narim n v Mfucipal (corpo ation of Bombay* (19 3) 4 Bom 609 840 83 I C 8 6 ( ) A B 305
- (i) *Ta chery v Murthum* (1884) 8 Bom 432 4 0
- (j) *Mercantile U n e Service Associa on v Toms* [1926] \* A L 13 A s to action of d l t, see *Walker v Sir* [1914] \* K L 9 0 *Id l Films L mited v Richards* [19 1 ] K B 3 4 321

At what stage of the suit leave should be obtained—The proper course is to obtain permission before the suit is instituted but if that is not done the rule does not forbid leave being granted afterwards. Permission under this rule may be granted even after the institution of the suit (k)

Whether the leave should be express—It has been held by the High Court of Calcutta that the leave to sue need not be express it is enough if it can be inferred from the proceedings (l). On the other hand there is a *dictum* of Stuart C J in an Allahabad case (m) that the leave to sue must be express. A Full Bench of the Madras High Court has held that the suit may be a representative suit although the procedure prescribed by this rule has not been followed (n)

Leave must be granted to definitely named persons—Where this was not done the suit was dismissed by the High Court of Calcutta (o). The other Courts would probably grant fresh leave in such a case. See notes above. At what stage of the suit etc.

May be sued.—This rule applies not only to the case of numerous plaintiffs having the same interest but also to the case of numerous defendants having the same interest. Thus where the inhabitants of a village assert a right of way over land belonging to the plaintiff the plaintiff may with the permission of the Court sue any one or more of the inhabitants on behalf of them all (p). The consent of the defendants on the record is not necessary for this purpose (q).

May defend.—When there are numerous defendants having the same interest any one of them may be sued on his behalf and on behalf of others. But where this is not done and all the defendants are on the record any one defendant may defend the suit on behalf of himself and the rest with the permission of the Court.

Who should apply for permission—(1) Where a plaintiff intends to sue on behalf of himself and others it is the plaintiff that should apply for leave. (2) Similarly where a plaintiff intends to sue one defendant for himself and others it is the plaintiff that should apply for leave. (3) Where numerous defendants having the same interest are all sued and they are all on the record and if any one defendant is appointed by the other defendants to defend the suit on behalf of all it is that defendant who must apply for leave (r).

In *Walker v Sur* (s) Vaughan Williams L J said. The rule as it stands does not purport to leave it to the mere will or choice of the plaintiff or of the defendants nor to give a right in either case of selection at the choice of a plaintiff who wishes to sue representative members of an unincorporated society. It lies with the judge to give the authority and if he thinks it a case in which the plaintiff may properly sue the persons that he proposes to sue as people proper to be authorized to defend in such cause or matter on behalf of or for the benefit of all persons so interested then the order may be made.

Notice of suit. Where a person sues or is sued or defends a suit on behalf of himself and others any decree that may be passed in the suit is binding upon them all (s 11 Explanation VI) unless the decree has been obtained by fraud or collusion (Evidence Act 1872 s 44). It is therefore necessary that notice of the suit should be given to all the parties who would be bound by the decree for otherwise a person might be concluded by a suit of which he was unaware.

- (k) *Ferandez v Podgiet* (189) 1 B m 84  
*S v a v Paghra* (1900) 22 M d 8  
*Ch v v Krishn* (1907) 22 Mad 399  
*Ildeav v B C P* (1900) All 909  
*Alam d*  
*Al v Abdul Majid* (1917) 44 Cal 58 39  
*1 C 3 d* assenting from *Oriental Bk v*  
*Goh d* (1883) 9 Cal 604  
 (l) *Dh v v J sh* (1894) 21 C L 180  
*Klu*  
*J m* (1907) 9 Cal 100  
*Krish v*  
*Atul* (10 4) 39 Cal L J 61 81 IC 9  
 (4) A C 909  
 (m) *H ralat v Bh on* (1883) 5 All 60

- (n) *So achalam v K maracit* (19 8) 51 M d 1 8  
 107 IC 8 (9) A N FB  
 (o) *K l Ka ta v Court I road* (1900) 17 Cal  
 906 Buts c (191) 44 C 1 9 32 IC 73  
 (p) *Chun Lal v Rookhst* (1888) 15 Cal 460  
 (q) *Ambalam v Bartle* (1913) 36 Mad 418 4 5  
 13 IC 599  
 (r) See *London Association for Protection of*  
*Trade v Lands Limited* [1916]  
 2 A C 15 8 39  
 (s) [1914] A C 11 934

and when notice was not given the Patna High Court held that a decree could only be passed against those defendants who were on the record (t) But reference must be made in this connection to the Madras case of *Sonachalam v. Kumaravelu* (u) which holds that the representative character of a suit is a matter of substance rather than of form It is however open to any one of the parties whose name does not stand on the record and who would be bound by the decree under the provisions of this rule and sec 11 to apply to the Court under sub rule (2) to be made a party to the suit and the Court may add him as a party *provided* his interest will be seriously prejudiced if he is not so joined (v) See note below Adding parties.

Court shall give notice by personal service or by public advertisement — These words show that it is the *duty of the Court* to cause service of the notice or cause an advertisement to be published It is the duty of the plaintiff however to move the Court for that purpose But if he omits to do so the suit ought not to be dismissed on account of the failure of the Court to perform the duties imposed upon it by this rule The appellate Court should in such a case remand the case to the Court of first instance so that it may issue the notice (w)

Title of suit — When the plaintiff sues or defendant is sued on behalf of himself and others under this rule that fact should be stated in the title of the suit and not merely in the plaint (x) The title of the suit where the plaintiff sues in a representative character is as follows [see Appendix 1 I leadings (1) Titles of suits] —

|  |   |           |
|--|---|-----------|
| A B on behalf of himself and all other creditors<br>of X | } | Plaintiff |
|--|---|-----------|

C D

Defendant

Suit in name of wrong plaintiff — A brings a suit under this section on behalf of himself and other creditors of Y It turns out that A is not a creditor of Y Thereupon B an admitted creditor of Y applies to be added as a plaintiff under Order 10 (1) Has the Court power to grant the application? The question arose in a recent Madras case but it was left open (y) The Madras case was not one of a bona fide mistake and it is submitted that if the suit was instituted by A by such a mistake the amendment may be allowed on terms

Compromise of representative suit — A plaintiff suing in a representative character cannot compromise without leave of the Court nor can he give up or alter any right of the others without their consent or the leave of the Court (z) Similarly a person authorized by the Court to defend a suit on behalf of others having the same interest cannot even if there is no defence consent to judgment against them the proper course in such a case is to submit to judgment on their behalf (a)

Adding parties — The Court will not compel the plaintiff to add the persons on whose behalf he sues as co plaintiffs Thus where an action was brought by a plaintiff on behalf of himself and the other owners of a ship against the defendants for freight and dues for the use of the ship and the defendants applied to add the names of the other owners as plaintiffs in order that the defendants might have the liability of the other owners as plaintiffs for costs it was held that the plaintiff could not be compelled to add the other owners as co plaintiffs (b) Where a plaintiff sues on behalf of himself and others and one of the persons on whose behalf he sues objects

- (t) *Ghatthan v. Shamal Lal* (19 8) 7 Pat 19 108 I C 330 (S) 41 20  
(u) *Sonachalam v. Kumaravelu* (19 9) 51 Mad 13 10 I C 62 (S) A 31 7 F R  
(v) *As v. Y. Kamaiah* (1910) 34 Bom 40 41 C 130  
(w) *M. L. Lal v. P. A. Jayl v. T. curi* (1908) 3 Cal 101 1 SA 1 L I v. M. ammal I R (10 ) 44 All 31 65 I C 259 ( ) A 4 16

- ( ) *Re Tottenham* [1906] 1 Ch 624  
(y) *Kriha v. Sacha v. ppa* (19 4) 47 Mad. L J 540 8 I C 49 (24) A M 883  
(z) *Re Caly v. and v. de n U t l a d C m* p y i n e t i (1908) 6 Ch 65 69 662  
( ) *Free v. Fichmo* [1890] 6 L T 47 See also *Abd v. I. A. m v. Mahomed Ja kat Ali* (19 3) 5 I A 96 5 Cal 19 103 I C 361 (24) 4 P C 16  
(b) *De Hart v. Stevenson* (18 6) 1 Q B D 313

to the plaintiff so doing he may apply to have himself added as a defendant (c) If one of the persons on whose behalf the plaintiff purports to sue is dissatisfied with an order made in the suit he may apply to be added as a defendant but he cannot appeal from the order (d) The application to be added as a defendant must be made without unnecessary delay (e) Where in a suit by a creditor for the administration of the estate of the deceased debtor on behalf of himself and other creditors one of the creditors applied to be joined as a party it was held that he should not be so joined unless the Court was satisfied that his interests would be seriously prejudiced if he was not so joined (f) See note above Notice of suit

**Addition of plaintiffs after decree**—Where the plaintiffs on record neglect to execute the decree passed in a suit brought under this rule the Court may add other persons having the same interest as the plaintiffs to enable them to execute the decree (g)

**Decree in a representative suit**—The general rule of law is that in suits where one person is allowed to represent others as defendant in a representative capacity any decree passed binds those others only with respect to the *property* of those others which he can in law represent and although the party on record *eo nomine* may be made personally liable no personal decree can be passed against the others This is the principle to be applied to suits brought under this rule (h) It has accordingly been held that an injunction in a decree passed in a representative suit brought under this rule is not binding on those who are not actually parties on the record (i) See s 11 Explanation VI and notes above Representative suit

**Costs in a representative suit**—As to costs in a representative suit see the observations of Marten J in the undermentioned case (j)

**Abatement of suit**—Where a suit is brought under this rule by A on behalf of himself and 20 others and one of the twenty nine who had never applied to the Court to be made a party under sub r (2) dies pending the suit his death does not cause the suit to abate (k)

**Abatement of appeal**—A suit is brought by A and B under this rule on behalf of themselves and 387 others against C and a decree is passed in the suit for the plaintiffs C appeals from the decree Pending the appeal 3 out of the 387 who had never applied to be made parties under sub r (2) die C does not apply to bring on record the legal representatives of the three deceased Does the appeal abate? No because the three deceased were not parties to the suit *eo nomine* (l)

Forty persons institute a suit against B in their own names (and not under this rule) and obtain a decree jointly against B B appeals from the decree and applies for and obtains an order from the appellate Court when the appeal is admitted that 4 out of the 40 respondents may be permitted under this rule to defend the appeal Pending the appeal one of the 36 respondents dies but no steps are taken to bring his legal representative on the record. Does the appeal abate? Yes because the decree was obtained by the plaintiffs for themselves and not in a representative capacity Even if the procedure prescribed by this rule is applicable to appeals by the operation of s 107 the order passed by the appellate Court under this rule did not relieve B from the

- (c) *Bilson v Chelch* (188) 9 Ch D 55  
*Fraser v Cooper Hale & C* (188) 21  
 Ch D 718 *May v Newton* (1887) 34  
 Ch D 347 349  
 (d) *Watson v Carr* (No 1) (1881) 17 Ch D 19  
 (e) *Conjehare v Lewis* (1883) 48 L J 5-7  
 (f) *Tassanji v Em albas* (1910) 34 Bom 420  
 41 C 130 See also Re *Schuchmacher*  
 [1907] 1 Ch 719  
 (g) *Sir mintha v Kumaranam* (1903) 44  
 Mad L J 384 7-1 C 284 (-3) A.M.  
 47

- (h) *Sah b Thambai v Hamid* (1913) 36 Mad 414  
 1-1 C 1008  
 (i) *Sadagopa Chari v Trishnamachari* (1889)  
 12 Mad 36 *Srinivas v Arayr* (1910)  
 33 Mad 483 8-1 C 999  
 (j) *Bhuroobai v Harida* (1918) 4 Bom 556  
 5-6 S 4-1 C 9  
 (k) *Fam Dval v Mammad* (1919) Punj Rec  
 no 46 p 115 51 C 437 *Jam Copal v*  
*Har K. Sen* (1900) 7 Lal L J 517 83 C  
 48 (2) A L 598 *Rah Jam v Dury*  
*D s* (1906) 91 C 553 (-8) A L 16  
 (l) *Lams v H a* (1900) 1 Lah 58 60 C 111

necessity of impeaching all those persons who were plaintiffs in the suit and had obtained a decree in their favour and the representatives of any of those persons who had died. Moreover the decree having been passed in favour of all the forty plaintiffs jointly the appeal abates in its entirety (m)

Representative suit and res judicata.—See notes above Representative suit and Decree in a representative suit

9 [S 31, R S C, O 16 r 11] No suit shall be defeated by reason of the misjoinder or non joinder of parties, and the Court may in every suit deal with the matter in controversy so far as regards the rights and interests of the parties actually before it

Misjoinder of parties.—A misjoinder or non joinder of parties is not fatal to the suit (n). Where there is a misjoinder of parties the name of the plaintiff or the defendant who has been improperly joined may be struck out under r 10 sub r (2) below and the case may be proceeded with. See s 99 above

Non joinder of parties.—As regards non joinder of parties a distinction has been drawn between the non joinder of a person who ought to have been joined as a party and the non joinder of a person whose joinder is only a matter of convenience or expediency [see O 1 r 10 (2)]. A suit by executors trustees co owners of immovable property partners etc for recovery of property in which they are jointly interested belongs to the former class. As to this class of cases it has been held that if the suit is brought by some only of the persons interested e.g. by some of the executors and not all and if the defendant objects on the ground of non joinder the plaintiffs may apply for an amendment to join the absent parties as co plaintiffs in which case the Court should allow the application and not dismiss the suit. But if after the objection has been raised the plaintiffs proceed with the suit without bringing on the record the persons whose non joinder has been objected to the suit it has been held must be dismissed. This is because O 1 r 9 is a rule of procedure which does not affect substantive law and as the persons not joined are not bound the decree cannot be effective. In the latter class of cases that is cases in which the joinder of a person as a party is only a matter of convenience the absent party may be added or the suit may be tried without him (o). The same principle applies in the case of defendants (p). See notes to O 1 r 10 Limitation Act see 22

As to when objections to misjoinder and non joinder of parties should be taken see r 13 below

10 [Ss 27, 32, 33, R S C, O 16 rr 2 11, 39] (1) Where a suit has been instituted in the name of the wrong person as plaintiff or where it is doubtful whether it has been instituted in the name of the right plaintiff, the Court may at any

- (m) *Poo Chai v B y d* (19 1) 5 Lah 43  
*1111 in Hal M f m al v Barikurd*  
 (19 1) Lah 43 88 1 c 59 (5) 4 L  
 1 1
- (n) *Ja k al v Fawru j* (18 9) 4 Cal 949  
*Dwan Shb A th v Alha co Ja k of*  
*D m l Ld* (1915) Punj Lec no 3 1  
 19 J C 450
- (o) *Moi r lu v An amol* (19 3) 44 Ma 1  
*1 J 12 7 I C 65 [3] A M 337*  
*Sh m ga v Subdayu* (19 1) 4 Mad

- L J 333 70 I C 64 (2) A M 317  
*H ran v f me h* (19 10) Cal W N  
 19 5 6 I C 4 1 f manathan  
*Arunach lam* (19 1) 44 Mad 43 60 I C  
 316 (1) A M 55 [Court should allow  
 amendment]
- (p) (19 0) Cal W N 19 6 I C 4 3 supra  
 di ti cui hed in u a v Ch d (19 1) 40  
 Cal L J 4 84 I C 467 (24) A C 1070  
 where the suit was for damages against the  
 defendants



stage of the suit, if satisfied that the suit has been instituted through a *bona fide* mistake, and that it is necessary for the determination of the real matter in dispute so to do, order any other person to be substituted or added as plaintiff upon such terms as the Court thinks just

(2) The Court may at any stage of the proceedings, either upon or without the application of either party, and on such terms as may appear to the Court to be just, order that the name of any party improperly joined, whether as plaintiff or defendant, be struck out, and that the name of any person who ought to have been joined, whether as plaintiff or defendant, or whose presence before the Court may be necessary in order to enable the Court effectually and completely to adjudicate upon and settle all the questions involved in the suit, be added

(3) No person shall be added as a plaintiff suing without a next friend or as the next friend of a plaintiff under any disability without his consent

(4) Where a defendant is added, the plaint shall, unless the Court otherwise directs, be amended in such manner as may be necessary and amended copies of the summons and of the plaint shall be served on the new defendant and, if the Court thinks fit, on the original defendant

(5) Subject to the provisions of the Indian Limitation Act, 1877, section 22, the proceedings as against any person added as defendant shall be deemed to have begun only on the service of the summons

#### SUB RULE (1)

Sub rule (1) is the equivalent of s 27 of the Code of 1882 It corresponds to P 5 C O 16 r 2

Scope of sub rule (1)—Sub rule (1) contemplates cases in which a suit is brought by a plaintiff and he subsequently discovers that he cannot get full relief without joining some other person as co plaintiff (g) or where it is found that some other person and not the original plaintiff is entitled to the relief claimed In the former case the application (which must be made by the original plaintiff) will be for *adding* and in the latter for *substituting* that other person as *plaintiff* But the Court must be satisfied before the application is granted that the amendment has become necessary

through a *bona fide* mistake on the part of the original plaintiff. The mistake may be either one of fact (r) or of law (s). Where the point is doubtful it is in itself evidence of a *bona fide* mistake (t). Again where the Court of first instance takes one view of the law and the Court of Appeal takes another that in itself is evidence of a *bona fide* mistake (u).

**Amendment allowed**—(1) The Official Assignee of Madras constitutes *A* *B* Official Assignee of Bombay his attorney to institute a suit on his behalf in Bombay *A* *B* instead of suing as constituted attorney of the Official Assignee of Madras sues by mistake as Official Assignee of Bombay. The plaint may be amended under sub rule (1) by substituting the former description for the latter. *Sardarmal v Arandamal* (1897) 21 Bom 205.

(2) A partner in a firm carrying on business out of British India and to which O 30 does not apply files a suit in the name of the firm. He was allowed to amend by adding the names of all the partners but the case was treated as one of substitution and not misdescription and he was required to pay costs of the action up to the time of amendment. *Tyankatesh Oil Mill v Elmahomed* (1928) 30 Bom L R 117 109 I O 89 (28) A B 191.

(3) A Hindu appoints *A* guardian of the property of his minor son under his will but appoints no executor. *A* believing that his appointment as guardian has the effect of constituting him executor of the will by implication sues *B* to recover certain property belonging to the estate of the deceased. The Court finds that *A* is not executor by implication. The plaint may be amended by substituting the son as plaintiff. *Seshamma v Chennappa* (1897) 20 Mad 167. [In this case the amendment was allowed in second appeal.]

(4) *A* sues *B* for work done under a contract. *B* contends that the contract has been assigned by *A* to *C* and *A* therefore has no right to sue. *A* admits the assignment but says that the assignment is not absolute but by way of charge only and that he has therefore a right to sue. It is found that the assignment to *C* is absolute and that there was a *bona fide* mistake on the part of *A* in believing that the assignment was by way of charge only. The plaint may be amended by substituting *C* as plaintiff. *Hughes v Pump House Hotel Co* [1902] 2 K B 485.

In the last mentioned case *B* objected to the amendment on the ground that as the assignment was found to be absolute *A* had no cause of action at the time the action was brought but the objection was overruled. Cozens Hardy L J said. It is said that the rule does not apply when it is shown that the plaintiff has no right of action but there are abundant authorities to the contrary effect. The cases cited in the judgment in that case clearly show that the plaint would have been allowed to be amended if that was the application by adding *C* as plaintiff. This interpretation of O 16 r 2 of the English Rules which corresponds in wording with sub rule (1) of this rule would seem to be opposed to the view taken by the High Court of Bombay. It would seem that the Bombay Court would not allow an amendment if the original plaintiff had no right of action at the time the suit was brought (v). But this view it is submitted is not correct and one of the cases cited by that Court in support of its view affirms the contrary (w). In a recent case the High Court of Madras expressly held that the fact that the original plaintiff has no cause of action does not take away the jurisdiction of the Court to order the substitution of another person as plaintiff (x).

( ) *Duckett v G* (1877) 6 C D R. See *Maha* (191) 1st L J 199 3d L C 151 where there was no mistake at all.  
(t) *Hughes v Pump House Hotel Co* [1902] 2 K B 485.  
(u) *Doaba & Co v H* (1900) 2 Lah L J 400.

(v) [1902] 2 K B 485 at p 486 *supra*.  
(w) *Bha v Ka* (1896) 20 Bom 537.  
(x) *See A v B v C* (1896) 20 Bom 677.  
(y) *Krishna Rao v The Collector & Government Agent* (1907) 30 Mad 419.

**Amendment not allowed**—It would seem that no amendment should be allowed under sub rule (1) if the rights in dispute between the *new plaintiff* and the defendant would not be the same as those in dispute between the *original plaintiff* and the defendant. A suit is brought by an importer of Roskopf Patent watches for infringement of trade mark alleging that he has got the *exclusive right to use* the trade mark in India. The trade mark belongs to the manufacturer and *not to the importer*. The importer is subsequently advised that he cannot sue on the *manufacturer's* trade mark and he thereupon applies that the manufacturer may be either added or substituted as plaintiff. If the manufacturer is made a party his claim will raise questions as to how far he is entitled to the trade mark in the *country of its origin* and consequently in India. That would be a case wholly different from that of the importer. Can the manufacturer be made a party under these circumstances? The question arose in a Bombay case (y) Batty J. said that the point was one on which there seemed to be considerable room for doubt. Eventually the application was refused on the ground that it was made too late.

**Upon such terms as the Court thinks fit**—Liberty to amend may be given upon the terms that the plaintiff should pay to the defendant his costs of the suit upto and including the order of amendment and that the new plaintiff should only be entitled to such relief as he could have claimed if the suit had been commenced at the date on which he was added as a party (z).

**Consent**—No person can be added or substituted as plaintiff under sub rule (1) without his consent. Thus a company cannot be made a plaintiff in a suit without its consent (a). See sub rule (3).

**Limitation**—Section 22 of the Limitation Act provides that when after the institution of a suit a party is *substituted or added* as a plaintiff or defendant the date of *substitution or addition* is to be deemed as regards that party as the date of institution. It has been held that this provision of the law relates only to the addition of parties under sub rule (2) and not under sub rule (1). The result is that a party may be substituted or added under sub rule (1) even after the period of limitation. Thus where an agent sued in his own name and subsequently at a time when a new suit would have been barred by limitation his principals were substituted as plaintiffs it was held that the suit being the same the change of parties did not affect the question of limitation (b).

### SUB RULES (2) to (5)

Sub rules (2) (3) and (v) correspond to s 32 of the Code of 1882 and to R. S. O. 10 r 11. Sub rule (4) corresponds to s 33 of the Code of 1882.

**Old section**—Under the old section 32 there was a distinction between the power of the Court to *strike out* parties and the power to *add* parties. Under that section the power to *strike out* parties could only be exercised on the *application* of a party and that too if the application was made *on or before the first hearing*. But the power to *add* parties could be exercised by the Court at *any time* and *even without any application*. Under sub rule (2) the power to *strike out* as well as to *add* parties may be exercised by the Court at *any stage of the proceedings* and even without any application by a party.

**At any stage of the proceedings**—The power to strike out or add parties may be exercised at *any stage of the proceedings*. Thus fresh parties were added in one case after a decree had been passed and a reference made to the Commissioner to take accounts and sell the property (c). In another case fresh parties were added after a suit

(y) *Herger v Droz* (1901) — *Lom* 433 463-66  
*Ja da v D mofardas* (1913) 9  
*Lom L R* 418 1031 C. — ( ) A B  
 44  
 (z) *A J o gh v B H* (1880) 41 Ch D 241  
 316 *lto ncy Gc er l v Fontpruud Water*

*Works C* [1908] 1 Ch 398  
 (a) *P m Larsen v Jam Kishan* (1911) *Punj*  
*Rec* no 46 p 16 101 C 515  
 (b) *Parna v Blah dev* (1898) *Bom* 62  
 (c) *Tal t land v Advocate General* (18 1) 8 B  
 II C 96

had been reinstated under s. 108 of the Code of 1882 [now O 9 r 13] (d) In a Calcutta case a fresh party was added in a suit for partition after the preliminary decree had been passed and the Commissioner had made his report but before the drawing up of the final decree (e) A Court can add parties after the suit has been remanded to it by the Court of appeal (f) Under the corresponding English rule it has been held that the Court has jurisdiction to allow amendment even after final judgment *so long as anything remains to be done in the action* though it be only assessment of damages (g)

**Parties when added**—Under this rule a person may be added as a party to a suit in the following two cases—

(1) when he *ought* to have been joined as plaintiff or defendant and not so joined or

(2) when without his presence the questions in the suit cannot be completely decided

There is no jurisdiction to add a party in any other case (h) Thus a person should not be added as a defendant merely because he would be *incidentally* affected by the judgment (i) The Secretary of State is not a proper or necessary party in every suit in which a statute is challenged as *ultra vires* (j)

Parties cannot be added so as to introduce quite a new cause of action—A purchased goods from B by sample. The bulk did not correspond with the sample and A thereupon sued B for damages. B contended that he had purchased the goods in question from X by sample and applied that X should be added as a party to the suit as the question between him (B) and X was the same as the question between him (B) and A (1) whether the goods were according to the sample) so as to relieve him (B) from the necessity of bringing a fresh suit against X in the event of the Court holding that the goods were not according to the sample. *Held* refusing B's application that X was not a person who ought to be joined as a party to the suit nor was his presence necessary to decide the questions involved in the suit. In this case A had nothing to do with Y and to add Y as a party would be to introduce a new cause of action which existed only as between B and Y. The Court would then have to inquire into the circumstances under which B's agreement with Y was entered into an inquiry with which A had nothing to do (k)

Parties cannot be added so as to alter the nature of the suit—A sued for his share of the estate of a deceased relative. On an application to have other persons interested in the said estate added as parties to the suit it was held that the Court could not add them as parties as to do so would be to alter the nature of the suit by converting it into a general administration suit (l) It has similarly been held that parties should not be added in a suit for rent so as to change it into a suit for title though questions of title may be incidentally investigated in a suit for arrears of rent e.g. where the tenant disputes the extent of the title of the plaintiff to the arrears claimed by the plaintiff (m)

**Transposing defendant as plaintiff**—The Court has power under sub r (2) to transfer a defendant to the category of plaintiffs. Thus where A and B are trustees

(d) *T. Ram Singh v. Kishore* (1898) 20 All. 188

(e) *Jot. dra v. L. J.* (1905) 3 Cal. 483

(f) *Kale the v. M. J.* (1906) 3 Rang. 44

9 I. C. 1 (6) All. 9

(g) *Th. D. de of I. cleuch* [1901] P. 91

(h) *McCh. a. e. v. Lyles* (No. 2) [1900] 1 Ch. 911

912

(i) *Moorv. Mar. d. n.* [1900] 1 Ch. 49

(j) *1. a. th. i. n. g. v. S. d. n. r. a.* (1906) 50 Mad.

349 I. C. 16 (6) A. M. 836

(k) *Mah. m. d. End. fa. v. V. uol* (1890) 4 Cal. 35

*P. leigh v. Gouchen* [1892] 1 Ch. 381

(l) *Oh. Ling. Tee v. Au. n. fee* (1903) 10 W. R.

28 *Il. gu. Lai v. B. kio. Lam* (1900) 4

All. 553 555

(m) *Abd. IG. ef. v. Al. M. ual* (1903) 3 Cal. W. N.

408 I. C. 360 (25) A. C. d. J. v. rat. v.

*Amulva* (1900) 45 (all. L. J. 146 101 I. C.

5 ( ) A. C. 340

of certain property and *A* brings a suit to recover the property from *C* impleading *B* as a defendant the Court may on *A*'s death transpose *B* as plaintiff for the further conduct of the suit (n). In a Bombay case *A* brought a partnership suit for accounts against 12 defendants. He then settled with most of the defendants and applied to the Court for leave to withdraw the suit or that the suit might be dismissed. Two of the defendants objected to the dismissal of the suit and applied that they might be made plaintiffs and that the plaintiff might be made a defendant and the suit proceeded with. The Court granted the application (o). *A* sues *B* to recover money borrowed by *B* from *C* who is dead alleging that *C* had created a trust of the money and that he was appointed trustee of the money. *C*'s widow is impleaded as a co defendant in the suit. It is found that the money sued for was not trust money but it belonged absolutely to *C*. This is a proper case in which the Court should remove the widow from the array of defendants and bring her in the array of plaintiffs (p). A defendant may be transferred to the category of plaintiffs on his application even after a preliminary decree for accounts has been passed (q). But the Court should not make an order transferring a defendant to the category of plaintiffs if it results in changing the character of the suit (r). *A* sues *B* to recover a sum of money and impleads *C* who says that he and not *A* is entitled to the money as a co defendant. *C* applies that he should be allowed to continue the suit as plaintiff instead of *A*. The application should be refused even if it is found that *C* and not *A* is entitled to the money. To grant the application would be to deprive *A* of his right to ask for a determination upon his claim (s).

**Transposing plaintiff as defendant**—In the case of a difference between co plaintiffs the proper course is to make an order that the name of one of them be struck out as plaintiff and added as a defendant (t). But such an order will be made only on security being given by the plaintiff who continues on the record as plaintiff for the costs of the original defendant up to the date of the amendment (u). Such an order may be supported by the terms of sub r (2) namely on such terms as may appear to the Court to be just.

**Striking out name of party improperly joined**—The impropriety referred to in this rule is in introducing a party who has no connection with the relief claimed in the plaint (v).

**Who ought to have been joined**—Sub r (2) provides for the addition of (1) necessary parties and (2) of proper parties. Necessary parties are parties who ought to have been joined that is parties necessary to the constitution of the suit without whom no decree at all can be passed (w). Proper parties are those whose presence enables the Court to adjudicate more effectually and completely (x) as explained in the next paragraph.

All co sharers are necessary parties to a suit for partition and they should all be joined as parties to the suit. Similarly in a suit to recover trust property all the trustees must be joined as parties [O 31 r 2]. But the Official Assignee is not a necessary party in a suit against an insolvent (y) [see O 22 r 10 notes. Assignment of interest ill (3) and (4)]. In a suit to set aside an order for rateable distribution all persons interested in the distribution must be parties to the suit (z) see s 73. In a suit for dissolution of

(n) *Saminatha v Raj gopal* (19 1) 40 Mad L J 38 6 I C 360 (1) A M 124

(o) *Eduleja v Fullebb* (1883) Bom 167

(p) *Boal Chand v Bhoop Singh* (19 8) 3 Luck 41 10 I C 43 (1) A O 484

(q) *Deb d'va v N e dra* (1919) 4 Cal W N 110 54 I C 636

(r) *Jay ba dhu v Haris* (19 3) 36 Cal L J 9 6 I C 15 (1) A C 459

(s) *J o v Bhagwan* (19 1) 19 All L J 833 63 I C 3 (1) A A 184

(t) *Math v Inre* [190 ] Ch 460

(u) *Bh abendra v Uday Narai* (19 3) 50 Cal 83 9 I C 293 (1) A C 51

(v) *Rama Rao v Th Raja of Fut pur* (1919) 4 Cal 10 5 49 I C 835

(w) *K h J s d v H r r a n s gh* (1911) 33 40 2 2 6 9 I C 39 [1 C] 584

(x) *581 51 I C 3* (1919) 43 Bom 5 5 581 51 I C 223 *supra*

(y) *Chandmull v Pa es* (189 ) C I 259

(z) *G ur I road v Lam lat n* (1896) 13 Cal 19

partnership all partners are necessary parties but a person who is not in the partnership as a member of the firm but who is a member of a superior partnership in which he is on one side and the whole firm as a unit on the other is not a necessary party (a) See notes below Limitation Act

Whose presence before the Court may be necessary — A person may be added as a defendant to a suit though no relief may be claimed against him provided his presence is necessary for a complete and final decision of the questions involved in the suit (b) Such a person is called a *proper* party as distinguished from a *necessary* party. Thus if a suit is brought by a legatee against an executor for a legacy but the estate is not sufficient to pay all the legacies in full the executor may apply under sub rule (2) that the other legatees may be made parties so that if any rateable abatement is requisite the extent of such abatement may be ascertained in a manner binding on all the legatees (c) In a suit by a benamidar of the mortgagee the mortgagee may be made a party to the suit if his presence is necessary for the proper determination of the suit (d) Where in an administration suit in which the original parties do not dispute one another's status as heirs a person applies to be made a defendant and claims to be the sole heir of the deceased whose estate is to be administered so that if his claim is established the suit would be dismissed it was held that the Court can allow him to be added as a defendant in the suit in order to prevent multiplicity of suits and such person need not be compelled to file a separate suit to establish his status (e) See notes above Who ought to have been joined

Questions involved in the suit — Questions involved in the suit refer only to questions between parties to the suit (f) Further they refer only to questions as between plaintiffs and defendants and not to questions which may arise between co plaintiffs or between co defendants *inter se* (g)

Improper addition of plaintiff or defendant — Sub rule (2) does not enable a Court to override the effect of O 2 r 3. Hence if the joinder of a person as plaintiff would result in a misjoinder of plaintiffs and causes of action or the joinder of a person as defendant would result in a misjoinder of defendants and causes of action the application should be refused (h) Similarly if the joinder of a person as plaintiff is not possible under O 1 r 1 it does not become possible under this rule (i)

Joint contractors — See notes to O 1 r 6 Joint liability on a contract.

Consent of person added as plaintiff — If any person who ought to have been joined as plaintiff does not consent to join as plaintiff he may be made a defendant in the suit. The proper course is first to require him to join as plaintiff and if he refuses to join as plaintiff then to join him as defendant. But the suit should not be dismissed merely because he is joined as defendant without being first called upon to join as plaintiff (j)

Suit against a dead person — Where a suit is brought against a person who is found to have died before its institution the plaint cannot be amended by bringing his legal representative on the record though the suit may have been filed in ignorance of his death. The reason is that a suit against a dead man is a nullity from the first (l) But if a suit is against several defendants one of whom is found to have died before

- (a) *S. Thappa v. S. Bra.* 1911 C 17 (1) A I C 0  
(b) *Fash v. S. la. la.* (185) 1 Born 9  
(c) *I. rikollim v. K. la.* (190) 6 Born 301  
(d) *I. th. a. v. I. n. m.* (13) 45 M 1 L  
J 8 6 115 1 C 340 (9) A M 68  
(e) *M. g. T. v. M. g. T.* (19) 1 Ran  
159 103 1 C ( ) A R 19  
(f) *Y. th. l. g. v. I. n. m.* (19 6) 50 Mal 34  
9 1 C 14 (6) A M 836  
(g) *H. r. a. a. v. J. har. g.* (184) 9 All 44

- Y. th. v. B. a. m.* (1891) 15 Born 145  
(h) *K. l. a. n. v. P. a. m. l. a. n.* (1896) 18 All 306  
(i) *C. A. imbaram v. A. drama. m.* (19) 53  
Mad L J 69 10 I C 114 ( ) A M  
834  
(j) *P. y. v. K. ed. a. th.* (1899) 8 Cal 409 Eud  
v. th. v. w. d. (190) 4 All 2 6  
(k) *M. a. h. a. Ch. u. J. e. v. v. 4. a. n.* (1 62) 12 W R  
45 1 r p p v. T. a. d. l. (1902) 31 M 1 86  
*J. a. m. p. r. a. t. b. C. a. r. n. a. h. a. n. k.* (19 3) 1 Com.  
L R 11 6 I C 464 ( ) A B 109

10 its institution the suit should not be dismissed. It should proceed against the other defendants and the legal representatives of the deceased should be joined if he was a necessary party (l)

Limitation Act sec 22 provides amongst other things that when after the institution of a suit a party is added as a plaintiff or defendant the date of addition is to be considered as regards that party as the date of the institution of the suit. It has been held under this section that where necessary parties are not joined within the period of limitation the suit must be dismissed. Necessary parties mean parties necessary to the constitution of the suit (m) that is persons whose joinder is necessary to enable the Court to award such relief as may be given in the suit as framed (n). Thus in a suit by one of several joint promisees the other promisees are necessary parties for no relief can be given to one of them. The suit is not perfectly constituted unless all the co promisees join for the plaintiff can only enforce his claim in conjunction with them. If in such a suit the other promisees are not joined within the period of limitation the suit must be dismissed (o). Similarly where A, B and C were three partners and A sued B only for partnership accounts and C was added as a defendant after the period of limitation the suit was dismissed (p). On the same ground where a member of a joint Hindu family sued in his own name for a joint debt without making the other members parties to the suit and the defendant raised an objection on the ground of non joinder and the period of limitation had by that time expired it was held that it was too late to join the other members as co plaintiffs as the claim was at that date time barred and the suit was accordingly dismissed (q). And the suit must likewise be dismissed even if the Court of its own motion adds the other members as plaintiffs in circumstances such as those mentioned above. The mere fact that the Court of its own motion orders that the name of any person be added as a party does not render the provisions of s 22 inapplicable to the case (r). There is nothing in sub rule (2) which frees the Court when acting of its own motion from the restrictions of the Limitation Act in other words a Court acting under sub rule (2) is bound by the provisions of s 22 of the Limitation Act (s) and the rights which parties may have acquired under the Limitation Act are therefore safeguarded (t). On the other hand when a suit can be and is constituted without joining certain persons as parties and they are subsequently added as parties for the benefit of the defendants to ensure them against further litigation the suit should proceed though they are added as parties after the expiry of the period of limitation and the Court should award such relief as may be given in the suit as framed to such a case the provisions of s 22 do not apply (u). Thus where a promissory note is passed to the manager of a joint Hindu family he may sue the promisor without joining the other members of the family as co plaintiffs. In such a case if the other members are joined as plaintiffs after the statutory period has expired their joinder being unnecessary does not prevent the suit as originally constituted from being in time (v). It has similarly been held that that section does not apply when a person is added as a party

- (l) *Roop Chand v Sa dar Khan* (19-8) 9 Lah 60 1101 C 281 (3) A.L. 39  
 (m) *Kishan Iradat v Har Narain Si gh* (1911) 3 All 2 76 91 C 39 [P.C.]  
 (n) *G Rujayya v Anant* (1904) 8 Bom 11 17  
 (o) *Famsabul v Rami* (1881) 6 Cal 815  
 (p) *Ramdayal v Junmejoy* (188) 11 Cal 91  
 (q) *Kal dar v Nathu* (1888) 7 Bom 217 *Pat m bat v Furda* (1897) 1 Bom 590  
*Sehan v Leera* (1909) 5 Mad 294 4 1 C 33  
 (r) *Imam ud Din v Liladhar* (189) 11 All 5 4  
 (s) *Famskar v AKAICH dra* (1908) 3 Cal 519  
 (t) *Chooli g m v Verlia* (1907) 6 Bom. 29  
 107 1 C 37 (3) A.P.C. 2  
 (u) *Gururayya v Ana* (1904) 28 Bom 11 Pat

- shra Partap v Rudra Narain* (1904) 26 All 5 8 affirmed on app to 1 C (1910) 3 All 41 61 C 981 *Mazari Jai v Bhawanji Lam* (1908) 30 All 538 *Thatu Mans v Das Han Koeri* (1906) 33 C 1 10 9 *Annam lai v Ji r gappa* (1915) 38 M d 837 84 2 I C 86 *Purehand v Aro du* (1915) 39 Bom 9 31 I C 180 *SH Ans heb v S daship* (1919) 43 Bom 575 680 581 61 I C 923 *Contra Alatherson v Lam A nai* (1909) 36 C 18 687 689 11 C 66 *Shirubai v Shaddestwar* (191) 45 Bom 1009 1013 61 I C 590 (1) A 11 15 *Coori Mills v Ball v das* (1915) 97 Bom L.R. 1168 94 I C 55 (3) A 11 547  
 (v) *Kisho J sh d v Har A ro n* (1911) 38 I A 45 33 All. 2 91 C 739

merely to enable the Court effectually and completely to adjudicate upon the questions involved in the suit without any relief being claimed against him (w) Further the section does not apply where an assignee from a party to a suit the assignment having been made pending the suit is joined as a party to the suit (x) It has also been held that that section does not apply where a person is joined as a defendant in a suit and he is subsequently added as a plaintiff (y) In a case before the Privy Council where relief was claimed against a *debtor* estate but none of the defendants was impleaded as representing the estate and subsequently though after the expiration of the period of limitation prescribed for the suit one of the defendants [*i.e.* a person *already a party to the suit*] was impleaded as *sebit* and as representing the estate it was held that s 22 of the Limitation Act did not apply to the case ( ) Where a suit is originally brought against a firm in the name of the firm but subsequently the title of the plaint is amended by substituting the names of the members of the defendants family on its being brought that the defendant is not a firm but an undivided Hindu family the suit is not affected by the provisions of sec 22 (1) of the Indian Limitation Act since there is no addition of parties but only a substitution in order to correct a misdescription (a)

**Party may be added at any stage of suit**—Subject to the provisions of the Limitation Act referred to above a person may be added as a party to a suit at any stage of the suit and even at the time of passing the decree (b)

**Misdescription**—Where there is a misdescription of a defendant in the title of a suit there is complete power in the Court to make the necessary correction with out regard to lapse of time In this class of cases it is material to ascertain against whom the relief is claimed A sues the Municipal Committee of Gorakhpur through the Secretary instead of suing the Committee through the Resident as ought to have been done The relief claimed is against the Committee *No personal relief is sought against the Secretary* The case is one of misdescription and the plaint may be amended though the application for amendment is made after the expiry of the period of limitation (c) A sues The Agent B B & C I Ry Co Ltd The relief claimed is against the railway company No personal relief is claimed against the Agent A applies for amendment of the plaint after the expiry of the statutory period by striking out the word Agent The amendment should be allowed the suit being substantially against the company (d) But if the relief claimed was as against the Agent *personally* the amendment can be allowed only if there is no question of limitation (e) but not after the expiry of the period of limitation for the suit (f) Where a suit is brought against a joint Hindu family firm in the name of the firm the title of the plaint may be amended by substituting the names of the members of the joint family even after the period of limitation prescribed for the institution of the suit (g) Where a partner in a firm carrying on business out of British India and to which O 30 does not apply files a suit in the name of the firm and applies afterwards to amend the plaint by adding the names of the partners the case is not one of misdescription but of substitution within sub rule (1) of this rule (h) See note to sub rule (1) Amendment allowed

(u) *Maham d Ishag v Sheikh Ali* (1908) 1 C W N 84

(x) *Ar n h Ha v Orr* (1917) 40 Mad 9  
1 C 631 But see *Add l Rahman v*  
*Im r Al* (190 ) 31 C 1 61

(y) *Ah d r Moide n v Ja a Na i* (1894) 1 Mad  
1 N g dr tal v Ta pada (190 ) 35  
Cal 106 v s gh l man (1910) 34  
Bomb 91 41 C 49 Limitation Act 1908  
s 22 (1)

(z) *Te r y M h a v v Na n t* (180 ) 3  
Cal 54 *Shrim l* (1909) 3 Cal 1 9 3  
1 A 51 C 404

(a) *Pa pr s d v N r s* (19 ) Bom L R  
11 90 1 C 6 ( ) A B

(b) *Arish a v M d lal* (19 9) 31 Bom L R  
4 6 ( ) A B 33

(c) *Mann v Crooks* (1890) " All 98

(d) *Saravpu Ma fact n g Co v B B & C I*  
*Ry C* (19 3) 47 Bom 3 31 C 10  
( ) A B 45

(e) *Ind a Ge al s d F Co Ltd v Lal*  
*Mohan* (1916) 43 Cal 411 1 C 3

(f) *En l Ind a Fa l u r Co v l m Lak* n (19 4)  
31 Cal 20 81 C 31 ( ) A 1 3  
*Ag nt l eng l N a g y r l l u a j v l e l a r*  
*L l* (19 ) 5 Cal 25 90 1 C 4 6 ( )  
A C 16

(g) *Pam y asad v Sh n e* (19 ) " Bom  
L R 11 90 1 C 6 5 ( ) A B

(h) *Inda l a h v l l u l v l e l a m a l m a d* (19 9)  
3 Bom L R 11 109 1 C 20 (25) A  
B 191



**Appeal**—No appeal lies under this Code from any order made under this rule. But where the name of a defendant is struck out under this rule on the ground that the plaintiff does not disclose any cause of action against him the order operates as a decree and is appealable as such (i). Similarly if in a suit for partition the name of one of the defendants is struck out on the ground that he has no interest in the properties the subject matter of the suit he may appeal from the order as the order operates as a decree against him (j).

**Revision**—An order refusing to add a party as a defendant is not subject to revision under s 115 but the High Court may interfere under s 107 of the Government of India Act 1915 if there is a denial of the right of fair trial (k). Nor is an order refusing to substitute as plaintiffs in a suit persons interested in the suit (l).

**11** [S 32, 6th para Cf R S C O 16, r 39] The Court may give the conduct of the suit to such person as it deems proper

Conduct of suit

**Person**—The word person refers to a party to the suit and the Court cannot give the conduct of the suit to a stranger (m).

**12** [S 35] (1) Where there are more plaintiffs than one, any one or more of them may be authorized by any other of them to appear, plead or act for such other in any proceeding, and in like manner, where there are more defendants than one, any one or more of them may be authorized by any other of them to appear, plead or act for such other in any proceeding

Appearance of one of several plaintiffs or defendants for others

(2) The authority shall be in writing signed by the party giving it and shall be filed in Court

**13** [S 34] All objections on the ground of non joinder or misjoinder of parties shall be taken at the earliest possible opportunity and, in all cases where issues are settled, at or before such settlement, unless the ground of objection has subsequently arisen, and any such objection not so taken shall be deemed to have been waived

Objections as to non joinder or misjoinder

**Scope of the rule**—This rule refers to two kinds of objections the one for non joinder of parties and the other for misjoinder of parties. These objections must be taken at the earliest possible opportunity and in all cases where issues are settled at or before such settlement otherwise the objection will be deemed to have been waived (n).

(i) *Pama Rao v The Raja of Pimpur* (1919) 4 Mad 19 49 I C 83

(j) *P. m. v. Alafkhan* (19 4) 2 Pat 8 9 8 I C 90 (—) A P 11

(k) *Pabbala v. V. J. Han* (1886) 13 Cal 90  
*Kali I. v. T. I. Han* (19—) 4 Pat 7 3  
 93 I C 93 (—) A P 07

(l) *Prudable Trust Comp. v. Hafu* (19—)  
 OAR 8 108 I C 35 (24) A A 9

(m) *T. p. v. Srim. Beg. in* (1924) 46 Cal L J 530 106 I C 8 4 (28) A C 143

(n) *Obay v. H. v. Ch. m.* (18—) 8 Cal. 409  
*Ta. mas v. Krish. a.* (1891) 11 Mad 409  
*Su. kottam v. Kala* (190—) 26 Lam 301

Where an objection to non joinder (o) or misjoinder (p) of parties is not taken in the Court of first instance it will be disallowed in appeal See notes to O 1 r 9 above See also s 99

**Unless the ground of objection has subsequently arisen** —These words are new When the ground of objection has arisen subsequent to the settlement of issues the objection may be taken even after the settlement of issues In fact it was so held under the old section though the words unless the ground of objection has subsequently arisen did not occur in that section Thus if a coparcener or a reversioner or a remainderman is born *after* the settlement of issues in a suit to which he is a necessary party and the plaintiff does not make him a party the defendant may object to his non joinder though issues have already been settled Thus in a partition suit all coparceners must be joined as parties even though some of them may be born after the institution of the suit Similarly where a woman who is a party to a suit is married *after* the settlement of issues and the nature of the suit is such that the husband is a necessary party the plaintiff should make the husband a party and the defendant may raise this objection though it be *after* the settlement of issues (q)

As to misjoinder of causes of action see O 2 r 7

## ORDER II

### *Frame of Suit*

**1 [S 42]** Every suit shall as far as practicable be framed so as to afford ground for final decision upon the subjects in dispute and to prevent further litigation concerning them

Frame of suit

From this rule read with r 2 below the intention of the Legislature appears to be that as far as possible all matters in dispute between the parties relating to the same transaction should be disposed of in the same suit (r)

**2 [S 43]** (1) Every suit shall include the whole of the claim which the plaintiff is entitled to make in respect of the cause of action, but a plaintiff may relinquish any portion of his claim in order to bring the suit within the jurisdiction of any Court

Suit to include the whole claim

(2) Where a plaintiff omits to sue in respect of, or intentionally relinquishes, any portion of his claim, he shall not afterwards sue in respect of the portion so omitted or relinquished

Relinquishment of part of claim

(o) *I hotlam v Kaa* (1902) 28 Bom 301  
*Ia a v Arishna* (1901) 14 M d 493

(p) *F kirapa v P d pa* (1901) 16 Bom 119  
 1

(q) *Madha v Dongre* (1881) 5 Bom 609  
 (r) *r i Chand v M k n Bha* (1904) 30 Cal 371 See also *I acra v I yth aha* (1903) 6 Mad 611 64 66 *M su ma* *naa TA rutengadam* (1908) 31 Mad 335 394 398

(3) A person entitled to more than one relief in respect of the same cause of action may sue for all or any of such reliefs, but if he omits, except with the leave of the Court, to sue

Omission to sue for one of several reliefs

for all such reliefs, he shall not afterwards sue for any relief so omitted

*Explanation*—For the purposes of this rule an obligation and a collateral security for its performance and successive claims arising under the same obligation shall be deemed respectively to constitute but one cause of action

#### Illustration

A lets a house to B at a yearly rent of Rs 1200. The rent for the whole of the years 1905, 1906 and 1907 is due and unpaid. A sues B in 1908 only for the rent due for 1906. A shall not afterwards sue B for the rent due for 1905 or 1907.

*Changes in the section*—The words obtained before the first hearing after the words the leave of the Court [see sub rule (3)] have been omitted. The words and successive claims arising under the same obligation have been added into the Explanation. The illustration has been expanded so as to comprise the case of rent due for a period subsequent to the one for which the suit is brought.

*Cause of action*—In *Pitapur Paja v Suriya Rau* (s) their Lordships of the Privy Council referring to the expression cause of action in this rule said that it meant the cause of action for which the suit was brought. Referring to this decision their Lordships said in the recent case of *Muhammad Hafi v Muhammad Zakariya* (t).

The Lordships see no reason to attempt to qualify or to extend those words because they are in fact nothing but a repetition of the exact words of the Code. The cause of action is the cause of action which gives occasion for and forms the foundation of the suit and if that cause enables a man to ask for larger and wider relief than that to which he limits his claim he cannot afterwards seek to recover the balance by independent proceedings. See notes to s 20. Cause of action.

*Splitting of claim*—This and the preceding rule are aimed against a multiplicity of suits in respect of the same cause of action (u). The object of the present rule is to use the language of r 1 of this order to prevent further litigation. For that purpose the rule provides that every suit shall include the whole of the claim which the plaintiff is entitled to make in respect of the same cause of action. He is not entitled to split his cause of action into parts and bring separate suits in respect of each part. If he omits to sue in respect of or intentionally relinquishes any portion of the claim arising from the same cause of action he will be precluded from suing in respect of the portion so omitted or relinquished even though he states in his plaint that he intends to bring a second suit for the portion omitted (v). But it cannot be said of a plaintiff that he has omitted to sue in respect of a portion of his claim unless he was at some time prior to the suit aware or informed of the claim or of the facts which would give him a cause of action (w). If the plaintiff was aware of the claim and omitted to sue in respect thereof he could not afterwards sue in respect thereof though the omission

(s) (1885) 8 M.L.J. 505, 12 I.A. 116, 119.

(t) (1922) 49 I.A. 9, 144 All.L.J. 1665, 1 C.79 (2), A.C. 23.

(u) *Ali v. P. v. M. Lon* (1911) 38 I.A. 140, 115 All.C. 497.

(v) *W. I. v. A. v. A.* (1893) 9 Cal. 322.

(w) *Le. I. v. A. v. A.* (1893) 6 Mad. 311. *Am. v. Indad Hori* (1888) 15 Cal. 800, 15 I.A. 106. *Sanku v. Parakkal* (1890) 19 Mad. 145. *B. v. R. v. R.* (1910) 3 All. 65, 71 C. 20.

was accidental or involuntary (x) For the definition of cause of action see notes to s 20 Cause of action

### Illustrations

(1) *Relinquishment*—A owes B Rs 2 200 B may relinquish Rs 200 to bring his suit within the jurisdiction of a Presidency Small Cause Court and may sue A in that Court for Rs 2 000 only Here the relinquishment being intentional B cannot afterwards sue A for Rs 200 the portion relinquished But if the suit is transferred on A's application to the High Court B may add Rs 200 to his claim the High Court having jurisdiction over the entire claim *Ramlall v Bhajhar* (1896) 1 C W N 32

(2) *Accidental omission*—A Mahomedan wife sues her husband to recover property belonging to her including Government paper of the value of Rs 10 000 and a decree is passed in her favour She afterwards sues the husband to recover from him Government paper of the value of Rs 500 alleging that she omitted to include it in the previous suit by an oversight The suit is barred for she was aware of her claim when she brought the previous suit *Bulloor Ruheem v Shumsoonnissa* (1867) 11 M I A 51

(3) *Instalments*—Where a promissory note is payable by instalments and two or more instalments have become due and the holder of the note sues only for one of the instalments and omits to sue for the other instalments he cannot afterwards sue for those instalments *MacIntosh v Gill* (1874) 12 B L R 37 *Narayan v Mumba* (1906) 8 Bom L P 547 Similarly if a promissory note is made payable by instalments and it is provided that in default of payment of any one instalment the whole of the balance shall be payable immediately a suit for recovery of the unpaid instalment will bar a subsequent suit for the balance *Shrinivas v Chanbasapagouda* (1923) 25 Bom L R 203 72 I C 290 (23) A B 201 In a Madras case it was said that there was no bar if the default clause gave the obligee the option of recovering the whole balance due at once as where the words used were when required or when you require or if you choose or you will be at liberty to sue *Mulyaprana v Kalu* (1928) 112 I C 270 (28) A M 705 The *Mulyaprana* case was considered by the same High Court in *Rego v Philip* (1929) 56 Mad L J 580 (29) A M 371

(4) *Two promises for one debt*—A accompanies B a pleader to Hardwar as B's medical attendant for which Rs 1 300 become due to him as his fees B passes a promissory note to A for Rs 700 and agrees as for the balance of Rs 600 to do certain legal work for A B dies without doing the legal work undertaken by him A sues C B's son upon the promissory note and a decree is passed for him He then brings another suit against C to recover the Rs 600 alleging that the legal work which B had agreed to do for him had not been done The suit for the recovery of Rs 600 is barred *Preonath v Bisanath* (1907) 29 All 256 The above decision has been dissented from by the High Court of Madras on the ground that if several promissory notes are executed for portions of the same debt each promissory note creates a distinct cause of action on which a separate suit may be brought *Anantanarayana v Sarithri* (1913) 36 Mad L J 158 13 I C 458

(5) *Set off*—A sues B for Rs 200 As against the said claim B claims to set off Rs 200 being part of a sum of Rs 1 200 alleged to be due to him by A but omits to counterclaim from A the balance of Rs 1 000 B cannot afterwards sue A to recover Rs 1 000 *Narbut v Mahesh* (1905) 32 Cal 654

(6) *Continuous account*—When a tradesman has a bill against a party for any amount in which the items are so connected together that it appears that the dealing is not intended to terminate with one contract but to be continuous so that one item if not paid shall be united with another and form one continuous demand, the whole

together forms but *one cause of action* and cannot be divided *Bonsey v Wordsworth* (1856) 18 C B 32, 334 *Kedar Nath v Dinabandhu* (1915) 42 Cal 1043 31 I C 696

(7) *Omission of portion of a claim in a suit against one of several promisors*—The omission of a portion of a claim in a suit against one of several promisors is no bar to a subsequent suit against another promisor in respect of the portion so omitted. A lets a house to B and C at a yearly rent of Rs 1200. The rent for the whole of the years 1906, 1906 and 1907 is due and unpaid. A sues B in 1908 for the rent due for 1907. A cannot afterwards sue B for the rent due for 1906 or 1906 but he can sue C for the rent due for those two years (y). See the illustration to the present rule.

(8) A suit for redemption of two out of three plots comprised in one mortgage is a bar to a subsequent suit for redemption of the third plot. *Bhau Day v Pallu* (1922) 24 Bom L R 1157 73 I C 862 (23) A B 63

(9) A suit by a reversioner against X to recover two out of three properties alienated to him by a Hindu widow having a limited interest is a bar to a subsequent suit against him to recover the third. *Darbars v Gobind* (1924) 46 All 822 60 I C 31 (24) A A 902

(10) A suit by a coparcener that a mortgage of one property is not binding on him bars a suit for a similar relief as to another property included in the same mortgage. *Abhaidat v Ragho* (1925) 1 Luck 1 91 I C 976 (25) A O 77. See also *Abhaidat Singh v Ragho* (1926) 1 Luck 1 91 I C 976 (26) A O 77

(11) If a mortgage and a lease are one transaction a suit for rent will bar a suit to recover the mortgage money. *Diran Chand v Ralla Ram* (1926) 8 Lah. L J 381 97 I C 396 (26) A L 99. But not so if the transactions are separate. *Gurdial v Diran Chand* (1928) 112 I C 15 (28) A L 732

#### Explanation to the Rule—

A *Obligation and collateral security for its performance*—The Explanation to the present rule is not intended to be an illustration of the foregoing provision but a substantive enactment making an obligation and a collateral security for its performance (which would otherwise be two independent causes of action) one cause of action for the purposes of the rule (z). In a recent case their Lordships of the Privy Council said (a)

The [Explanation] shows that a personal claim for the mortgage money under a mortgage and the enforcement of the security for the debt are to be regarded as *one and the same cause of action*. That provision is in marked distinction to the law of this country where a mortgagee is at liberty to appoint a receiver under his deed to sue for the debt and to take proceedings for sale or foreclosure independently and at the same time.

It is important therefore in considering the effect of the code to bear in mind that its obvious intention is to establish a rule of law different from that accepted here. See notes below. First suit for interest due under a mortgage second suit for principal and Exceptions to the rule against splitting of reliefs.

B *Successive claims arising under the same obligation constitute a single cause of action*—The words *successive claims arising under the same obligation* have been added into the Explanation and the illustration to the rule has been expanded to give effect to a Calcutta decision where it was held that a claim in respect of all arrears of rent constitutes a *single cause of action* (b). The illustration shows that if rent has become due for the years 1905, 1906 and 1907 the landlord can bring only one suit for the whole of the rent in arrears and that if he sues for the rent due for a particular year only he will be precluded from suing for the rent due for the other years. It must

(y) *Pam Nyulu v Aracamu* (1910) 3 Mad 317 51 I C 735

(z) *Pajana v Jona La a* (1914) 41 I A 14 118 61 I C 2-3

(a) *Kul N Nagan v Peia M I* (1933) 50 I A

115 117 4 Lah 3 31 7 I C 197 ( ) A PC 41

(b) *Tareek Chander v Panch* (1881) 6 Cal 791 *Mahomedbhai v Ad m* (1922) 46 I m 229 35 61 I C 919 ( ) 4 B

however be noted that though this rule precludes the landlord from bringing a *fresh* suit for rent not included in the former suit it does not prevent him from adopting any other remedy the law gives him to recover the rent. Thus though in the case put in the illustration the landlord cannot sue for the rent due for the year 1900 or 1907 he can dis-train for the rent due for those years (c). On the same principle as in the illustration a suit for an annuity for the year 1917 is a bar to a subsequent suit for annuity for the years 1914 1915 and 1916 (d). See also ill (7) above.

Interest accruing due from time to time under a mortgage deed maintenance *malikana* &c are other instances of successive claims arising under the same obligation.

**Distinct causes of action**—If the cause of action in the subsequent suit is different from that in the first suit the subsequent suit is not barred (e). What the rule requires is that every suit shall include the whole of the claim arising from one and the same cause of action and not that every suit shall include every claim or every cause of action which the plaintiff may have against the defendant (f). As observed by their Lordships of the Privy Council in *Payana v. Pana Lana* (g) the rule is directed to securing the exhaustion of the relief in respect of a cause of action and not to the inclusion in one and the same action of different causes of action even though they arise from the same transaction. One great criterion when the question arises as to whether the cause of action in the subsequent suit is identical with that in the first suit is whether the same evidence will maintain both actions (h). For the meaning of cause of action see notes above. Cause of action.

#### Illustrations

(1) *Different properties different defendants*—A claiming as his father's heir sues B for possession of a certain piece of land. He then sues C also as his father's heir for possession of another piece of land. The fact that both pieces of land are claimed by A under the same title does not preclude A from maintaining separate suits against B and C. *Dampantoboyina v. Aldala* (1902) 25 Mad 736. *Narayan v. Shamrao* (1903) 27 Bom 379. *Ramekhantra v. Gajanan* (1920) 44 Bom 300. 362 56 I C 349.

(2) A suit brought by some members of a joint Hindu family against other members of the same family for partition of joint family property does not bar a second suit by the same plaintiffs for partition of other property belonging jointly to the family and strangers. *Purehottam v. Altmaram* (1899) 23 Bom 597.

(3) A sues B for specific performance of an agreement for the sale to him of B's land and obtains a decree. In execution of the decree A is put in possession of a portion only of the land as it is found that the rest of the land did not belong to B but to B's son. A subsequent suit by A against B for recovery of an aliquot portion of the price to the extent of the son's share is not barred under this rule the cause of action being entirely distinct. *Venkatarama v. Venkatia* (1901) 24 Mad 27. *Parangodan v. Perumtholula* (1904) 27 Mad 380.

(4) A suit by a Mahomedan widow for dower is no bar to a subsequent suit by her for a declaration of her right to possess for life her husband's estate in accordance with a proved local custom. *Mahomed v. Hasan Bano* (1894) 21 Cal 157. 20 I A 150.

(c) *E. a. a. Doss v. Venkataraj* (1898) 1 Mad 60.

(d) *Abul Feroze v. M. Hamma* (1904) 44 All 661. 65 I C 90 (1) A 439.

(e) *Mullick v. Shro. Froshad* (1896) 3 Cal 81. 80 I C 100. 101 I C 100. 102 I C 100.

(f) *Put v. Raj v. Suraya* (1898) 48 Mad 50. 51 I C 114. 115 I C 114. 116 I C 114.

(g) *Imdad* (1888) 15 Cal 800. 15 I C 106.

(h) *man v. H. vman* (1853) 19 C 113.

18 I A 153. *Jay v. J. a. J. a.* (1914) 41 I A 14. 148 I C 113. 149 I C 113.

*Pro a. v. K. d. m.* (1900) 21 Cal W N 63. 64 I C 18. (1) A C 31.

108 I C 613. (1908) 40 Cal 431.

108 I C 613. (1908) 40 Cal 431.

108 I C 613. (1908) 40 Cal 431.

108 I C 613. (1908) 40 Cal 431.

108 I C 613. (1908) 40 Cal 431.

108 I C 613. (1908) 40 Cal 431.

(5) A suit to *eject* a tenant holding under a lease is no bar to a subsequent suit against him for *rent* under the same lease *Subraya v Rathnavelu* (1909) 32 Mad. 330 2 I C 313

(6) The dismissal of a suit for a *declaration of title* under s 42 of the Specific Relief Act 1877 on the ground that the plaintiff not being in possession ought to have asked for possession also is no bar to a subsequent suit for a *declaration of title* and for possession *Darbo v Keshoras* (1879) 2 All 356 *Sarsuts v Kunj Behari Lal* (1883) 5 All 345 *Jibunti Nath v Shih Nath* (1882) 8 Cal 819 *Nonoo Singh v Anand* (1885) 12 Cal 291 *Mohan Lal v Bilaso* (1892) 14 All 512 *Sayed Suliman v Bontala* (1915) 38 Mad. 247 20 I C 418 Similarly the dismissal of a suit for an *injunction* to restrain the defendant from interfering with the plaintiff's possession of certain lands on the ground that the plaintiff was not in possession is no bar to a subsequent suit for *possession* *Bande Ali v Gokul Visir* (1912) 34 All 172 13 I C 154

(7) *Promissory note*—original cause of action—A sues B upon a *promissory note* but the action fails owing to a material alteration in the note A is not precluded from subsequently suing B on the *original cause of action* i.e. from suing B to recover the consideration for which the note was given The two causes of action are quite distinct *Payana v Pana Lana* (1914) 41 I A 142 26 I C 228 *Beni Ram v Ram Chandar* (1914) 36 All 560 26 I C 302 See also *Bhag Bhari v Gujar Mal* (1917) Punj Rec no 63 p 230 38 I C 623

(8) A alleging that he is entitled to one moiety of a piece of land and that B is entitled to the other moiety and that B falsely claiming the ownership of the whole land demolished the structures standing on A's moiety of the land and dispossessed A of his moiety sues B for damages for demolition of the structures and appropriation of the materials A decree is passed in the suit for A Subsequently A alleging that since the demolition of the structures B has been occupying the entire property to the exclusion of A by denying A's title thereto sues B for a declaration of title to one moiety of the land and for separate possession thereof Here the cause of action is the act of dispossession and it being the same in both the suits the second suit is barred under this rule *Akhardah Company Ltd v Durga Charan* (1919) 46 Cal 640 28 I C 636

(9) A suit by A against B to recover immovable property in consequence of having been improperly turned out of possession is no bar to a subsequent suit to recover from the same defendant movable property in consequence of its wrongful detention *Pillapur Paja v Suriya Rau* (1884) 8 Mad 520 12 I A 116

(10) A suit by reversioners against a Hindu widow for a declaratory decree and for an injunction forbidding alienations of her husband's property is no bar to a subsequent suit by them for a declaration that a gift made by her of the property is inoperative and cannot affect their reversionary rights *Chand Kour v Partab Singh* (1888) 15 I A 156 16 Cal 98

(11) The dismissal of a suit for specific performance by a purchaser is no bar to a subsequent suit by him for the recovery of earnest money *Munni Biba v Kunwar Hamta* (1923) 45 All 378 72 I C 86 (23) A A 321

(12) The dismissal of a suit for *rent* on the ground that the plaintiff was not the landlord but that he and the defendant held the land as tenants in common is no bar to a subsequent suit by the same plaintiff against the same defendant for *partition* of the land *Timappa v Manjamma* (1923) 25 Bom L R 491 73 I C 424 (23) A B 410

(13) The dismissal of a suit for possession by A against B on the ground that B held the property as a mortgagee is no bar to a subsequent suit by A against B for redemption *Jaimal v Aneshi Mal* (1923) 4 Lah 187 75 I C 53 (24) A L 143

(14) A mortgage deed contains a stipulation conferring upon the mortgagee the option to sue for interest or for possession in the event of the mortgagor's failure to pay

interest at the stipulated time The mortgagor fails to pay interest and the mortgagee sues him for the interest The mortgagor again fails to pay interest and the mortgagee brings a suit against him for possession The previous suit is not a bar to the subsequent suit *Parmeshri Das v Falaria* (1920) 1 Lah 407 59 I C 71 [I B]

(15) The dismissal of a suit for rent at an enhanced rate is no bar to a subsequent suit for rent at the rate originally fixed *Saddruddin v Banu* (1888) 15 Cal 14. Nor is a decree for the plaintiff in a suit for arrears of rent at the old rate a bar to a suit to recover the difference between rent at the old rate and that at the enhanced rate for the same period if the plaintiff had obtained a decree that he was entitled to rent at an enhanced rate *Deb Narain v Raja Jagadish* (1928) 32 C W N 870 110 I C 390 (28) A C 684

For other cases see foot note (i)

*First suit for possession subsequent suit for mesne profits prior to suit*—It has been held by the High Courts of Calcutta (j) Madras (k) Bombay (l) and Rangoon (m) that a suit for possession of land is not a bar to a subsequent suit for mesne profits of such land accrued due prior to the institution of the suit for possession (n) the reason given being that the cause of action for possession is quite distinct from the cause of action for mesne profits and conversely a suit for mesne profits is not a bar to a subsequent suit for possession (o) On the other hand the High Court of Allahabad (p) has held that a suit for possession is a bar to a subsequent suit for mesne profits accrued due prior to the date of the suit As regards mesne profits accrued due subsequent to a suit for possession the High Court of Allahabad has held in one case that the suit for possession is not a bar to a suit for the mesne profits (q) and in another that it is (r) See O 20 r 12 see also notes to s 11 on p 70 above

*First suit for interest due under a mortgage second suit for principal*—Where the principal secured by a mortgage has become due and the mortgagee sues for interest only a suit for interest alone will bar a subsequent suit for principal (s) unless there is a separate covenant for the payment of interest secured in a separate manner e.g. a covenant enabling the mortgagee to sue for overdue interest without calling in the principal after the date fixed for the payment of principal (t) But there is no bar at all if the principal had not become due at the date of the first suit (u)

- (i) *Ha Raj v Lal* (1904) 8 Bom 447  
*Chal dom v Kakkath* (1904) 5 Mad 669  
*Uma Lejam v Muthammada* (1911) 33 All 91 9 I C 60 [first suit for prompt dower second suit for deferred dower]  
*Sonu v Bahinidas* (1910) 40 Bom 351  
*33 I C 950 Pam Barath v Ramlal* (1916) 25 All 17 33 I C 124 [partition suits relating to properties in different districts] descended from in *Basava v Dooda Lingappa* (1913) 44 Mad L J 6 63 I C 430 (3) A M 584 *Sheobaran Singh v Brijwan Sahai* (1919) 41 All 86 50 I C 953 *L k m Das v Balak Pam* (1911) 1 unj Rec no 104 p 353 16 I C 24 *G B Shai v Havel Shal* (1915) 1 unj Rec no 87 p 35 31 I C 463 *Abd Fashid v Quadri Tun nissa* (1914) 46 All 54 9 I C 335 (24) A A 13 [first suit for specific share in immovable property—second suit for share in a dower debt] *Fhat am v Naura* (1913) 4 Lah 6 1 C 6 (-4) A L 1 *Mth mmat Hussa v Abd i* (1911) 3 Lah 1 65 I C 10 (-) A L 111 *J h v Amir* (1913) 4 Lah 5 3 I C 1 (-3) A L 63 *Sardaram L v H rde ath* (1913) Lah L J 36 8 I C 894 (-5) A L 459 *Sha m gan v Janch i* (1916) 49 Mad 506 9 I C 209 (-6) A M 693 *J h a a bapalky v Gopal* (1913) 56 Mad L J 673 (-9) A M 54 *Mohar v ng h v Dh i i R m* (1910) 11 L h. L J 64 *Durg Prasad*

- v Raja Rajan* (1918) 3 Luck 487 114 I C 169 (-8) A O 309  
 (j) *Laltesor v Jani* (1891) 19 Cal 615  
 (k) *Ponnammal v R m rda* (1915) 33 Mad 89 7 I C 69 *Ajuidus v Soudagar* (1916) 51 Mad L J 59 I C 399 (-6) A M 101  
 (l) *Pam ha dra v Lodha* (1904) 6 Bom L R 488 80 I C 59 (24) A R 363  
 (m) *Ma Mye ng v Ma o o Ch i* (1916) 4 Rang 103 9 I C 380 (-4) A R 13  
 (n) *L Messor v Jani* (1891) 19 Cal 615  
 (o) *Mo oh r Lal v Gour Sunkar* (1883) 9 Cal 93 *Turpat v Narasimha* (1888) 11 Mad 210  
 (p) *Mewa ku r v B nara Prasad* (1891) 1 All 533  
 (q) *Shoo Kum r v a ndas* (1900) 94 All 601  
 (r) *Gordh v F h mbar* (1901) 49 All 59 (-7) A A 716  
 (s) *H km t Ha v im m Al* (1900) 1 All 61  
 (t) *Lo ke i v i U i* (1891) 1 Bom 6  
 (u) *K he Va a v Pals M i* (1911) Punj Rec no 88 p 91 47 I C 937 *Natha Singh v Chua L i* (1914) Punj Rec no 69 p 30 47 I C 364 [where letter was made payable in the shape of a note under a separate writing] See also *Davison on Con eyancing* 3rd ed Vol II Part II p 591  
 (v) *Q r a d r m sa v ng pp* (1907) 54 Mad L J 636 10 I C 157 (-) A M 580 *Joseph v Joseph* (1914) 6 Lan 71 115 I C 671 (-20) A R 1



In *Muhammad Hafi v Muhammad Zakeriya (v)* A executed a simple mortgage in 1910. The mortgage provided by cl. 2 that the interest should be paid monthly and that if it was not paid for 6 months the mortgagee could realize either the unpaid interest only or both the principal and interest by bringing a suit without waiting for the expiration of the time provided for repayment of the principal. By cl. 7 it was provided that if the principal with interest was not paid within 3 years the mortgagee should be entitled to sue for principal and interest. In 1914 the mortgagee sued in respect of the interest due and obtained a decree. In 1915 he brought a second suit in respect of the principal and the interest then due. Their Lordships of the Privy Council held that the second suit could not be maintained having regard to the provisions of this rule. Their Lordships said: "What was the cause of action that the plaintiffs possessed when the proceedings were first instituted? It was the cause of action due either to the fact that the interest had been unpaid for more than six months or that the three years had elapsed and the principal was also unpaid and in either case they could have sued for realisation to provide for the whole amount secured by the deed. Not having done so they were debarred from instituting the second suit."

The question came up again before their Lordships of the Privy Council in *Aishan Yaram v Pala Mal* (w). The rule to be deduced from that decision may be stated thus. If a mortgage deed provides for the payment of principal and interest as *independent obligations* a suit for a *personal* decree for the interest due is no bar to a subsequent suit to realize the principal. In such a case the two causes of action are distinct. But if the mortgage deed in default of payment of interest gives the mortgagee the right to realize both the principal and interest and the mortgagee upon a default occurring sues to realize the interest *from the property* O 2 r 2 he is precluded from afterwards suing to realize the principal due even though his plaint in the first suit has purported to reserve the right to do so. The reason is that in such a case the cause of action—the non payment of the interest—gives rise to two forms of relief which the Code provides shall not be split see the Explanation to the Rule. Their Lordships observed that if the mortgagees in their first suit claimed only a *personal* relief in respect of the unpaid interest their case would be on surer ground. But their claim in the first suit was for a decree for interest *recoverable from the mortgaged property*.

*First suit for produce payable under a mortgage second suit for possession*—A mortgage bond provides that the mortgagor shall pay a share of the produce of the mortgaged land to the mortgagee every year and that in default the mortgagee shall be entitled to take possession of the land. The mortgagor fails to pay the produce for the year 1896. In 1897 the mortgagee sues for the value of the produce for 1896 but he does not claim possession of the land as he was entitled to do under the bond. This suit is a bar to a subsequent suit for possession on the mortgagor's failure to pay the produce for subsequent years. The mortgagee ought to have claimed possession in the first suit (x). See notes below. Omission to sue for one of several reliefs—all (1)

*Properties held under separate titles* — A plaintiff is not bound to include in the same suit separate properties held by different persons under different titles (y). But he is bound to include in the same suit all properties held by the same defendant though under different titles (z).

Different causes of action arising from the same transaction.—This rule does not require that when several causes of action arise from one transaction the

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>(r) (19<sup>3</sup>) 40 I A 9 44 AU 1 16 I C 9<sup>(a)</sup> )<br/>         I C 93 in appeal from (19<sup>1</sup>) 39 AH<br/>         06 41 I C 33</p> <p>( ) (19<sup>3</sup>) 01 A 115 4 Lah 3 - I C 187<br/>         ( ) A F C 41 <i>S. Army Ind v. Official</i><br/> <i>Assoc. of C (19<sup>1</sup>) 49 Mad 03 ( 5) A M</i><br/> <i>11 0 01 I C 403 (1) dependent covenant</i><br/> <i>to pa int test—first suit for interest</i></p> | <p>et alini g only a pr o nlr H [—nd suit<br/>         for i t rest h lln t barred]</p> <p>(r) <i>CAP F I Das v M su</i> (1914) I R 50 4 19<br/>         I C 941</p> <p>(y) <i>Lado F b ( v Jam Cha d</i> (1919) 41 AD<br/>         83 01 I C 90</p> <p>(r) <i>M rti v Bhoja Ram</i> (1904) 16 AH 163 [F D ]</p> |
|---|--|

plaintiff should sue for all of them in one suit. What the rule lays down is that where there is *one entire cause of action* the plaintiff cannot split the cause of action into parts so as to bring separate suits in respect of those parts. As observed by their Lordships of the Privy Council in *Payana v Pana Lana* (a) the rule is directed to securing the exhaustion of the relief in respect of a cause of action and not to the inclusion in one and the same action of different causes of action *even though they arise from the same transaction*. It was held in that case that a suit upon a promissory note the suit failing owing to a material alteration in the note was not a bar to a subsequent suit to recover the consideration for which the promissory note was given.

In *Anderson v Kalagarla* (b) A agreed to purchase 10 bales of yarn from B. A took delivery of 7 bales but failed to pay the price of those bales and as regards the remaining 3 bales refused to take delivery thereof. Garth C.J. expressed the opinion that a suit by B against A to recover damages for failure to take delivery of the three bales was not a bar to a subsequent suit by B to recover from A the price of the 7 bales. The learned judge observed that a claim for the price of goods sold was a cause of action of a different nature from a claim for damages for the non acceptance of goods and the fact that both claims arose under the same contract did not constitute them *one and the same cause of action*. Wilson J. expressed a different opinion stating that the claims having arisen under the same contract the cause of action was but *one* and that the subsequent suit was therefore barred. The opinion of Wilson J. was followed in *Duncan v Jeetmull* (c) which also was a case of breach of *one and the same contract*. These two cases show that all existing breaches of the same contract must be joined in the same suit but they have been held not to apply to the case where there are *separate contracts* though contained in the same instrument (d). Thus where it is expressly provided by an indent that each monthly shipment and item should be treated as a separate contract the plaintiff is entitled to bring a separate suit for damages in respect of each shipment (e). Conversely where goods are delivered under separate orders each order and delivery of goods is a separate contract and a separate cause of action unless it be proved that all the goods were delivered as under a single contract (f). See notes below. He shall not afterwards sue in respect of the portion so omitted.

Closely connected with this question is a point which was left open by their Lordships of the Privy Council namely whether a mortgagee who holds *several mortgages on the same property* can treat them with respect to the provisions of this rule as *separate causes of action* or whether he must bring one suit on all the mortgages (g). This subject has already been considered in the notes to s. 11 under the head *Application of the above rules to suits on mortgage*.

**Omits to sue in respect of any portion of his claim.**—This rule applies to cases where a suit has been filed and the plaintiff omits in such suit to sue in respect of a portion of the claim (h). It does not apply where no suit has been filed at all or where a plaintiff returned to the plaintiff for presentation to the proper Court or where the plaintiff does nothing further in the matter (i) nor does it apply where a suit is filed and subsequently withdrawn under O. 3 r. 1 (1) below (j).

**He shall not afterwards sue in respect of the portion so omitted.**—The bar is not avoided by an expression of intention to sue again (k). See notes below.

(a) (1914) 41 I.A. 14 148 61 C. 9

(b) (1890) 1 Cal. 339

(c) (189) 19 Cal. 3 See also *11 F. J. I. 1*  
*11 F. J. I. 1* (1909) 11 Bom. L. 1 46 1  
 I. C. 310

(d) *11 F. J. I. 1* (1909) 11 Bom. L. 1 46 1  
 approved in *11 F. J. I. 1* (1909) 11 Bom. L. 1 46 1  
*11 F. J. I. 1* (1909) 11 Bom. L. 1 46 1  
*11 F. J. I. 1* (1909) 11 Bom. L. 1 46 1  
*11 F. J. I. 1* (1909) 11 Bom. L. 1 46 1

(e) *11 F. J. I. 1* (1909) 11 Bom. L. 1 46 1

(f) *11 F. J. I. 1* (1909) 11 Bom. L. 1 46 1

(g) *11 F. J. I. 1* (1909) 11 Bom. L. 1 46 1

(h) *11 F. J. I. 1* (1909) 11 Bom. L. 1 46 1

(i) *11 F. J. I. 1* (1909) 11 Bom. L. 1 46 1

(j) *11 F. J. I. 1* (1909) 11 Bom. L. 1 46 1

(k) *11 F. J. I. 1* (1909) 11 Bom. L. 1 46 1

by obtaining leave to sue in respect of the portion so omitted the reason is that the leave contemplated by this section is the leave to sue for one of several *reliefs* referred to in sub r (3) it does not relate to the portion so omitted referred to in sub r (2) (l)

The rule says he shall not *afterwards* sue It does not therefore apply where the suits are simultaneous and not successive (m) But fractions of a day are recognized and on the presumption that suits filed on the same day are filed in the order of their numbers in the register it has been held that the suit of the subsequent number is barred (n) But that presumption has been doubted and the plaintiff allowed to elect which suit shall be held to be barred under this rule (o)

It has been held by the Calcutta High Court that the present rule refers to a case where there has been a suit in which there has been an omission to sue in respect of portion of a claim and a decree has been passed in that suit So long as no decree is passed a second suit in respect of the portion so omitted is not barred It follows from this that where a suit brought in respect only of a portion of a cause of action has not been heard and decided the Court may allow the plaintiff in the suit to be amended by adding the omitted portion of the claim (p) Similarly if such a suit is withdrawn under O 23 r 1 (2) with liberty to bring a fresh suit the plaintiff may include in the fresh suit the portion that was omitted in the suit withdrawn by him (q)

A sues B in respect of a portion only of a cause of action Pending this suit A brings another suit against B in respect of the remaining portion of the same cause of action. According to the Calcutta decision cited above neither suit is a bar to the other so long as no decree is passed in either suit It is open therefore to A to rectify his error in bringing two suits in respect of the same cause of action by applying for leave to amend the plaintiff in either suit by adding the omitted portion which forms the subject matter of the other suit and then withdrawing the other suit under O 23 r 1 (1) The Chief Court of the Punjab has gone further and held that if in such a case A is allowed to withdraw either suit with liberty to bring a fresh suit under 23 r 1 (2) he is entitled to bring a fresh suit by virtue of the leave granted to him though the other suit has been carried to a decision (r)

Omitting to sue for one of several reliefs —Where a person is entitled to more than one relief in respect of the same cause of action he may sue for all the reliefs or he may sue for one or more of them and reserve his right with the leave of the Court to sue for the rest (s) If no such leave is obtained he will be precluded from afterwards suing for any relief so omitted (t) But if the right to the relief in respect of which a further suit is brought did not exist at the date of the institution of the former suit the subsequent suit is not barred (u) The words in s. 43 of the Code of 1882 were

with the leave of the Court obtained before the first hearing Those words were construed literally and it was held that leave might be applied for and obtained when the case was called on for first hearing and before anything had been done towards the hearing of the suit (v) The italicized words have been omitted with the result that the leave may now be granted at any stage of the suit The leave however must be obtained from the Court before which the original suit was pending The leave if granted is good even if the pecuniary value of the relief allowed to be omitted from the suit exceeds the pecuniary limits of the jurisdiction of the Court granting the leave (w)

- (l) *Paja Bahadur Shikdar v F J Wappa* (1909) 11 Bom L.R. 46 11 C 319  
 (m) *Talwar v Varja* (1868) 5 Bom H.C. A.C. 30 *Kaleshar v Jagan* (1881) 1 All 60  
 App 3 m v F mas ml (1886) 9 Mad 79  
 (n) *Mrit v Bhola Ram* (1894) 16 All 165 1  
 173  
 (o) *P v Lu v Pam du* (1906) 49 Mad 869 97  
 1 C 413 (26) A M 934 *Appasami v*  
*J m sami sup a*  
 (r) (1914) 45 Cal 30 316 71 C 1 9 *supra*

- (q) *Behar Lal v Srimati Baran* (1892) 17 All.  
 33  
 (r) *Cham Muhammad v Nur Khan* (1917)  
 10 All Rec no 6 p 27 41 C 89  
 (s) *I t j v Abdul* (1941) 5 Bom 463  
 (t) *I t j v Abdul v Karan Singh* (1915) 37 All  
 616 30 C 9 1  
 (v) *Parsi v Kh i Lam* (1891) 3 All 87  
 (w) *Istons v Abdul* (1951) 5 Bom 433  
 (x) *M Ammal v Pami v Kallu Singh* (1911)  
 7 All L.J 1901 81 C 6 9

*Illustrations*

(1) *Rent and possession* — *A* lets his land to *B* for a period of five years on condition that if *B* fails to pay the rent every year the lease shall be void. *B* fails to pay the rent due for the second year. Here *A* is entitled to two reliefs namely to sue *B* (1) for recovery of the rent and (2) also for possession of the land on the ground that the lease has become void and he may sue for both these reliefs. If he sues for rent only and does not reserve his right with the leave of the Court to sue for possession he cannot afterwards sue for possession. *Subbaraya v Krishna* (1883) 6 Mad. 159. Similarly if he sues for possession only and does not reserve his right with the leave of the Court to sue for arrears of rent he cannot afterwards sue for the rent. *Aashinath v Nathoo* (1914) 38 Bom 444 25 I C 73.

(2) *Specific performance and possession* — *A* agrees to sell his land to *B*. *B* sues *A* for specific performance of the agreement and obtains a decree. *B* then sues *A* for possession of the land. Is the suit for possession barred under this rule? Yes according to the decision in *Varayana v Kandaram* (1899) 22 Mad 24 the reason given being that the right to possession arises coincidentally with the right to the execution of conveyance. No according to the decision in *Nathu v Budhu* (1894) 18 Bom 537. *Krishnammal v Soundararaja* (1915) 38 Mad 608 22 I C 912 and *Krishnaji v Sanjappa* (1925) 27 Bom L. P. 49 86 I C 132 (2). *A B* 181 the reason given being that the right to possession accrues only on the execution of the deed of conveyance. See also *Sundara v Sivalingam* (1923) 47 Mad 150 77 I C 442 (24) *A M* 360 and *Deonandan v Janli* (1920) 5 Lah L J 315 317.

(3) *Possession and specific performance* — On 1st March 1905 *A* enters into an agreement with *B* for the sale of his lands to *B* the sale to be completed on 1st August 1905. It is agreed that *B* shall pay part of the purchase money on the date of the agreement and that *A* shall on such payment being made put *B* in possession of the land. *B* pays part of the purchase money and *A* puts him in possession of the land. The sale is not completed on 1st August owing to certain differences between the parties. On 15th August *A* forcibly ejects *B* from the land and enters into possession. Thereupon *B* sues *A* for possession but omits to sue for specific performance of the agreement for sale. *B* cannot afterwards sue *A* for specific performance. *Pangayya v Nanjappa* (1901) 24 Mad 491 28 I A 221 with facts slightly varied.

(4) *A* agrees to sell his property to *B*. He then enters into a contract to sell it to *C*. *B* sues *A* for a permanent injunction restraining *A* from selling the property to *C*. The suit is dismissed on the ground that such a suit did not lie. A subsequent suit by *B* against *A* for specific performance of the agreement is not barred. *Sardar Mal v Hirde Nath* (1925) 6 Lah 384 87 I C 991 (2). *A L* 459.

### Exceptions to the rule against splitting of reliefs—

1. *Order 34 rule 14* — Sub rule (3) provides that where a person entitled to more than one relief in respect of the same cause of action omits except with the leave of the Court to sue for all such reliefs he cannot afterwards sue for any relief so omitted. According to this sub rule if a mortgagee sues the mortgagor on the personal covenant to repay the mortgage debt and omits to sue for sale of the mortgaged property he cannot afterwards sue for sale unless he has reserved his right to do so with the leave of the Court. To this however there is an exception being that contained in O 34 r 14. The latter rule may be stated thus a mortgagee sues the mortgagor to recover the mortgage-debt from the mortgagor personally and obtains a decree. He then applies for the attachment and sale of the mortgaged property in execution of the decree. The mortgaged property may be attached but it cannot be sold in execution proceedings. The only mode of bringing it to sale is by instituting a fresh suit for sale. O 34 r 14 says that the mortgagee

may institute such a suit notwithstanding anything contained in O 2 r 2 (x). The suit will be one under s 67 of the Transfer of Property Act 1889. It must however be noted that though O 34 r 14 allows a mortgagee to split his remedies it does not allow him to split his claim (y).

2 Order 34 rule 6—The effect of this rule is that where a mortgagee has obtained a decree for sale of the mortgaged property and the property is sold but the net sale proceeds are not sufficient to pay the mortgage debt he may subsequently apply for a decree for the balance notwithstanding anything contained in O 2 r 2 although a claim to such relief has not been included in his suit ( ). This however is not strictly speaking an exception for no separate suit has to be brought for a decree for the balance.

3 Deccan Agriculturists Relief Act 1879 (as amended by Act XIII of 1899) s 15 f—The effect of the said section is to allow a mortgagor to split his remedies by providing in effect that if he sues the mortgagee for an account he will not be precluded from suing him subsequently for redemption (a).

Leave to sue—See notes. He shall not afterwards sue in respect of the portion so omitted and Omission to sue for one of several reliefs.

Amendment of plaint—See notes above. He shall not afterwards sue in respect of the portion so omitted.

Withdrawal of one of two pending suits—See notes above. He shall not afterwards sue in respect of the portion so omitted.

Minors—The provisions of this rule apply to adults as well as minors. Thus a suit by a minor by his guardian and next friend for rent due for 1903 and 1904 will bar a subsequent suit by the minor on attaining majority for the rent due for 1901 and 1902. The acts of a guardian in the conduct of a suit must be upheld, unless it is shown that they were unreasonable or improper (b) or that the minor's interests were not properly safeguarded (c).

Official Assignee—This rule merely bars a second suit. Therefore the Official Assignee cannot by an application to the Insolvency Court ask for a declaration on behalf of the insolvent mortgagor that the right of the mortgagee to sue for the principal is barred under this rule (d).

Execution proceedings—The present rule does not apply to proceedings in execution of a decree. A decree holder may therefore present successive applications for realizing different portions of his decree. Thus if a decree gives reliefs for possession and costs there is nothing in the Code which prevents separate and successive applications for execution as regards either of them (e).

3 [S 43 Of R S C, O 18, r 1] (1) Save as otherwise provided, a plaintiff may unite in the same suit several causes of action against the same defendant, or the same defendants jointly, and any plaintiffs having causes of action in which they are jointly interested against the same defendant or the same defendants jointly may unite such causes of action in the same suit.

Joinder of causes of action

- (x) *I Isarpal v Mewa Lal* (1914) 36 All 461  
11 C 49  
(y) *Girdhar v Jashwanth* (1901) 5 Bom 161  
*Ke Narayan v Jashwanth* (1906) 30 Bom 156  
( ) *Musheb v Inayatullah* (1909) 11 All 513  
*Hamsabai v Amlal Nath* (1904) 20 All 346  
(a) See *Bhau v Hari* (1893) 7 Bom 377  
(b) *Gopal v Nagan* (1899) 23 Mad 309

- (c) *Iyankar v K. K.* (1901) 45 Bom 809 89  
611 C 76 (1) A D 434  
(d) *Srinivas v Official Assignee* (1902) 43  
Mad 701 (2) A D 11 1911 C 403  
(e) *Tadha Kashi* *Tadha Kashi* (1901) 14  
C 513 *Islamabram v Islamabram*  
(1915) 24 M 1 109 11 C 3 (pendre  
N D v D (1919) 3 Cal 34 261 C 56  
( ) A C 1010

(2) Where causes of action are united, the jurisdiction of the Court as regards the suit shall depend on the amount or value of the aggregate subject matters at the date of instituting the suit

Scope of the rule.—O 1 r 1 deals with joinder of plaintiffs O 1 r 3 deals with joinder of defendants The present rule deals with joinder of causes of actions It is to be read subject to the provisions of rr 4 and 5 below as is shown by the words save as otherwise provided (f) It is also to be read subject to the provisions of O 1 rr 1 and 3 The frame of a suit may not be supported by this rule and yet it may be justified by O 1 r 1 or O 1 r 3 (g) Rules 6 and 7 of this Order are to be read with this rule

Cause of action—See notes to s 20 Cause of action

One plaintiff one defendant and two or more causes of action—Where there is only one plaintiff and only one defendant the rule says that the plaintiff may unite in the same suit several causes of action against the same defendant provided of course that the provisions of rr 4 and 5 of this Order are not contravened If the causes of action are so disconnected that they cannot be conveniently tried together the Court may order separate trials under r 6 below These trials however will not be distinct suits but they will be in the nature of sub suits under the title and number of the principal suit from which they spring (h) In *Saccharins Corporation Ltd v Wild* (i) the plaintiff corporation the owners of twenty three patents for saccharin sued the defendant for alleged infringement of all the trade marks There were thus twenty three causes of action united in one suit It was ordered that the suit should be confined in the first instance to any three of the patents which the plaintiffs might select Collins M R said Now we start here with a writ launched covering twenty three causes of action *Prima facie* in old days one cause of action was thought to be enough That was gradually more or less relaxed and one cause of action was allowed to be coupled with one or two subordinate or necessarily connected causes of action Then came by the Rules under the Judicature Acts a still further relaxation but always subject to the one underlying principle namely that the burden lay on the plaintiff to prove his case and that no extra burden should be imposed on the defendant through the plaintiff needlessly enlarging the area of dispute *Prima facie a do en causes of action cannot be combined in one writ they must be so intimately connected as to justify their being included in one writ* but when one finds no less than twenty three that seems to me to be an outrageous extension of the latitude given by the rules to the plaintiff (j) Cozen Hardy L J said The action strikes me as almost an abuse of the process of the Court (k)

The rule that a plaintiff may unite in the same suit several causes of action against the same defendant does not apply to suits for rent under the Agra Tenancy Act Hence a plaintiff cannot join in one suit claims for arrears of rent of occupancy and non occupancy holdings though the claims may be against the same defendant (l) In a case under the Bengal Tenancy Act 8 of 183 the Privy Council held that a plaintiff may join in one suit claims against a defendant in respect of more than one tenure (m)

(f) See *J vray v Jirush ta* (1884) 7 Ma 1 171

(g) *J vray v Jirush ta* (1884) 7 Ma 1 171  
(h) *J vray v Jirush ta* (1884) 7 Ma 1 171  
(i) *J vray v Jirush ta* (1884) 7 Ma 1 171  
(j) *J vray v Jirush ta* (1884) 7 Ma 1 171  
(k) *J vray v Jirush ta* (1884) 7 Ma 1 171

(l) *J vray v Jirush ta* (1884) 7 Ma 1 171

(m) *J vray v Jirush ta* (1884) 7 Ma 1 171

(l) *J vray v Jirush ta* (1884) 7 Ma 1 171

(f) *J vray v Jirush ta* (1884) 7 Ma 1 171  
(g) *J vray v Jirush ta* (1884) 7 Ma 1 171  
(h) *J vray v Jirush ta* (1884) 7 Ma 1 171  
(i) *J vray v Jirush ta* (1884) 7 Ma 1 171  
(j) *J vray v Jirush ta* (1884) 7 Ma 1 171  
(k) *J vray v Jirush ta* (1884) 7 Ma 1 171

(l) *J vray v Jirush ta* (1884) 7 Ma 1 171  
(m) *J vray v Jirush ta* (1884) 7 Ma 1 171

**Misjoinder of plaintiffs and causes of action**—Where there are *two or more plaintiffs* and *two or more causes of action* the rule says that any plaintiffs having causes of action in which they are *jointly* interested against the same defendant may unite such causes of action in the same suit. But the rule is to be read subject to the provisions of O 1 r 1. The result is that where there are two or more plaintiffs and two or more causes of action they may be joined in one suit if the right to the relief and the causes of action arise from *the same act or transaction* and that there is a *common question of law or fact* though they may not all be *jointly* interested in all the causes of action. But if the right to the relief claimed does not arise from *the same act or transaction* or if there is no *common question of law or fact* the plaintiffs cannot all join in one suit unless they are *jointly interested* in the causes of action as provided by this rule (n). See notes to O 1 r 1. The new Rule fills (1) to (4).

Where the plaintiffs are *not jointly interested* in the causes of action united in one suit the suit is said to be bad for misjoinder of plaintiffs and causes of action. A sells to Y two plots of land adjoining each other one of which is claimed by A by adverse possession and the other by B by adverse possession. Under the Code of 1882 A and B could not join together as plaintiffs in one suit against X and Y for the evidence of adverse possession by A would not be evidence of adverse possession in favour of B and *vice versa* (o). This would also be the case under this Code. Similarly where five plaintiffs contract separately to sell cotton though to the same defendant they cannot all join in one suit for damages for breach of the five contracts (p).

**Procedure in case of misjoinder of plaintiffs and causes of action**—Under the Code of 1882 where a plaint was presented which was bad for misjoinder of plaintiffs and causes of action the Judge to whom the plaint was presented might return it for amendment under s 53. If the plaint having been returned for amendment was not amended it might be rejected under s 54 cl (d). If the defect was not noticed when the plaint was presented but was brought to the notice of the Court at a later stage the Court might grant leave to the plaintiffs to amend the plaint within a time fixed by the Court and might order that if the amendment was not made within the time prescribed the suit should stand dismissed with costs. Where leave to amend was granted the plaintiff had to elect as to which of them should proceed with the suit and the plaint had then to be amended by striking out the names of the other plaintiffs and making consequential amendments (q). At the same time liberty was given to the defendant to amend his written statement to meet the case of the particular plaintiff who had elected to proceed with the suit (r). It was also held in some cases under that Code that where a suit was bad for misjoinder of plaintiffs and causes of action it was not proper to dismiss the suit without giving the plaintiff an opportunity of amendment (s). If the suit was dismissed and the *plaintiffs* appealed the appellate Court might set aside the decree and remand the case to the lower Court with a direction to that Court to return the plaint for amendment (t). As to the procedure to be followed under the present Code see notes to r 7 below.

Where the defendant objects to the frame of a suit on the ground that the suit is bad for misjoinder of plaintiffs and causes of action but the objection is overruled and a decree is passed for the plaintiffs and the defendant appeals from the decree on the ground that the suit ought to have been held to be bad for misjoinder of plaintiffs and

- ( ) *Pamela v. The Brijend v. The* (1915) 4 Cal 111 120 123 411 C 914  
(e) *A. v. R. v. Vellay* (1911) 34 Mad 55 61 C 13  
(p) *Chand Lal v. D. G. D.* (1900) 7 Bom L R 47 8 J C 43 ( ) A R 34  
(q) *Alfred v. Barrow* (1897) 31 Cal 66  
*Va. aial v. J. and J.* (1907) 26 Bom 209

- As. P. J. v. The Chaurao* (1901) 26 All 18  
(r) *Alfred v. B. v. v.* (1907) 34 Cal 66 61  
(s) *B. and L. v. R. v. M.* (1903) 15 All 30  
(t) *P. v. J. v. D. v. v.* (1907) 8 Mad 41  
*J. v. L. v. L. v. L.* (1903) 15 All 30

causes of action the appellate Court if it found there had been such a misjoinder should not interfere with the decree unless the misjoinder has affected the merits of the case. This is the effect of the provisions of s 99 of this Code which enjoins *inter alia* that a decree shall be reversed or substantially varied in appeal *on account of any misjoinder of parties or causes of action* where such misjoinder does not affect the merits of the case. The italicized words are new. They did not occur in the corresponding s 578 of the Code of 1882. They have been added into s 99 to supersede the practice followed under the old Code. Under that Code where a decree was passed for the plaintiffs in a suit involving a misjoinder of plaintiffs and causes of action the course adopted by the appellate Court was to reverse the decree in appeal and remand the case to the lower Court with the directions to that Court to return the plaint to the plaintiffs for amendment so that the plaintiffs might elect as to which of them should continue as plaintiffs in the suit (u). Such a course would not have been necessary if a misjoinder of plaintiffs and causes of action was an irregularity such as could be condoned under s 575. But the practice referred to developed as the cases were against the application of s 518 (1). The effect of section 99 is to preclude the appellate Court from reversing a decree on the ground of misjoinder of plaintiffs and causes of action and remanding the case to the lower Court as was done under the old Code unless the misjoinder has affected the merits of the case.

**Misjoinder of defendants and causes of action**—Where there are two or more defendants and two or more causes of action the rule says that the plaintiff may unite in the same suit several causes of action against the same defendants jointly

*Joint interest in the questions raised by the litigation is a condition precedent to the joinder of several causes of action against several defendants (w) If the causes of action alleged are separate and the defendants are arrayed in different sets the suit is bad for misjoinder of defendants and causes of action and is technically multifarious (x) There is no provision in the Code allowing distinct causes of action against distinct sets of defendants that is to say causes of action in which the defendants are not all jointly interested to be united in one suit (y) This rule however is to be read subject to the provisions of O 1 r 3 which relates to joinder of defendants Hence two or more defendants may be joined as parties in one suit though there are two or more causes of action provided the right to the relief claimed arises from the same act or transaction and there is a common question of law or fact and this is so although they may not all be jointly interested in all the causes of action But if the right to the relief claimed does not arise from the same act or transaction or if there be no common question of law or fact the defendants cannot all be joined in one suit unless they are jointly interested in the causes of action as provided by this rule ( ) See notes to O 1 r 3 New I u l 15*

(4) (v) and (6) The following are instances of cases in which it was held that the suit was bad for misjoinder of defendants and causes of action

### Suits held to be multifarious

1. *B* agrees to sell certain lands to *A*. *A* sues *B* and a third person *C* on the ground that *B* was willing to execute the deed of sale but was unable to do so as a result of a sale of the title deeds under a false claim of an equitable lien upon the land by *C* to part with them. As against *B*, *A* claims specific performance of the contract.

- (c) *Sad* a B b s      *Shedh* y f h a m i (196) 18  
All 131    l h    l h h.    l ra B b  
(1930) 18 All 19 l p    l m D b  
l l (1936) 19 All 43    l sp l v  
l f t (1907) 6 l om 29    of m  
Ch d a v    4f l Ch l a (197) l C l  
10 t p    41  
(d) *Tajl* l    l a d t (1907) 6 l om -59  
ch p 68 y f h m Ch a l a    4tsp  
(ha f a l j )    l l l 540 t    544  
(e) *Eh* t l a i    l k h r (196) 6 All  
106 108 The principle taps though

- (1) trial lost the last year of the war  
 fr n in H 60  
 3 All 14 31 60  
 (2) at the trial of the war crimes in Germany  
 44 163 171  
 (3) at the trial of the war crimes in Germany  
 (1 36) 34 L  
 5 for 14 (1 36) 34 L  
 (4) at the trial of the war crimes in Germany  
 (al 111) 122  
 (5) at the trial of the war crimes in Germany  
 (6 121) 21



3 against *C* he asks for a declaration that he has no lien upon the lands and for delivery of the title deeds. The suit is bad for misjoinder of defendants and causes of action. The two causes of action are entirely distinct they do not arise from the same transaction nor would their trial involve any common question of law or fact. *Luckumsey v Fa ulla* (1881) 5 Bom 177 following *De Houghton v Money* (1876) L R 2 Ch App 166 distinguished in *Arishnaswami v Sundarappayyar* (1895) 18 Mad 415.

The rule in *De Houghton v Money* and *Luckumsey v Fa ulla* is that if on the face of the plaint or of the plaintiff's case it appears that a third party who was not a party to the contract upon which the suit was brought had a distinct interest but which interest is sought to be declared null and void upon some equitable ground such a claim against the said third party could not be made a part of the suit. In the case of *De Houghton v Money* it was admitted by the plaintiff that there was a conveyance in favour of Money but it was said that that conveyance was executed under such circumstances as would make it a voidable one and in the case of *Luckumsey v Fa ulla* it was clearly admitted by the plaintiff that the third party who was not a party to the contract had a distinct interest. (a) The case is different however where *A* (purchaser) sues *B* (vendor) and *C* (vendor's benamidar) claiming specific performance against *B* and a declaration against *C* that *C* is a mere benamidar for there the two defendants are identical and there is but one cause of action and no misjoinder. *Molund Lall v Chotaj Lall* (1884) 10 Cal 1061 1068 1069.

3 Seven different salt manufacturers enter into seven different contracts with *A* to manufacture salt for *A* and to deliver it in his factory *A* alleging that all the seven persons had failed to deliver salt according to the terms of the agreement with them brings one suit against them for a decree that they might be directed to deliver the salt to him. The suit is bad for multifariousness for the breach of each contract gives rise to a distinct cause of action and no one defendant is interested in any of the causes of action arising from the breach of contract with the other defendants. *Namaswami v Adir Ammal* (1894) 17 Mad 168.

3 *A* and *B* at Madura enter into an agreement to carry on business in partnership at Silangoor and they send *C* as their agent to Silangoor to conduct the business there *A* alleging that *C* had failed to carry out his instructions and to furnish accounts and that *B* was colluding with *C* sues *B* and *C* claiming dissolution of partnership as against *B* and damages for breach of contract as agent as against *C*. The suit is bad for multifariousness for there are two distinct causes of action and neither defendant is liable in respect of the cause of action against the other. *Muthappa v Muthu* (1904) 27 Mad 60. See this case commented upon in *Aiyathurai v Muhammad Veera* (1908) 18 Mad L J 238 243 244.

4 A joint Hindu family consisting of 3 members *A*, *B* and *C* owns several properties. *A* agrees to sell his share to *P*. *A* fails to execute the necessary sale deed. *P* sues *A* for specific performance and includes in the suit a claim for partition and possession against all the members of the family namely *A*, *B* and *C*. The suit is bad for misjoinder. The claim for partition cannot be joined with the claim for specific performance as at the date of the suit the plaintiff had no right to sue for partition not having completed his title by a sale deed. Wallis CJ said. The other members of the family were no parties to the alleged contract and therefore were not proper parties to the suit in so far as it is a suit for specific performance and it would in my opinion be a distinct hardship to them to force them to defend a suit for partition which would not lie if the plaintiff failed to prove his contract. *Rangayya v Subramania* (1917) 40 Mad. 365 40 I C 429 [F B]. See ill. (1) above.

In *ills* (1) and (3) what were really two suits were combined into one. In *ill* (2) what were really seven suits were united in one suit. In all these cases it was held that the suit was bad for misjoinder of defendants and causes of action. The reason why the law forbids a joinder in one suit of distinct causes of action against different defendants *each of whom is unconnected with the cause of action against the others* may thus be stated in the words of Peacock C.J. (b). Such a joinder complicates the case before the Judge and renders it exceedingly difficult for him in dealing with the case of each defendant to exclude from his consideration those portions of the evidence which may not be admissible against him though admissible against one or more of the others. Moreover it is vexatious and harassing to the different defendants. Such a procedure renders it almost compulsory on all the defendants to be present either in person or by their pleaders whilst the case is going on against the others in respect of matters in which they are not interested and moreover it is harassing and inconvenient as regards the attendance of the witnesses of the several defendants as it renders it necessary for the witnesses of each to be present and to be detained whilst the case of the others is being heard and determined. For further illustrations see notes to O 1 r 3 under the heads New Rule and Severally.

**Procedure in case of multifariousness that is misjoinder of defendants and causes of action**—Under the Code of 1882 where a plaint was presented which was bad for misjoinder of defendants and causes of action the Judge to whom the plaint was presented might return it for amendment under s 53. If the plaint having been returned for amendment was not amended it might be rejected under sec 54 cl (d). If the defect was not noticed when the plaint was presented but was brought to the notice of the Court at a later stage the Court might on the application of the plaintiff and on such terms as to costs as the Court thought proper permit the plaintiff to withdraw from the suit against those defendants who were not interested in the cause of action in respect of which he elected to proceed and grant leave to bring a fresh suit or suits against them (c) [O 23 r 1] or allow the plaintiff to amend the plaint by striking out the names of those defendants and making consequential amendments. Where leave to amend was granted to the plaintiff and the plaintiff did not amend within the time fixed by the Court and the suit was dismissed the appellate Court might confirm the decree if it found that the suit was multifarious (d). As to the procedure to be followed under the present Code see notes to r 7 below.

Where the defendants object to the frame of a suit on the ground that the suit is multifarious but the objection is overruled and a decree is passed for the plaintiff and the defendants appeal from the decree on the ground that the suit ought to have been held to be multifarious the appellate Court even if it finds the suit to be multifarious should not interfere with the decree unless the misjoinder has affected the merits of the case. This is the effect of s 99 which declares *inter alia* that no decree shall be reversed or substantially varied in appeal on account of any misjoinder of parties or causes of action where such misjoinder does not affect the merits of the case. The word italicized are new. They did not occur in the corresponding s 578 of the Code of 1882. They have been inserted in s 99 to supersede the practice followed by the Courts under the old Code. Under that Code where a decree was passed for the plaintiffs in a suit which was bad for multifariousness the course adopted by the appellate Court was either to reverse the decree of the lower Court and dismiss the plaintiff's suit (e) or to sustain the decree of the lower Court as against a particular set of defendants in respect of the causes of action in which they were jointly interested and grant permission to the plaintiff to withdraw from the suit against the other defendants with liberty to bring a fresh suit

(b) *Raj Ram Tewari v Luckman* (1867) 8 W R 15

(c) *Luckumsey v Farulla* (1831) 5 Bom 1 - 19

(d) *Aa har v Basa* 12 *th re* (1833) Bom 59

*Pam Na a m v 4 oia* (1857) 14 Cal. 6 1

(e) *M thappa v Muthu* (1904) 22 Mad 80 85

*Amamanyaya v Adar* (174) 17 Mad 164 18

or suits against them (f) Such a course would not have been necessary had the Court held that a misjoinder of defendants and causes of action was an irregularity such as could be cured by s 578 But it was held that the section did not apply to a misjoinder of this kind and that even if it did apply the misjoinder should be regarded as a defect that must affect the merits of the case within the meaning of that section (g) The insertion of the words on account of any misjoinder of parties or causes of action in s 99 makes it quite clear that the appellate Court should not interfere with a decree if the only objection to the decree is that of multifariousness unless the misjoinder has affected the merits of the case

**Two or more defendants and one cause of action**—Every case of multifariousness presupposes more than one cause of action Hence where there is only one cause of action there can be no multifariousness

### *Suits held not to be multifarious*

1 A alleging that his brother B mortgaged his (A's) share in his father's property to C without his knowledge and consent and that C was in possession as mortgagee sues B and C for a declaration of title to his share of the property and for possession of the share The suit is not bad for multifariousness for there are no two causes of action but only one namely the infringement of A's right of ownership by B The mortgage and dispossession are both acts evidencing the infringement of A's right *Indur Kuar v Gur Prasad* (1889) 11 All 33 *Ma Har Ali v Sayad Husain* (1902) 24 All 358 *Aubra Jan v Pam Bali* (1908) 30 All 560

2 A sells three properties by private contract to B After the sale to B all the three properties are attached in execution of a decree held by C against A and they are sold in execution to D E and F respectively A suit by B against A (the vendor) C (the decree holder) and D E and F (execution purchasers) to set aside the execution sale is not bad for multifariousness *Haranund v Prosunno Chunder* (1883) 9 Cal 763 *Gunani v Ram Charan* (1878) 1 All 533

**Note**—In the Calcutta case cited above Garth CJ said The plaintiff has but one object namely to establish his private purchase as against the claim in execution and the defendants who contest his claim have but one defence which is common to them all viz that the plaintiff's purchase is invalid

**Unnecessary parties added as defendants**—Where persons who are not necessary parties are joined as defendants they should not be reckoned as parties in considering whether or not the suit is bad for multifariousness 1 and B are two co-sharers of a village 1 and B sell their respective shares to C by two separate deeds of sale D alleging that he is entitled to pre-empt the property sues 1 B and C for pre-emption Here the suit is not bad for multifariousness for 1 and B being vendors they are not necessary parties to a suit for pre-emption The suit is really against the vendee C (A)

**Suit for ejectment by real owner against holders under derivative titles from a trespasser as the common source**—In a suit for possession all persons claiming by derivative titles from a trespasser as the common source may be joined as defendants 1 obtains a lease of a piece of land from B and enters into possession of the land Subsequently B ignoring the lease lets the land in separate portions and by separate leases to C D and E 1 sues B C D and E to eject them from the land The suit is not bad for multifariousness In this as in every action of ejectment there is but one cause of action namely dispossession It is immaterial that C D and

(f) *Go M Lal v KAs at Ss gA* (194) 16 All

(g) *Go A Lal v KAs at Ss gA* (194) 16 All 9 23 *Namasiraya v KAs* (194) 16 All 13 *Mad 16 18 Muthappa v Muthu*

(1901) 24 All 80 81  
(A) *H. B. v. Tota Dal* (1910) 37 All 14 31  
C 35 *Jwal m v K. A. Vata* (1916) 40 All 319 320 321 C 60 (1911) A L 1-6

*F* claim under different titles The title by which they claim forms no part of the plaintiff's cause of action (i) The case is different if the defendants do not all claim under the same trespasser Thus if *A* owns lands and he is dispossessed of one portion by *B* of another portion by *C* and of a third portion by *D* *A* cannot bring one suit for possession against *B* *C* and *D* (j)

Where two or more persons conspire together to commit a wrong or to commit a breach of several contracts entered into with them separately by the plaintiff they may all be joined as defendants in one suit—The reason is that the plaintiff has in such a case but one cause of action against all the defendants namely a conspiracy to do the act complained of Thus if in ill (2) on p 415 above the seven salt manufacturers had conspired together not to deliver the salt to *A* *A* could have brought one suit against them all Similarly if *A* and *B* conspire together to assault *C* *C* may bring one suit against them for damages for assault (k) Upon the same principle where *A* obtained a decree against *B* for possession of certain lands in which 86 persons had distinct and separate tenures and these 86 persons combined together to keep *A* out of possession and declined to pay the rent to him it was held that *A* might join the 86 tenants as defendants in one suit for a declaration of his proprietary right to the lands (l) But separate suits should be brought if there is no collusion or combination between the tenants (m)

Two or more plaintiffs two or more defendants and two or more causes of action—In such a case the plaintiffs must be jointly interested in the cause of action and the defendants also must be jointly interested in the causes of action The rule says Any plaintiffs having causes of action in which they are jointly interested against the same defendants jointly may unite such causes of action in the same suit If the plaintiffs are not jointly interested in the causes of action the suit will be bad for misjoinder of plaintiffs and causes of action If the plaintiffs are jointly interested in the several causes of action but the defendants are not the suit will be bad for multifariousness And if neither the plaintiffs nor the defendants are jointly interested in the causes of action the suit will be bad for a double misjoinder namely misjoinder of plaintiffs and causes of action and misjoinder of defendants and causes of action Thus if *A* agrees to sell and deliver salt to *B* and *C* agrees to sell and deliver salt to *D* and *B* and *D* sue *A* and *C* for damages for breach of the contracts entered into with them respectively the suit is bad for a double misjoinder Neither plaintiff has any interest in the cause of action of the other nor has either defendants any interest in the cause of action against the other But if two contracts are entered into each between *B* and *D* of the one part and *A* and *C* of the other part *B* and *D* may bring one suit against *A* and *C* on the two contracts

**Jurisdiction**—Where a plaintiff combines several causes of action against the same defendant in one suit the jurisdiction of the Court as regards the suit depends on the value of the aggregate subject matters (n) See sub r (2)

**Revision**—It has been held by the High Court of Madras that a decision on the question whether a suit is bad for misjoinder of parties and causes of action is subject to revision (o)

- (i) *Vanda F m r v Pa om h* (190 ) 9 Cal 81 80 *Isham Chu der v Jameswa* (183 ) 4 Cal 831 *Parbit v Mahmud* (190 ) 3 All 6 *Umadai v Buth I* (190J) 33 Bom 93 11 C 10 *Ighunth v Sa o h* (190) 3 Bom 66
- (j) *Af al hah v L chms Va a n* (1918) 40 All 11 4 I C 86
- (k) *V ajal v F md t* (190 ) 6 Bom 59 *Sing J di v Mad ra Law* (189 ) 9 Mad 360
- (l) *Joke Nath v Ke had I m* (1846) 13 C 114

- ( ) *Pam Vana m v An odi* (183 ) 14 Cal 631 *S dh ndu v Durga* (1837) 14 Cal 43
- (n) *Ch agh Dan v Bh gwan Das* (1915) Punj Rec no 100 p 400 2 I C 40
- (o) *F lappa v Chudamba* (18...) 43 Mad L J OIC 634 ( ) A M I 4 SA mks v Aru chelam (18 ) 45 Mad 194 194 691 C 961 ( ) A M 35 *Arumachell m v Ar nach Nam* (18 ) 43 Mad L J 16 691 C 906 ( ) A M 436

**Proviso to the Rule**—The proviso to the rule enables a plaintiff to claim in one suit redemption or foreclosure and possession (c)

**Leave of Court—Objection as to misjoinder**—Leave should be obtained *before* the plaint is filed (d). But the leave under this rule is not a *condition precedent* to jurisdiction and it may therefore be granted on good cause shown even *after* the institution of the suit (e). Under s 41 of the Code of 1892 it was held that an objection that the plaintiff had joined together claims which under that section could not be joined together without the leave of the Court should be taken in the Court of first instance and that if it was not so taken it should be regarded as waived and it should not be entertained by the Court of appeal (f). Under this Code the objection should be taken at the earliest possible opportunity and in all cases where issues are settled at or before such settlement if it is not so taken it will be deemed to have been waived (r 7 below). And even if the objection is taken in time and disallowed the appellate Court should not interfere with the decree in appeal merely on the ground that claims which ought not to be joined under this rule have been joined in one suit unless the misjoinder has affected the merits of the case (s 99 above).

Where a claim cannot be joined with a claim for the recovery of immovable property *without the leave* of the Court it is optional with the plaintiff either to obtain the leave and bring one suit in respect of both the claims or to bring *separate* suits in respect of each of them. The plaintiff is not confined to the first only of these two courses (g).

**Counterclaim**—This rule applies to a counterclaim as well as to an original action (h).

**Appeal**—No appeal lies from an order under this rule rejecting an application for leave to join a claim with a claim for the recovery of immovable property (i). See s 99 above.

**Revision**—See notes to r 3. Revision.

**5 [S 44 R S C O 18, r 5]** No claim by or against an executor, administrator, or heir, as such, shall be joined with claims by or against him personally, unless the last mentioned claims are alleged to arise with reference to the estate in respect of which the plaintiff or defendant sues or is sued as executor, administrator or heir, or such as he was entitled to, or liable for, jointly with the deceased person whom he represents.

**Scope of the rule**—This rule provides that no claim by a person in his *representative character* shall be joined in the same suit with claims by him *personally* nor shall claims against a person in his representative character be joined with claims against him personally—

(1) unless the claims by or against him personally arise with reference to the estate which he represents or

(2) unless he was entitled to or liable for those claims *jointly* with the deceased person whom he represents.

The object of the rule is to prevent an executor or administrator from intermingling the assets of his testator with his own moneys (j).

- (c) *Jhola Lal v JA prd* (1910) 31 At 41 8 IC 88 (4) AP 613  
(d) *Pichay v Hind* (1909) 11 C D 90  
(e) See *Liljed v G. H. v. d. M. (op. cit.)*  
*Do v. Co. Ltd* (1909) 3 Times R p 50  
(f) *DA dha v. J. mch ad a* (1901) 5 Hon 54  
*M. L. v. C. L.* (1911) 16 All 129

- (g) *E. J. v. T. a. v. T. a.* (1903) 30 C 1 91 No 0  
*Sh. J. v. T. a. v. T. a.* (1904) 6 All 300  
*30. Lale v. J. a. v. J. a.* (1909) 19 Cal 613  
(h) *C. m. v. J. a. v. J. a.* (1909) 19 Cal 613  
*(1. v. J. a. v. J. a.)* 19 Cal 613  
(i) *Do dha v. J. mch ad a* (1901) 5 Hon 54  
(j) *Do dha v. J. mch ad a* (1901) 5 Hon 54  
*T. v. J. a. v. J. a.* (1911) 16 All 129

## Illustrations

O 2,

(a) A is a tenant for life of certain property and B is the remainderman. A gives a lease of the property to C. A dies leaving a will of which B is the sole executor. Some months after A's death B sues C (1) for arrears of rent due to the estate of A and (2) for rent due to him personally subsequent to A's death. Here the first claim is by C as executor and the second claim is by him personally as remainderman. The claim by C personally does not arise with reference to the estate of A of which C is executor. The two claims therefore cannot be joined together in the same suit. *Tredegar v Roberts* [1914] 1 K. B. 283.

(b) A dies leaving a will of which B is the executor. By his will A directs B to continue his business. The executor purchases for the purposes of A's business certain goods from C in his own name. C may in such a case sue B for the price of the goods and he may claim the price against B personally or in the alternative against him as executor. The reason is that the personal claim against B arises with reference to the estate of which he is the executor. But if B purchased certain goods from C as executor in the course of the administration of A's estate and other goods under a separate contract altogether in his own name and expressly for the purpose of his own business, C cannot join both claims against B in one suit (1).

(c) A and B carry on business in partnership. A dies leaving a son S who obtains letters of administration to his father's estate. After A's death S and B continue the business in partnership with the old partnership assets. S as administrator sues B for the accounts of the partnership between his father A and B. He also claims dissolution of the partnership between him personally and B and for his share in the partnership. The suit does not offend the provisions of this rule as the personal claim of S in respect of the partnership between him and B arises with reference to the estate in respect of which he is summoned as administrator. *Irunachallam v Arunachallam* (1922) 43 Mad. L. J. 218. 60 I. C. 966 (2-). A. M. 436.

(cc) The suit is against N as executor of I deceased for administration of the estate of I and also for an account of a partnership which had been carried on by V and N. The suit is not bad for misjoinder of causes of action for O. J. r. 5 allows a claim against an executor as such to be joined with a claim against him personally which is alleged to arise out of the estate in respect of which the executor is sued. *Vathubai v Varayana Charya* (1927) 51 Bom. 800. 104 I. C. 764 (27) A. B. 470.

(d) The second branch of the rule may be illustrated by the following case. A and B jointly purchase goods from C. A dies leaving a will of which B is the executor. Here A and B are jointly liable for the price of the goods. C may therefore sue B for the price in his (B's) personal as well as representative character. If A and B had purchased goods from C under separate contracts, C ought to bring two separate suits against B one as A's executor to recover the price of goods sold to A and the other against B personally to recover the price of the goods sold to him (B).

Heir as such.—An heir may sue or be sued in his personal capacity or he may sue or be sued in his representative capacity (see notes to O. 7 r. 4). The words "claim by an heir as such" in this rule refer to a claim by him in his representative capacity that is as representing the estate of the deceased whose heir he claims to be (1).

## Illustrations

1. A Mahomedan dies leaving a widow and daughters by a predeceased wife. The widow sues the daughters (1) for her dower and (2) for her share of the inheritance in her husband's estate. It is contended on behalf of the daughters that the first claim is

(1) *S. Fatima v Scott* (1867) 4 Ch. D. 643.

(2) *Widow v Daughters* (1893) 41 W. L. R. 111.

(3) *Abdullah v N. S. & Co.* (1906) 13 All. 556.

*Hafsa b. Mahomed* (1907) 31 L. com. disc. ting. from *Abd. b. v. Hay*, (1893) 6 Bom. 330.

by the widow *personally* and that the second claim is by her *as an heir* and that the two claims cannot be joined in one suit. This contention is not sound for the second claim cannot be said to be *by an heir as such*. The claim is made by the widow not as representing her husband's estate and for the benefit of the estate but for her own and personal benefit. The two claims may therefore be joined in one suit. *Ahmad ud-din v Silander* (1896) 18 All 256.

2 A Hindu widow sues her husband's executors to recover (1) certain ornaments forming part of her *stridhana* and (2) her share in her husband's estate. The suit is properly constituted see *Haji aboo v Mahomed* (1907) 31 Bom 105 dissenting from *Ashabai v Haji Tyeib* (188-) 6 Bom 390. *Janlibai v Shrinivas* (1914) 38 Bom 120. 70 I C 533 [suit against husband's coparceners for *stridhana* and maintenance].

**Procedure**—Where two claims which this rule does not allow to be joined are joined in one suit the practice is to amend the plaint by striking out one of them and the suit may then be proceeded with (m).

**Objection as to misjoinder when to be taken**—See r 7 below.

**Appeal**—See s 99 above.

**Revision**—See notes to r 3. **Revision**

6 [S 45, 2nd para R S C, O 18, r 1] Where it appears to the Court that any causes of action joined in one suit cannot be conveniently tried or disposed of together, the Court may order separate trials or make such other order as may be expedient.

This rule does not apply to cases of *misjoinder* but to cases where several causes of action have been *properly* joined in one suit and the causes of action so joined cannot be conveniently tried together (n). See notes to r 3. One plaintiff one defendant and two or more causes of action.

7 [New] All objections on the ground of misjoinder of causes of action shall be taken at the earliest possible opportunity and, in all cases where issues are settled at or before such settlement unless the ground of objection has subsequently arisen, and any such objection not so taken shall be deemed to have been waived.

**Objections as to misjoinder of causes of action**—This rule is new. It places objections on the ground of misjoinder of causes of action on the same footing as objections on the ground of non joinder and misjoinder of parties [O 1 r 13]. Such objections must be taken at the earliest possible opportunity and any such objection not so taken is to be deemed to have been waived (o). Sec 99 provides that no decree shall be reversed or varied on account of any misjoinder of causes of action not affecting the merits of the case or the jurisdiction of the Court.

(m) *Ashabai v Haji Tyeb* (188-) 6 Bom 390  
394 *Tredegar v Roberts* [1914] 1 K. B.  
83

(n) *Muthappa v M. Isha* (1904) 7 Mad 80 84

(o) *Valibhai v Narayan Charya* (19-7) 51

Bom 800 104 I C 764 (7) A B 40  
*Joel v Family v Ghulam Hossain*  
(19-8) 10 Lah. L. J. 40 108 I C 52, (-8)  
4 L. 89 *Treacy v Charn v Hunsman*  
(18-3) 20 W. R. 40

Under the Code of 1882 when a plaint was presented which was bad for misjoinder of causes of action it could be returned for amendment under s 53 at any time before the settlement of issues if the plaint was not amended it could be rejected under s 54 cl (d) These provisions have not been re enacted in this Code The Court however may under this Code allow an amendment under O 6 r 17 if the plaintiff applies for it It may also direct the plaintiff under the same rule to amend the plaint on the application of the defendant or where there are two or more defendants on the application of any one of them O 6 r 18 deals with failure to amend after order

As under the old Code so under this Code the Court may where a suit is bad for misjoinder of plaintiffs and causes of action direct the plaintiffs to elect as to which of them shall proceed with the suit and where a suit is bad for misjoinder of defendants and causes of action direct them to elect against which defendants they will proceed and direct all necessary amendments to be made within a time to be prescribed by the Court If the plaintiff does not comply with the order and amend the plaint the Court may stay the action

The misjoinder of causes of action referred to in this rule is not only the misjoinder contemplated by r 3 above but also that contemplated by rr 4 and 5 above

### ORDER III

#### *Recognized Agents and Pleadors*

1 [S ] Any appearance, application or act in or to any Court, required or authorized by law to be made or done by a party in such Court, may except where otherwise expressly provided by any law for the time being in force, be made or done by the party in person, or by his recognized agent, or by a pleader appearing, applying or acting on his behalf

Appearance etc may be in person by recognized agent or by pleader

Provided that any such appearance shall, if the Court so directs, be made by the party in person

Amendments—The words appearing applying or acting were substituted for the words duly appointed to act by the Code of Civil Procedure (Second Amendment) Act 1926

Appearing applying or acting—These words as stated above have been substituted for the words duly appointed to act which occurred in the original rule The changes made in rule 4 below provide for the various purposes for which a pleader may be appointed The words duly appointed to act appear in the proviso to the amended r 4 (5) below See notes to r 4 below Pleadors appointed to act and pleaders engaged only to plead

Appearance—If a recognized agent although able to do so does not conduct the case on behalf of his principal his mere presence in Court is not an appearance in the suit within the meaning of r 6 or r 8 of O 9 (p) See O 9 below and notes to O 9 r 9 Meaning of Appearance

Appearance by party in person—See O 5 r 3

Application for leave to sue in forma pauperis—Such an application cannot be made by a recognized agent (q) See O 33 r 3



2 [S 37] The recognised agents of parties by whom such appearances, applications and acts may be made or done are—

Recognised agents

- (a) persons holding powers of attorney, authorizing them to make and do such appearances, applications and acts on behalf of such parties,
- (b) persons carrying on trade or business for and in the names of parties not resident within the local limits of the jurisdiction of the Court within which limits the appearance, application or act is made or done, in matters connected with such trade or business only, where no other agent is expressly authorized to make and do such appearances, applications and acts

Clause (a) has been amended by the Bombay High Court under s 122—See Appendix IV below Rules made by the High Court of Bombay Where a power of attorney instead of being a general power as required by r 2 (a) as amended by the Bombay High Court was a special power it was held that it was a defect not affecting the merits of the case within the meaning of s 99 and that the decree should not be disturbed in appeal (r)

Clause (b)—Where a plaint is signed and presented by the plaintiff's clerk who has no authority from the plaintiff to carry on business in the plaintiff's name the plaint cannot be said to have been signed by the plaintiff's recognised agent. In such a case the Court may rightly dismiss the suit (e)

3 [S 38] (1) Processes served on the recognised agent of a party shall be as effectual as if the same had been served on the party in person, unless the Court otherwise directs

Service of process on recognised agent

(2) The provisions for the service of process on a party to a suit shall apply to the service of process on his recognised agent

Service of process on recognised agent—A person holding a power of attorney is not bound to accept service of summons he may refuse to do so for he is not bound to act under the power (f)

4 [S 39] (1) No pleader shall act for any person in any Court, unless he has been appointed for the purpose by such person by a

Appointment of pleader

document in writing signed by such person or by his recognised agent or by some other person duly authorised by or under a power of attorney to make such appointment

(r) *G. P. v. J. on* (1933) 4 Bom 6  
 1 C 34 (3) A B 44  
 (e) *Uttamram v. T. J. J. J.* (19 ) 46 Bom 150

64 I C 5 (3) A B 113  
 (f) *Luthee Ch. d. In re* (188 ) 8 Cal 317

(2) Every such appointment shall be filed in Court and shall be deemed to be in force until determined with the leave of the Court by a writing signed by the client or the pleader, as the case may be, and filed in Court, or until the client or the pleader dies or until all proceedings in the suit are ended so far as regards the client

(3) For the purposes of sub rule (2) an application for review of judgment, an application under section 144 or section 152 of this Code, any appeal from any decree or order in the suit and any application or act for the purpose of obtaining copies of documents or return of documents produced or filed in the suit or of obtaining refund of monies paid into the Court in connection with the suit shall be deemed to be proceedings in the suit

(4) The High Court may, by general order, direct that where the person by whom a pleader is appointed is unable to write his name, his mark upon the document appointing the pleader shall be attested by such person and in such manner as may be specified by the order

(5) No pleader who has been engaged for the purpose of pleading only shall plead on behalf of any party, unless he has filed in Court a memorandum of appearance signed by himself and stating—

- (a) the names of the parties to the suit,
- (b) the name of the party for whom he appears, and
- (c) the name of the person by whom he is authorised to appear

Provided that nothing in this sub rule shall apply to any pleader engaged to plead on behalf of any party by any other pleader who has been duly appointed to act in Court on behalf of such party

Old rule—The present rule was substituted for the old rule 4 by the Code of Civil Procedure (Second Amendment) Act 1926. The old rule was as follows —

(1) The appointment of a pleader to make or do any appearance application or act for any person shall be in writing and shall be signed by such person or by his recognized agent or by some other person duly authorized by power of attorney to act in this behalf

(-) Every such appointment when accepted by a pleader shall be filed in Court and shall be considered to be in force until determined with the leave of the Court by a writing signed by the client or the pleader as the case may be and filed in Court or until the client or the pleader dies or until all proceedings in the suit are ended so far as regards the client

(3) No advocate of any High Court established under the Indian High Courts Act 1861 or of any Chief Court and no advocate of any other High Court who is a barrister shall be required to present any document empowering him to act "

**Amendment of the rule**—This rule is as amended by the Code of Civil Procedure (Second Amendment) Act 1926 Sub rules (1) and (2) correspond with the previous sub rules (1) and (2) except that in sub rule (2) the words when accepted by a pleader which occurred after the words every such appointment have been omitted. Under the old rule which required an acceptance it was held that the acceptance need not be in writing but that if the rules of the Court required a written acceptance the pleader would not be heard unless it was in writing (u) Sub rules (3) to (v) and the proviso are new

**Pleaders appointed to act and pleaders engaged only to plead**—Under the rule as it stood originally every pleader had to be appointed by a writing signed by the party or by his recognized agent etc Under the present rule a distinction is drawn between —

(1) a pleader appointed to act in Court

(2) a pleader engaged for the purpose of pleading only and

(3) a pleader engaged to plead by a pleader duly appointed to act in Court

(1) As regards a pleader appointed to act in Court it is provided by sub rule (1) that he cannot act for any person in any Court unless he is appointed by such person by a document in writing signed by such person or his recognized agent etc It is only if the appointment is made by a writing signed by the party etc that he can act and it is only where he is so appointed that he can be said to be duly appointed to act See the proviso to sub rule (5)

When a suit is instituted by a plaintiff through an agent the Court has the power to enquire into the agent's authority (t) A pleader appointed by an official liquidator who has obtained the sanction of the Court to institute a suit is duly appointed within the meaning of this rule though no sanction has been obtained under the Indian Companies Act for the appointment of the pleader (u) Where a party to a suit authorizes an agent by a special power of attorney to appoint a pleader to sign execution petitions a pleader appointed by the agent to support a petition verified by the agent is a pleader duly appointed to act on the party's behalf (x) Omission to file a vakilpatra together with the memorandum of appeal does not prevent the appeal from being an appeal properly preferred (y)

A pleader duly appointed by a person to act in Court on his behalf may appear or make an application or otherwise act for him

(2) A pleader engaged for the purpose of pleading only has to file a memorandum of appearance signed by himself as provided by sub rule (5)

(3) A pleader engaged to plead on behalf of a party by any other pleader who has been duly appointed to act has not to file either a vakalatnamah or a memorandum

**Rules of Courts**—This rule does not give an absolute right to any practitioner to appear in any Court in any matter he chooses It is subject to the rules governing the admission of different classes of practitioners in different Courts and to rules framed by the High Court (z)

- (u) *M he A Cha dra v Pa hu* (1916) 43 Cal 894 3 I C 39 *Jogesh Chandra Gupta in the matter of* (1916) 6 Cal WN 33 33 I C 831 *In the matter of two Pleaders* (1917) 1st L J 59 41 I C 38 *I d A I m v Kail Ram* (19 ) 6 Lah 461 91 I C 30 ( 6 ) A L J
- (v) *Nam Va oia v Ranghu* (189 ) 19 Cal 68 191 A 135
- (w) *Kolluwar a d Ahmedabad Ba li g Cor*

- porat on Ltd v G das* (1914) 5 Lah 414 84 I C 510 ( 5 ) A L
- (x) *Thiruvengadam v I rada I d v* (1911) 49 I A 534 44 Mad 736 70 I C 31 ( ) 4 I C →
- (y) *M ho d v Sh A Ahmed* (1906) 8 Bom L R 538 9 I C 260 (20) A B 336
- (z) *Verrappa S I esa* (1905) 48 Ma 165 *In v The Fide s of th H gh Co rt* (1884) 8 Bom 10

Advocates—See original sub rule (3) and the undermentioned case (a)

Bombay Pleaders Act 1920—S 10 and Form C in Schedule II of the Bombay Pleaders Acts have been repealed by the Code of Civil Procedure (Second Amendment) Act 1926

Delegation of authority by pleader —Where a pleader cannot attend he has no power to delegate his authority to another pleader (b)

Until determined with the leave of Court —A pleader cannot determine his appointment without the leave of the Court and after reasonable notice to the client (c) An attorney's retainer cannot be revoked by his client by a mere letter it can only be revoked with the leave of the Court by a writing signed by the client and filed in Court as provided in this rule (d) No formality is necessary about the leave of the Court (e)

Until all proceedings in the suit are ended —Where a suit is dismissed for default a pleader engaged to act in Court must not require a fresh power of attorney for the purpose of applying for the restoration of the case (f)

5 [S 40] Any process served on the pleader of any party or left at the office or ordinary residence of such pleader and whether the same is for the personal appearance of the party or not shall be presumed to be duly communicated and made known to the party whom the pleader represents, and, unless the Court otherwise directs, shall be as effectual for all purposes as if the same had been given to or served on the party in person

Service of process on pleader

6 [S 41] (1) Besides the recognised agents described in rule 2 any person residing within the jurisdiction of the Court may be appointed an agent to accept service of process

Agent to accept service

(2) Such appointment may be special or general and shall be made by an instrument in writing signed by the principal, and such instrument or, if the appointment is general, a certified copy thereof shall be filed in Court

Appointment to be in writing and to be filed in Court

## ORDER IV

### *Institution of Suits*

1 [S 48] (1) Every suit shall be instituted by presenting a plaint to the Court or such officer as it appoints in this behalf

Suit to be commenced by plaint

- (a) *L. P. ti s v. Dhulji* (195) 4 Pat 669  
 1 C 19 (-5) A 1 -3  
 (b) *Shardil v. J. K. J.* (1806) 0 Bom 993  
 (c) *L. P. r v. P. J.* (19--) 49 Cal 3 11 C  
 81 ( ) A C 515  
 (d) *At i (h d r v. Lakshman* (1009) 36 Cal 609

- 21 C 80  
 (e) *Ma skram v. Mah dam* (184) 4 Mad 519 8 1 C 10 ( 5) A M 21 (F L.)  
 (f) *Abd l A l v. P. J. b. A. i. o. Bank Ltd*  
 (13 9) 10 Lah L. J. 0 114 I C 76 ( 9)  
 1 L 98

(2) Every plaint shall comply with the rules contained in Orders VI and VII, so far as they are applicable

Plaint presented to judge at club after office hours—There is nothing in this rule to show that the presentation of the plaint must be during office hours or must be to the officer appointed at the Court or at any particular place. A judge therefore may accept a plaint at his residence or at his club after office hours if presented to him at that place. In so doing the judge constitutes himself an officer to receive the plaint (g)

2 [S 58] The Court shall cause the particulars of every suit to be entered in a book to be kept for the purpose and called the register of civil suits. Such entries shall be numbered in every year according to the order in which the plaints are admitted

## ORDER V

### *Issue and Service of Summons*

#### ISSUE OF SUMMONS

1 [S 64] (1) When a suit has been duly instituted a summons may be issued to the defendant to appear and answer the claim on a day to be therein specified

Provided that no such summons shall be issued when the defendant has appeared at the presentation of the plaint and admitted the plaintiff's claim

(2) A defendant to whom a summons has been issued under sub rule (1) may appear—

- (a) in person, or
- (b) by a pleader duly instructed and able to answer all material questions relating to the suit, or
- (c) by a pleader accompanied by some person able to answer all such questions

(3) Every such summons shall be signed by the Judge or such officer as he appoints, and shall be sealed with the seal of the Court

Decree without issue of summons—The proviso to sub r (1) contemplates cases where a decree may be passed against a defendant without issue or service of summons upon him (h)

(g) *S. Narayana v. Sa. & Rathachari* (1911) 47 Mad 31 9 I C 1017 (4) A M 418 *Thakur D. N. R. M. v. H. Rida* (1911) 34 All 48 14 I C 44 [Memorandum of appeal]

presented at judge's residence)  
(h) *B. K. of Be gail v. Currie & Co* (1869) 3 B L R 396

**2 [S 65]** Every summons shall be accompanied by a copy of the plaint or, if so permitted, by a concise statement

Copy or statement annexed to summons

**3 [S 66]** (1) Where the Court sees reason to require the personal appearance of the defendant, the summons shall order him to appear in person in Court on the day therein specified

Court may order defendant or plaintiff to appear in person

(2) Where the Court sees reason to require the personal appearance of the plaintiff on the same day, it shall make an order for such appearance

Consequence of non attendance—As to the consequence of non attendance in person see O 9 r 12

Non attendance of party on adjourned date—Where an order is made under this rule for the personal appearance of a party on a specified day he is not bound to appear personally on any adjourned date unless a fresh order is made requiring his appearance on that date. Where no fresh order is made and the Court disposes of the suit under O 9 r 12 the order is one made without jurisdiction (1)

No party to be ordered to appear in person unless a resident within certain limits

**4 [S 67]** No party shall be ordered to appear in person unless he resides—

(a) within the local limits of the Court's ordinary original jurisdiction, or

(b) without such limits but at a place less than fifty or (where there is railway or steamer communication or other established public conveyance for five-sixths of the distance between the place where he resides and the place where the Court is situate), less than two hundred miles distance from the court house

**5 [S 68]** The Court shall determine, at the time of issuing the summons, whether it shall be for the settlement of issues only, or for the final disposal of the suit, and the summons shall contain a direction accordingly

Summons to be either to settle issues or for final disposal

Provided that, in every suit heard by a Court of Small Causes, the summons shall be for the final disposal of the suit

Summons for final disposal—As a general rule summonses for final disposal of suits should be issued only in simple cases (2)

(1) *S. and Nath v. Mallu* (1911) 9 A.L.J. 639  
I.C. 634

(2) *T. J. Ram v. Sudram* (1914) 39 Bom. 37  
30 A.L.J. 665

**6 [ S 69 ]** The day for the appearance of the defendant shall be fixed with reference to the current business of the Court, the place of residence of the defendant and the time necessary for the service of the summons, and the day shall be so fixed as to allow the defendant sufficient time to enable him to appear and answer on such day

Fixing day for appearance of defendants

**7 [ S 70 ]** The summons to appear and answer shall order the defendant to produce all documents in his possession or power upon which he intends to rely in support of his case

Summons to order defendant to produce documents relied on by him

**8 [ S 71 ]** Where the summons is for the final disposal of the suit, it shall also direct the defendant to produce, on the day fixed for his appearance all witnesses upon whose evidence he intends to rely in support of his case

On issue of summons for final disposal defendant to be directed to produce his witnesses

### *Service of Summons*

**9 [ S 72 ]** (1) Where the defendant resides within the jurisdiction of the Court in which the suit is instituted or has an agent resident within that jurisdiction who is empowered to accept the service of the summons, the summons shall, unless the Court otherwise directs, be delivered or sent to the proper officer to be served by him or one of his subordinates

Delivery or transmission of summons for service

(2) The proper officer may be an officer of a Court other than that in which the suit is instituted, and, where he is such an officer, the summons may be sent to him by post or in such other manner as the Court may direct

**10 [ S 73 ]** Service of the summons shall be made by delivering or tendering a copy thereof signed by the Judge or such officer as he appoints in this behalf, and sealed with the seal of the Court

Mode of service

**Object of service**—The object of the service of a summons in whatever way it may be effected (other than substituted service to which other considerations apply) is that the defendant may be informed of the institution of the suit in due time before the date fixed for the hearing (1) See notes to r 17 below Service of summons.

- 11 [ S 74 ]** Save as otherwise prescribed, where there are more defendants than one, service of the summons shall be made on each defendant

Service on several defendants

Partners — As to service on partners see O 30 r 3

- 12 [ S 75 ]** Wherever it is practicable, service shall be made on the defendant in person, unless he has an agent empowered to accept service, in which case service on such agent shall be sufficient

Service to be on defendant in person when practicable or on his agent

- 13 [ S 76 ]** (1) In a suit relating to any business or work against a person who does not reside within the local limits of the jurisdiction of the Court from which the summons is issued, service on any manager or agent, who at the time of service, personally carries on such business or work for such person within such limits, shall be deemed good service

Service on agent by whom defendant carried on business

(2) For the purpose of this rule the master of a ship shall be deemed to be the agent of the owner or charterer

Manager or agent personally carrying on business—The manager or agent contemplated by this rule is one who has an initiative and independent discretion albeit subject possibly to general orders for his guidance. A mere servant employed to carry out orders or to execute a particular commission or a factor or commission agent who is not identified with the firm for which he acts is not such an agent (2)

- 14 [ S 77 ]** Where in a suit to obtain relief respecting, or compensation for wrong to, immovable property, service cannot be made on the defendant in person, and the defendant has no agent empowered to accept the service, it may be made on any agent of the defendant in charge of the property

Service on agent in charge in suits for immovable property

- 15 [ S 78 ]** Where in any suit the defendant cannot be found and has no agent empowered to accept service of the summons on his behalf, service may be made on any adult male member of the family of the defendant who is residing with him

Where service may be on male member of defendant's family

*Explanation*—A servant is not a member of the family within the meaning of this rule



**Service on adult male member**—Where no attempt is made to find the defendant and the summons is served on his son the summons cannot be said to be duly served. The inquiry as to the whereabouts of the defendant must not be perfunctory (m)

**16 [S 79]** Where the serving officer delivers or tenders a copy of the summons to the defendant personally, or to an agent or other person on his behalf, he shall require the signature of the person to whom the copy is so delivered or tendered to an acknowledgment of service endorsed on the original summons

Person served to sign acknowledgment

**Refusal to sign acknowledgment**—A mere refusal to sign an acknowledgment of service is not an offence under s 173 or s 180 of the Indian Penal Code (n)

**17 [S 86]** Where the defendant or his agent or such other person as aforesaid refuses to sign the acknowledgment, or where the serving officer, after using all due and reasonable diligence, cannot find the defendant, and there is no agent empowered to accept service of the summons on his behalf, nor any other person on whom service can be made, the serving officer shall affix a copy of the summons on the outer door or some other conspicuous part of the house in which the defendant ordinarily resides or carries on business or personally works for gain, and shall then return the original to the Court from which it was issued, with a report endorsed thereon or annexed thereto stating that he has so affixed the copy, the circumstances under which he did so, and the name and address of the person (if any) by whom the house was identified and in whose presence the copy was affixed

Procedure when defendant refuses to accept service or cannot be found

**The old section**—This section corresponds with s 80 of the Code of 1832 except in the following particulars —

- 1 The words after using all due and reasonable diligence are new They give effect to the decisions cited in the notes below under the head After using all due and reasonable diligence
- 2 The words or carries on business or personally works for gain have been added to remove a doubt which arose under the old section as to whether it was good service to affix a copy of the summons on the outer door of the defendant's place of business (o)
- 3 The words and the name and address etc at the end of the rule are also new They merely give effect to the existing practice.

(n) *Elra Chavay Kaal* (191) 6 Cal. W. N. 353; 63 I. C. 991 (1) A. C. 638  
(o) *Q. Emp. v. Ar. h. a. (193) 6 Cal. 38*

(e) *Chavappa v. Masaba* (180) B. H. C. A. C. 139



house but does not find him there and the defendant's adult son who is in the house refuses to accept service on behalf of the father these facts by themselves do not justify the officer in resorting to the mode of service prescribed by this rule he must before effecting such service inquire of the son as to where the defendant is and otherwise exercise due and reasonable diligence in finding the defendant (u) When a defendant is temporarily absent from home and is not represented in his house by an agent or male member of his family the summons should be again taken to the defendant's house to be served upon him at the time when enquiries made show that he is likely to be found at home (v) Mere temporary absence of the defendant does not justify the serving officer in affixing a copy of the summons on the door of the defendant's house (w) especially if the serving officer knows where the absent defendant is (x) See notes above under the head The old section

**Cannot find the defendant**—These words are wide enough to cover the case of a serving officer not being able to obtain access to a *purdanashin* lady or to deliver or tender a copy of the summons to her (y) See notes to r 19 below and notes also to O 9 r 13 Grounds on which *ex parte* decree may be set aside

**Proof of service**—If the plaintiff appears at the hearing of the suit but the defendant does not appear at the hearing the question whether the summons was duly served arises directly for the determination of the Court for the Court cannot proceed *ex parte* unless it is proved that the summons was duly served [O 9 r 6 (1)] Where a decree is passed *ex parte* against a defendant and the defendant satisfies the Court which passed the decree that the summons was not duly served upon him the Court may set aside the decree [O 9 r 13]

**18 [S 81]** The serving officer shall, in all cases in which the summons has been served under rule 16, endorse or annex, or cause to be endorsed or annexed, on or to the original

Endorsement of time and manner of service

summons, a return stating the time when and the manner in which the summons was served, and the name and address of the person (if any) identifying the person served and witnessing the delivery or tender of the summons

**Form of return**—See Appendix B to Schedule I Form No 11 The said Form has been altered in certain respects by the Chief Court of the Punjab see Appendix VII below

**19 [S 82, 1st para]** Where a summons is returned under rule 17, the Court shall, if the return under that rule has not been verified by the affidavit of the serving officer, and may, if

Examination of serving officer

it has been so verified, examine the serving officer on oath, or cause him to be so examined by another Court, touching his proceedings, and may make such further inquiry in the matter as it thinks fit, and shall either declare that the summons has been duly served or order such service as it thinks fit

(u) *S ka m v Padmakar* (1906) 30 Bom 63  
(v) *Bh m kett v Umabai* (189) 21 Bom 3  
(w) *S b m d v Subra m a* (1998) 1 Mad  
419 *Abraham v Donald* (1906) 29 Mad

34  
(y) *Sai na v Ga n* (1907) 4 All 30  
*Kat ode v Ah n Chandra* (1915) 19 C W  
N 1 31 30 1 C 64

Or order such service as it thinks fit —These words empower the Court even when there has been a technical compliance with the provisions of r 17 to order service in another mode if the Court thinks fit to do so in the interests of justice. Thus where the person to be served is a *purdanashin* lady and the serving officer not being able to obtain access to her affixes a copy of the summons on the outer door of her dwelling house as provided by r 17 yet although the mode of service is not improper the Court may under this rule direct the service of summons by means of notice by registered post so that the cover may in due course reach the lady herself (2)

## 20 [S 82, 2nd para, Ss 83, 84] (1) Where the Court

Substituted service

is satisfied that there is reason to believe that the defendant is keeping out of the way for the purpose of avoiding service, or that for any other reason, the summons cannot be served in the ordinary way, the Court shall order the summons to be served by affixing a copy thereof in some conspicuous place in the Court-house, and also upon some conspicuous part of the house [if any] in which the defendant is known to have last resided or carried on business or personally worked for gain, or in such other manner as the Court thinks fit

## (2) Service substituted by order of the Court shall be

Effect of substituted service

as effectual as if it had been made on the defendant personally

## (3) Where service is substituted by order of the Court,

Where service substituted  
time for appearance to be  
fixed

the Court shall fix such time for the appearance of the defendant as the case may require

Substituted service —See notes to r 17 above Service of summons

Where the Court is satisfied —The advisability of effecting service by substituted service is a matter primarily for the trial Court. The Appellate Court has no power to consider whether the order for substituted service was made on sufficient grounds or not. It has only to see whether the order was made according to law and whether the trial Court was satisfied that the conditions mentioned in this rule were fulfilled (a)

For any other reason —Where by the custom in India a defendant (being a Hindu woman of rank) could not be personally served with summons the Judicial Committee allowed service to be substituted on her *Deewan* [chief servant] (b)

## 21 [S 83 1st para] A summons may be sent by the

Rule of summons  
where defendant resides  
within jurisdiction of an  
other Court

Court by which it is issued, whether within or without the province, either by one of its officers or by post to any Court (not being the High Court) having jurisdiction in the place where the defendant resides

(2) *I. A. v. Vaidya* (1915) 19 C W

(a) *D. v. S. I. A. C. 64*

(b) *Clark v. Mullick* (1929) 2 M I A 63 64

Mal L J 477 10 C 43 ( ) A M

507

(b) *Clark v. Mullick* (1929) 2 M I A 63 64

house but does not find him there and the defendant's adult son who is in the house refuses to accept service on behalf of the father these facts by themselves do not justify the officer in resorting to the mode of service prescribed by this rule he must, before effecting such service inquire of the son as to where the defendant is and otherwise exercise due and reasonable diligence in finding the defendant (u) When a defendant is temporarily absent from home and is not represented in his house by an agent or male member of his family the summons should be again taken to the defendant's house to be served upon him at the time when enquiries made show that he is likely to be found at home (z) Mere temporary absence of the defendant does not justify the serving officer in affixing a copy of the summons on the door of the defendant's house (w) especially if the serving officer knows where the absent defendant is (z) See notes above under the head The old section

**Cannot find the defendant**—These words are wide enough to cover the case of a serving officer not being able to obtain access to a *purdanashin* lady or to deliver or tender a copy of the summons to her (y) See notes to r 19 below and notes also to O 9 r 13 Grounds on which *ex parte* decree may be set aside

**Proof of service**—If the plaintiff appears at the hearing of the suit but the defendant does not appear at the hearing the question whether the summons was duly served arises directly for the determination of the Court for the Court cannot proceed *ex parte* unless it is proved that the summons was duly served [O 9 r 6 (1)] Where a decree is passed *ex parte* against a defendant and the defendant satisfies the Court which passed the decree that the summons was not duly served upon him the Court may set aside the decree [O 9 r 13]

**18 [S 81]** The serving officer shall, in all cases in which the summons has been served under rule 16, endorse or annex, or cause to be endorsed or annexed, on or to the original summons, a return stating the time when and the manner in which the summons was served, and the name and address of the person (if any) identifying the person served and witnessing the delivery or tender of the summons

Endorsement of time and manner of service

**Form of return**—See Appendix B to Schedule I Form No 11 The said Form has been altered in certain respects by the Chief Court of the Punjab see Appendix VII below

**19 [S 82 1st para]** Where a summons is returned under rule 17, the Court shall, if the return under that rule has not been verified by the affidavit of the serving officer, and may, if it has been so verified, examine the serving officer on oath, or cause him to be so examined by another Court, touching his proceedings, and may make such further inquiry in the matter as it thinks fit, and shall either declare that the summons has been duly served or order such service as it thinks fit

Examination of serving officer

(u) *S k m v Paim l* (1906) 30 Bom 63  
(v) *Hlom hett v Umabai* (189) 1 Bom 3  
(w) *Sutram a v S brama a* (1900) 13 Ma 1  
419 *Abraham v De old* (1906) 9 Mad

(z) *S k a v Gauri* (1900) 4 All 30  
(y) *Ashwade v A him C and a* (1015) 19 C W  
N 1 31 30 I C 64

Or order such service as it thinks fit —These words empower the Court even when there has been a technical compliance with the provisions of r 17 to order service in another mode if the Court thinks fit to do so in the interests of justice. Thus where the person to be served is a *pardanashin* lady and the serving officer not being able to obtain access to her affixes a copy of the summons on the outer door of her dwelling house as provided by r 17 yet although the mode of service is not improper the Court may under this rule direct the service of summons by means of notice by registered post so that the cover may in due course reach the lady herself (2)

## 20 [S 82, 2nd para Ss 83-84] (1) Where the Court

substituted service

is satisfied that there is reason to believe that the defendant is keeping out of the way for the purpose of avoiding service, or that for any other reason, the summons cannot be served in the ordinary way, the Court shall order the summons to be served by affixing a copy thereof in some conspicuous place in the Court house, and also upon some conspicuous part of the house [if any] in which the defendant is known to have last resided or carried on business or personally worked for gain or in such other manner as the Court thinks fit

## (2) Service substituted by order of the Court shall be

Effect of substituted service

as effectual as if it had been made on the defendant personally

## (3) Where service is substituted by order of the Court,

Where service substituted time for appearance to be fixed

the Court shall fix such time for the appearance of the defendant as the case may require

Substituted service —See notes to r 17 above Service of summons

Where the Court is satisfied —The advisability of effecting service by substituted service is a matter primarily for the trial Court. The Appellate Court has no power to consider whether the order for substituted service was made on sufficient grounds or not. It has only to see whether the order was made according to law and whether the trial Court was satisfied that the conditions mentioned in this rule were fulfilled (a)

For any other reason —Where by the custom in India a defendant (being a Hindu woman of rank) could not be personally served with summons the Judicial Committee allowed service to be substituted on her *Deewan* [chief servant] (b)

## 21 [S 85, 1st para] A summons may be sent by the

Style of summons where defendant resides within jurisdiction of another Court

Court by which it is issued, whether with in or without the province, either by one of its officers or by post to any Court (not being the High Court) having jurisdiction in the place where the defendant resides

(2) *Ahmad v. P. Chandrasekhar* (1915) 19 C.W. 131, 30 I.C. 64

(a) *Dina Sen v. P. L. Sarma* (1977) 5

M 1 L.J. 477 10 I.C. 43 ( ) A.M.

(b) *C. v. Mulla* (1839) 2 M.I.A. 63 68

**Service by registered post**—This rule is to be read with s 27 of the General Clauses Act 10 of 1897 by which it is provided that when any document is required by an Act passed after 11th March 1897 to be served by post and the expression used is send [which is the expression used in the present rule] then unless a different intention appears [and no such intention appears in the present rule] the service shall be deemed to be effected by properly addressing pre paying and posting by registered post a letter containing the document and unless the contrary is proved to have been effected at the time at which the letter would be delivered in the ordinary course of post Reading the present rule with the said s 27 the High Court of Bombay held in a case in which it appeared that the postal packet enclosing the summons was properly addressed to the defendant and was registered duly stamped and posted but the packet was returned endorsed refused that the Court was entitled to draw the inference indicated in the said s 27 and to hold that there was sufficient service (c) In the earlier cases which arose under the corresponding section of the Code of 1882 where a postal packet was returned endorsed refused it was held that the service was not sufficient and that further evidence was necessary before the Court could act upon such endorsement (d) As to these cases however it is to be noted that they were all decided without any reference to s 27 of the General Clauses Act as all except one were decided before that Act came into force and the one decided after that Act came into force was not governed by the provisions of s 27 as that section did not apply to the Code of 1882 which was an enactment passed before 11th March 1897 the date on which the General Clauses Act came into force

The High Court of Bombay has recently held that the Court must allow the defendant a retrial if after a decree has been passed against him on evidence that the summons was served by registered post and returned refused he appears and denies receipt of the packet Macleod O J said Service by registered post is at any time a poor substitute for personal service which is directed by the Court It is allowed to litigants as a matter of convenience (e)

**22 [S 86]** Where a summons issued by any Court established beyond the limits of the towns of Calcutta Madras Bombay and Rangoon is to be served within any such limits, it shall be sent to the Court of Small Causes within whose jurisdiction it is to be served

S rvice within Presidency towns and R nsoon of ummon issued by Courts out ide

Additions made to the rule by the High Court of Bombay—See App IV

**23 [S 85, 2nd para]** The Court to which a summons is sent under rule 21 or rule 22 shall, upon receipt thereof, proceed as if it had been issued by such Court and shall then return

Duty of Court to which summons is sent

the summons to the Court of issue, together with the record (if any) of its proceedings with regard thereto

**Form of Return**—See Schedule I Appendix B Form No 10 and note the alterations made in the said Form by the High Court of Bombay in exercise of the powers conferred by s 122 above

(c) *El am Pa abas* (1911) 3 Bom 13 11 I C 31 See also *Roope* 15 II J Huz n (1914) 16 Bom L R 04 24 I C 437

(d) *Joye dro Chunder v Dur* 1 Nath (1899) 15 Cal 691 *Jaya nath v S asoo* (1903) 18

Form 506 *Ign G lam Hu n v Sas oo* (189 ) 21 Bom 41 418 *Fakhr* 1-d n v *Ghafu v I-d* (1901) 3 All 93

(e) *Sund r Spinner v M A Bh* 12 (19 ) 46 Bom 130 64 I C 396 ( ) A B S *Gaba dyce v C J Sm th* ( ) A P 663

**Sufficiency of service**—Where a summons has been transmitted by one Court to another for service by the latter and the return made by the Court serving the summons states that the service has been duly effected the presumption will be that the service was sufficient unless the return itself shows the insufficiency (f). Similarly when the return made by the Court serving the summons states that the summons has not been duly served and the summons is returned with that declaration to the Court from which it was issued the presumption is that the service was not sufficient and the Court from which the summons was issued should act upon that presumption unless there is good and strong evidence which comes or is brought to its notice showing that the summons was duly served (g). According to the Calcutta High Court however the Court issuing the summons must not proceed upon any presumption either way but must determine for itself whether the service was sufficient or not the reason given being that the present rule does not require the Court to which the summons is sent for service to make any return touching the sufficiency of service (h). This view has been dissented from by the High Court of Allahabad on grounds of expediency and further on the ground that it ignores the last sentence of rule 19 above which applies not only to the Court issuing the summons but also to the Court to which it is sent for service (i).

**24 [Ss 87, 88]** Where the defendant is confined in a prison, the summons shall be delivered or sent by post or otherwise to the officer in charge of the prison for service on the defendant

Service on defendant in prison

As to the duty of the officer to whom the summons is sent for service see r 29 below

**25 [S 89]** Where the defendant resides out of British India and has no agent in British India empowered to accept service, the summons shall be addressed to the defendant at the place where he is residing and sent to him by post, if there is postal communication between such place and the place where the Court is situate

Service where defendant resides out of British India and has no agent

Service by post—See notes to s 21 above

Service in foreign territory through Political Agent or Court

**26 [S 90]** Where—

- (a) in the exercise of any foreign jurisdiction vested in His Majesty or in the Governor General in Council, a Political Agent has been appointed, or a Court has been established or continued with power to serve a summons issued by a Court under this Code in any foreign territory in which the defendant resides, or

(f) *N. v. Mohamed v. K. Ba* (1886) 10 Bom

(g) *De la Iru v. Dr J. Mohan Lal* (1911) 33 All 612 11 I C 39

(h) *Fomanath v. G. P. Pado* (1892) 22 Cal 839

(i) *Dwarika Pr. ad v. B. J. Mohan Lal* (1911) 33 All 619 11 I C 39



- (b) the Governor-General in Council has, by notification in the *Gazette of India*, declared in respect of any Court situate in any such territory and not established or continued in the exercise of any such jurisdiction as aforesaid, that service by such Court of any summons issued by a Court under this Code shall be deemed to be a valid service,

the summons may be sent to such Political Agent or Court, by post or otherwise, for the purpose of being served upon the defendant and, if the Political Agent or Court returns the summons with an endorsement signed by such Political Agent or by the Judge or other Officer of the Court that the summons has been served on the defendant in manner hereinbefore directed, such endorsement shall be deemed to be evidence of service

The words italicized in cl (b) of this rule are new. They were inserted in this rule by the Repealing and Amending Act VIII of 1914

- 27 [S 422]** Where the defendant is a public officer (not belonging to His Majesty's military, naval or air forces or His Majesty's Indian Marine Service), or is the servant of a rail way company or local authority, the Court

Service on civil public officer or on servant of rail way company or local authority

may if it appears to it that the summons may be most conveniently so served, send it for service on the defendant to the head of the office in which he is employed, together with a copy to be retained by the defendant

**Amendments**—The words *or air* were added in the rule after the word *naval* by the Repealing and Amending Act 1927

**Officer belonging to the Indian Marine Service**—An officer or mechanic in the employ of the Indian Marine Service is subject to exactly the same rules as every other person under the Code that is to say service upon him is to be effected in the manner prescribed by rr 14 to 17 above (j)

- 28 [S 468]** Where the defendant is a soldier or airman the Court shall send the summons for service to his commanding officer together with a copy to be retained by the defendant

Service on soldiers

**Amendments**—The words *or airman* were inserted in the rule after the word *soldier* by the Repealing and Amending Act 1927

29 [Cf Ss 87 88 468] (1) Where a summons is delivered or sent to any person for service under rule 24, rule 27 or rule 28, such person shall be bound to serve it, if possible, and to return it under his signature, with a written acknowledgment of the defendant and such signature shall be deemed to be evidence of service

Duty of persons to whom summons is delivered or sent for service

(2) Where from any cause service is impossible, the summons shall be returned to the Court with a full statement of such cause and of the steps taken to procure service, and such statement shall be deemed to be evidence of non service

30 [Ss 91 92] (1) The Court may notwithstanding anything hereinbefore contained substitute for a summons a letter signed by the Judge or such officer as he may appoint in this behalf where the defendant is, in the opinion of the Court of a rank entitling him to such mark of consideration

Substitution of letter for summons

(2) A letter substituted under sub rule (1) shall contain all the particulars required to be stated in a summons, and, subject to the provisions of sub rule (3), shall be treated in all respects as a summons

(3) A letter so substituted may be sent to the defendant by post or by a special messenger selected by the Court, or in any other manner which the Court thinks fit, and where the defendant has an agent empowered to accept service, the letter may be delivered or sent to such agent

## ORDER VI

### *Pleadings generally*

1 [New Cf Jud Act 1873 S 100] O  
"Pleading" shall mean plaint or written statement

Plaint

Introduction of English rules of pleadings—The object of this Order is to introduce into British India the leading rules of pleadings followed in England. The whole of this Order excepting rr 14 and 15 is new. The rules comprised in this Order except rr 14 and 15 have been taken most of them from Order 19 and the rest from Order 23 of the English Rules made under the Judicature Acts. In one respect however the rigour of the English Rules has been relaxed by providing that the Court may notwithstanding the absence of any specific denial require any fact to be proved by the party who alleges it (see O 8 r 5)

**Function of pleadings** — The whole object of pleadings is to bring the parties to an issue and the meaning of the rules (relating to pleadings) was to prevent the issue being enlarged, which would prevent either party from knowing when the cause came on for trial what the real point to be discussed and decided was. In fact *the whole meaning of the system is to narrow the parties to definite issues* and thereby to diminish expense and delay especially as regards the amount of testimony required on either side at the hearing. (1) To attain this end the plaintiff should state in his plaint all the facts which constitute his cause of action. It is not sufficient to allege what may be a ground of action if something else be added which is not stated in the plaint. Upon all sound principles of pleading it is necessary to allege what must and not what may be a cause of action. (2) The defendant also should state in his written statement the material facts on which he relies for his defence. When the result of the pleading on both sides is that a material fact is affirmed on the one side and denied on the other the question thus raised between the parties is called an issue of *fact*. When one party answers his opponent's pleading by stating an objection in point of law the legal question thus raised between the parties is called an issue of *law*. See O 14 r 1.

A plaintiff's pleading is his plaint (O 7). A defendant's pleading is his written statement (O 8). In some cases a plaintiff who has filed his plaint may with the leave of the Court file a *written statement* or the Court may require him to file a *written statement*. In such cases the written statement forms part of the plaintiff's pleadings. Again there are cases in which a defendant who has filed his written statement may with the leave of the Court file an *additional written statement* or the Court may require him to do so. In such cases the *additional written statement* forms part of the defendant's pleadings. The plaintiff's written statement and the defendant's additional written statement are called *subsequent pleadings*. See O 8 r 9.

**2** [New R S C, O 19, r 4] Every pleading shall contain, and contain only, a statement in a concise form of the material facts on which the party pleading relies for his claim or defence, as the case may be, but not the evidence by which they are to be proved, and shall, when necessary, be divided into paragraphs, numbered consecutively. Dates, sums and numbers shall be expressed in figures.

Pleading to state material facts and not evidence

**General rules of pleading** — O 6 deals with Pleadings in general. O 7 deals with Plaints and O 8 with Written Statements. The following is a summary of the rules comprised in this order —

- 1 State your *whole* case in your pleading in other words set forth in your pleading *all* material facts on which you rely for your claim or defence (r 1).
- 2 State facts and *not* law (r 2). If any matter of law is set out in your opponent's pleading do not plead to it (m).
- 3 State the material facts on which you rely and *not* the evidence by which they are to be proved (rr 2 10 11 12).
- 4 State *material* facts only omit immaterial and unnecessary facts. Do not anticipate your opponent's pleading and plead to any matter which is not alleged against you (r 2).

(1) *Per Je sel M R In Th rp v Holdsworth*  
(18 6) 3 Ch D 637 632

(2) *West Rand Cc t t Gold M ng Co v Per*

(190) 10 K B 391 400  
(m) *Puch rd on v Mayo* 10 Ford (1 03) H B 1

- 5 State the facts of your case *concisely* but with precision (r 2)
- 6 It is not necessary to allege the performance of any condition precedent and  
an averment of performance is now implied in every pleading (r 6)
- 7 It is not necessary to set out the whole or any part of a document unless the  
precise words thereof are necessary. It is sufficient to state the effect of  
the document as briefly as possible (r 9)
- 8 It is not necessary to allege any matter of fact which the law presumes in  
your favour or as to which the burden of proof lies upon your opponent  
(r 13)

**Fundamental rule**—Rule 2 of this Order is the fundamental rule of pleadings. When analysed it will be found to require four things—

- I Every pleading must state *facts* and not law
- II It must state *material facts* and material facts only
- III It must state only the facts on which the party pleading relies for his claim or defence and *not the evidence* by which they are to be proved
- IV It must state such facts in a *concise form*

The main object or one of the main objects of this rule is that the one party may know what are the facts on which the other party relies in order that he may be prepared to meet the case. (n)

I Every pleading must state facts and not law —A pleading must not set forth a public statute for the Court is bound to take judicial notice of it (o) Nor should parties plead conclusions of law or of mixed law and fact it is for the Court to declare the law arising upon the facts before it The parties should only state the facts on which they rely for their claim or defence

It is bad pleading to allege merely that a *right* or a *duty* exists the facts must be set out which give rise to the right or create the duty. Thus in a suit for damages for negligence it is not enough for the plaintiff to state that the defendant has been guilty of negligence without showing in what respect he was negligent and how he became bound to use care to prevent injury to others. Negligence means a breach of duty to take due care and caution. The plaintiff therefore ought to state facts upon which the supposed duty is founded and the duty to the plaintiff with the breach of which the defendant is charged (p). Similarly it is not sufficient for the plaintiff to aver that the defendant did the act complained of wrongfully, unlawfully and improperly or

without any justification therefore or right so to do. He must state the facts upon which he proposes to rely as showing that the act was done wrongfully or unlawfully.

Those epithets under the present system of pleading are useless and redundant. They add nothing whatever to the plaintiff's case. They are merely now epithets of abuse. They were formerly in declarations essential because under that form of pleading *legal rights* were stated for facts but *facts alone* are stated now (g). Upon like principles it is not sufficient for the plaintiff to say Under and by virtue of a certain deed I am entitled etc. He must state the facts which go to show his title (r). In like manner a plaintiff claiming under a *donatio mortis causa* must state the facts which according to him would constitute it a valid *donatio mortis causa* it is not sufficient to say that the deceased two days before his death made a good and valid *donatio mortis causa* to the

( ) J. Morgan Orr v. Morgan (198 ) 3 C D  
49 496

(c) *Introdução à Engenharia* (1918) Plow 1 84

(p) Co. treit v. Egerlon (16) I R - C 1 3 1  
3 4 West I I C C I I Golt W i g Co

*v. Fox* [1905] 2 L. R. 391 400

(4) *P. Jessel M 1* in *Dof v E o n n a r y* (18 8)  
10 C D 94 30.

( ) *Field v. Esch* 158 3 Times

plaintiff of the property (s) Where a plaintiff claims by inheritance it is not sufficient to say I am the heir at law He must state the particulars showing the links of relationship on which he relies as constituting him such heir (t)

The same principles apply to a defendant's pleading A defendant may not in his written statement say merely I am not liable He must allege facts which show that he is not liable Thus a defendant who claims privilege in a suit for defamation must not plead merely that he published the words on a privileged occasion He must state the facts which give rise to the privilege (u)

II Every pleading must state material facts and material facts only—To begin with a party should set out in his pleading *all* material facts on which he relies for his claim or defence What particulars are to be stated must depend on the facts of each case But it is absolutely essential that the pleading not to be embarrassing to the defendant should state those facts which will put the defendants on their guard and tell them what they have to meet when the case comes on for trial (v) If a party omits to plead a material fact he will not be allowed to give evidence of that fact at the trial unless the Court gives him leave to amend his pleadings under r 17 below If parties were held strictly to their pleadings under the present system they ought not to be allowed to prove at the trial as a fact on which they would have to rely in order to support their case any fact which is not stated in the pleadings (w) Thus if A sues B for specific performance of a contract alleged to have been signed by B's agent and the only fact stated in B's written statement as a ground of defence is that the alleged agent was of unsound mind and therefore incompetent to contract B will not be allowed to prove at the hearing that the alleged agent *had in fact no authority to sign the contract* B ought to have pleaded want of authority in his written statement if he intended to rely upon it for his defence Nor will B be allowed to amend his written statement in such a case under rule 17 below for if a defendant were to be at liberty to put in a defence inconsistent with the rules of pleading and then at the trial get the case to stand over in order to put in a *new defence* the consequences might be very prejudicial (x)

Matters affecting damages—The present rule provides that every pleading should contain and contain only *material facts on which the party pleading relies for his claim or defence* as the case may be That is to say a plaintiff should contain only those material facts on which the plaintiff relies for his claim and a written statement should contain only those material facts on which the defendant relies for his defence Does this mean that the plaint should be confined to those facts only which constitute the plaintiff's *cause of action* and that the written statement should be confined to those facts only which constitute the defendant's *defence*? It has been held as regards a plaintiff's claim that the words *material facts on which the party pleading relies for his claim* are not confined to those facts which are essential to the plaintiff's cause of action but include any fact which the plaintiff is entitled to prove at the hearing Thus facts which merely tend to increase the amount of damages are not essential to the cause of action but they certainly are facts which the plaintiff is entitled to prove at the hearing as matters in aggravation of damages Such facts are therefore material facts within the meaning of this rule and a plaintiff has to state them in his plaint (y) As observed by Brett LJ in *Phillips v Phillips* ( ) the words of the rule are not the facts which will be necessary

(1) *F P rton Tor se dv Part n* (18<sup>th</sup>) 30 W R 8 [189]

(2) *Palme v Palme* [1899] 1 Q B 319

(3) *S mm nda v D* 2 (1893) 1 R 5 C L 338

(4) *Per Cotton LJ in Phillips v Phillips* (1885) 4 Q B D 127 139

(5) *Phillips v Phillips* (1885) 4 Q B D 127 133 per Brett LJ *Brook v Brook* (1886)

1 F D 19 *Davis v James* (1888) 6 C D 78

(6) *Byrd v W m* (1897) C D 281

(7) *Stallington v Lora* (1880) 6 Q B D 190 191 *Hudney v Moignard* (1890) 1 Q B D 630

(8) (1888) 4 Q B D 10 13

to support the cause of action they are the material facts on which the party relies for his claim. In *Millington v Loring* (a) which was a suit for damages for breach of a contract to marry the plaintiff after allying the promise to marry in the first paragraph and the breach thereof in the second went on to allege in the third paragraph that the plaintiff relying upon the said promise permitted the defendant to debauch and carnally know her whereby the defendant infected her with a venereal disease. Analysing the above plaint it may be stated that the first and second paragraphs stated facts that were essential to the cause of action: (1) facts relating to the making of the contract and facts relating to the breach of the contract being facts which constitute the cause of action in a suit for damages for the breach of a contract. But the facts stated in the third paragraph were not essential to the cause of action. Nevertheless they were material facts within the meaning of the rule for the plaintiff was entitled to prove them as matters in aggravation of damages and it was held that they were properly set forth in the plaint. Turning now to the defence in a suit for damages the rule laid down in *Wood v Durham* (b) is that a defendant is not in general entitled to plead in his defence matters in mitigation of damages. The ground of the decision in that case is that such matters do not constitute any defence to an action and a defendant can under the rule allege only those material facts on which he relies for his defence. As to *Millington v Loring* it was said that it was a case where there was a good cause of action of a double character stated: there were damages claimed by reason of an alleged breach of promise of marriage but there was far more because part of the cause of action was that by reason of that the plaintiff had been ill through the seduction by the defendant who had ruined her character and has infected her with a bad disease. One may be permitted to doubt whether illness through seduction and infection with disease formed part of the cause of action. Moreover the decision in *Millington v Loring* has been followed in a case later than *Wood v Durham* where it could not be said that there was a cause of action of a double character (c). However this may be it is to be remarked that the decision in *Wood v Durham* turned not only on the construction of the corresponding English rule but on O 21 r 4 which provides in express terms that no denial or defence shall be necessary as to damages claimed or their amount but they shall be deemed to be put in issue in all cases unless expressly admitted. O 21 r 4 of the English rules has not been reproduced in the Code. Therefore just as the plaintiff may plead any matter in aggravation of damages as to which he could give evidence at the trial so the defendant may plead any matter in mitigation of damages as to which he could give evidence at the trial. See notes to O 6 r 3. Except damages.

**Facts not yet material to a case.**—The pleadings should only contain such facts as are material at the present stage of the suit. It is not proper to anticipate the answer of the adversary. To do so is like leaping before one comes to the stile (d). It is no part of the statement of claim [plaint in our pleadings] to anticipate the defence and to state what the plaintiff would have to say in answer to it. That would be a return to the old inconvenient system of pleading in Chancery, which ought certainly not to be encouraged when the plaintiff used to allege in his bill imaginary defences of the defendant and make charges in reply to them (e). Thus it is unnecessary in a suit upon a bond to allege that the defendant was of full age when he executed the bond. For if he were a minor when he executed the bond it is for him to prove it; it need not be denied by anticipation (f). Similarly a defendant should not plead to any matter which is not alleged against him. Thus if a defendant is sued for slander the only way to meet the plaintiff's claim is to plead (1) that the words in question were not spoken and published

(a) (1880) 6 Q B D 199

(b) (1844) 1 Q B D 501 *Wood v Cox* (1855) 4 Times Rep 550(c) *Walters v Morgan* (1890) 4 Q B D 630(d) *Sir Ralph Borsari* (1873) 1 exch. 217(e) *Wall v Eve* (1846) 4 C D 341 34 per James L. J.(f) *Walters v Morgan* (1890) 4 Q B D 630*Sir Ralph Borsari* (1873) 1 exch. 217

2 or (2) that they were spoken and published and are true or (3) that they were spoken and published and are privileged. If instead of so doing he pleads that he did not say the words alleged in the plaint but that he said something else and that the something else which he said was true and spoken on a privileged occasion the defence will be struck out under r 16 below as one embarrassing the fair trial of the suit (g)

III Every pleading must state facts and not the evidence by which they are to be proved—Every pleading must contain a statement of the material facts on which the party pleading relies but not the evidence by which those facts are to be proved. It is an elementary rule of pleading that when a state of facts is relied on, it is enough to allege it simply without setting out the subordinate facts which are the means of producing it or the evidence sustaining the allegation (h). No doubt evidence also consists of facts but there is a convenient nomenclature to distinguish the two. The material facts on which the party pleading relies for his claim or defence are called *facta probanda*. The evidence or the facts by means of which they are to be proved are called *facta probantia*. Every pleading should contain only *facta probanda* and not *facta probantia*. The distinction is taken in the very rule itself between the facts on which the party relies and the evidence to prove those facts. Erle C.J. expressed it in this way. He said there were facts that might be called the *allegata probanda* the facts which ought to be proved and they were different from the evidence which was adduced to prove those facts. And it was upon that expression of opinion of Erle C.J. that rule 4 [of the English rules corresponding to the present rule] was drawn. The facts which ought to be stated are the material facts on which the party pleading relies. (i) Thus where a suit is brought against an Insurance Company on a policy on the life of A and one of the conditions of the policy is that it should be void if the insured committed suicide the Company should only plead if the defence is that A committed suicide that A died by his own hand. It is wrong to state in the written statement that A had been melancholy for weeks that he bought a pistol and shot himself with it. These facts are merely evidence (*facta probantia*) facts by means of which the *factum probandum* namely suicide is to be proved (j). Similarly it is wrong to set out in the pleading admissions made by the opponent for admissions are only evidence (k). Thus where a plaintiff alleged that certain windows of his were ancient and the defendant stated in his defence that the plaintiff had in a former action admitted that they were not ancient the allegation was struck out (l). Upon the same principle where the facts in a pedigree are facts to be relied upon as facts to establish the right or title they must be set out but where the pedigree is the means of proving the facts relied on as facts by which the right or title is to be established then the pedigree is evidence that need not be set out (m).

Rules 10, 11 and 12 of this Order are special applications of the general principle laid down in this rule.

IV Every pleading must state material facts in a concise form.—To attain this end the forms in Appendix A when applicable and where they are not applicable forms of the like character as nearly as may be should be used for all pleadings (see r 3 below). At the same time the rules given above under the head General rules of pleading should be borne in mind. But the pleader should not sacrifice precision to conciseness. For as observed by Kay J. although pleadings must now be concise they must also be precise (n). In fact rule 4 expressly required

- (g) *Rassam v Budge* (1893) 1 Q B 61.  
 (h) *Williams v Wicks* (1858) 8 A & L 314 331  
 per Lord Denman C.J.  
 (i) *Phillips v Phillips* (1878) 4 Q B D 1-7  
 133 per Brett, L.J.  
 (j) See *Borrolia v Hunter* (1846) 5 Man and  
 Gr 639.  
 (k) *Dorey v Corvett* (1837) 7 C D 48 495.  
 (l) *Fullamson v L & N W Railway Co*

- (1879) 12 C D 787 793. *Spedding v*  
*Forpatrick* (1888) 33 C D 410 414.  
*British Medical Life Association v British*  
*Fire Association* (1888) 39 L T 602.  
 (m) *Jumb v Beaumont* (1894) 49 L T 72.  
 (n) *Phillips v Phillips* (1878) 4 Q B D 1-7  
 134 per Brett, L.J.  
 (o) *Townsend v Wilson* (1887) 30 W R (Eng)  
 87.

that in all cases in which particulars may be necessary beyond such as are exemplified in the forms [in Appendix A] particulars (with dates and items if necessary) shall be stated in the pleadings. As to further information on this subject of certainty in pleading, see notes to rr 4 5 below

**Alternative and inconsistent allegations**—The rule now under consideration does not prohibit inconsistent pleadings. A person may rely upon one set of facts if he can succeed in proving them and he may rely upon another set of facts if he can succeed in proving them and it appears to me to be far too strict a construction of this Order to say that he must make up his mind on which particular line he will put his case when perhaps he is very much in the dark (o) The rules as to joinder of defendants (O 1 r 3) and causes of action (O 2 r 3) as also the rules as to the reliefs that may be claimed by a plaintiff (O 7 rr 7 8) clearly show that either party may allege in his pleadings two or more inconsistent sets of material facts and claim relief thereunder in the alternative (p) A plaintiff may rely upon several different rights alternatively although they may be inconsistent (q) But then as to each of those he ought to set out the facts upon which he would have to rely as facts to maintain that right (r) So too a defendant may by his written statement raise as many distinct and separate and therefore inconsistent defences as he may think proper (s) But this is subject to the provision contained in rule 16 below which provides that the Court may strike out any matter in a plaint or written statement which may embarrass the fair trial of the suit (t) A pleading however is not embarrassing within the meaning of rule 16 merely because it sets up inconsistent sets of facts (u) Hence it cannot be struck out solely on that ground To go to the length of saying that no inconsistent pleading can be pleaded appears to me not warranted by the rules and contrary to the established practice of the Courts (v) It must however be noted that If alternative cases are alleged the facts ought not to be mixed up leaving the [other party] to pick out the facts applicable to each case but facts ought to be distinctly stated so as to show on what facts each alternative of the relief sought is founded (w) [See O 7 r 8] If the facts are so mixed up that they may embarrass the fair trial of the suit the Court may strike out matters which may embarrass the trial What the rules prohibit are not inconsistent pleadings but pleadings which set up inconsistent and embarrassing claims and inconsistent and embarrassing defences See notes to O 7 r 7 **Alternative relief**

A plea that a policy of fire insurance was not in existence at the time of the fire and that there was no contract of insurance at all coupled with an alternative plea that if there was a contract then by reason of certain conditions precedent to the attaching of the liability the insurance company would not be liable is not contrary to the law of India (x)

**3 [New R S C O 19, r 5]** The forms in Appendix A when applicable, and where they are not applicable forms of the like character, as nearly as may be, shall be used for all pleadings

- (o) *Re Morgan Owen v Morgan* (1887) 35 C D 49 499 per Lindley L J  
(p) See *Bajal v Eason* (1877) 7 C D 1  
(q) *PAI pps v PAI pps* (18 5) 4 Q B D 1 7 134 per Br tt, L J  
(r) *Id* See also O 7 r 8  
(s) *Bendon v Greenwood* (18 8) 3 Ex D 351  
(t) *Re Morgan Owen v Morgan* (1887) 35 C D 49 496

- (u) *Id*  
(v) (1887) 35 C D 492 *supra*.  
(w) (1887) 3 C D 49 500 per Lindley L J  
(x) *Dary v G rell* (18 5) 7 C D 4 3 489, per Thesiger L J *Official Assignee v Eldysford* (1919) 4 C W N 145 148 54 1 C 00 See also O 8 r  
(y) *Hameed & Co v Universal Fire Insurance Co* (19 4) 4 Eas 144 831 C 593 (1904) A K 31



4 [New R S C, O 19, r 6] In all cases in which

Particulars to be given where necessary

the party pleading relies on any misrepresentation, fraud, breach of trust, wilful default, or undue influence and in all other cases in which particulars may be necessary beyond such as are exemplified in the forms aforesaid, particulars (with dates and items if necessary) shall be stated in the pleading

Object of particulars— Although pleadings must now be concise they must also be precise (y) For this purpose all necessary particulars must be embodied in the pleadings Where a plaint contains sufficient averments and indicates with reasonable precision what the claim sued on is the suit should not fail by reason of the omission or incorrect description of any particular (z) If the particulars stated in the pleadings are not sufficiently specific the other party may apply for further and better particulars under the next rule The object of particulars is to prevent surprise at the trial by informing the opposite party what case he has to meet to define and narrow the issues to be tried and so save unnecessary expense (a) *Particulars supplement pleadings* which would otherwise be too vague and general and ensure a fair trial by giving notice of the case intended to be set up (b) What particulars are to be stated must depend upon the facts of each case (c) As a general rule it may be stated that as much certainty and particularity must be insisted on as is reasonable having regard to the circumstances and to the nature of the acts themselves To insist upon less would be to relax old and intelligible principles To insist upon more would be the vainest pedantry (d) At the same time the distinction between *particulars* and *evidence* must be steadily kept in view The Courts have uniformly endeavoured to prevent the plaintiff or the defendant as the case may be from prying into the brief of his opponent for finding out *what is to be the evidence which is to be produced at the trial* On the other hand the Courts have uniformly said that the plaintiff or the defendant is entitled to be told *any and every particular* which will enable him properly to prepare his case for the trial so that he may not be taken by surprise (e) That is to say whilst particulars may be ordered to prevent surprise and to inform the opposite party of the case he has to meet particulars are not ordered of the mode in which it may be proposed to prove the case set up in the pleading (f) To use the phraseology of r 2 above particulars will be ordered of the *material facts* on which the party pleading relies for his claim or defence but not of the *evidence* by which those facts are to be proved Thus a defendant is not entitled to know the names of the plaintiff's witnesses for that is to require particulars of the *evidence* by which the plaintiff's case is to be proved But where the names of witnesses form part of the *material facts* constituting a party's case he is bound to state them in his pleading and if he does not an order may be made requiring him to disclose the names (g) If the particulars are those that he ought to give he cannot refuse to do so merely on the ground that his answer will disclose the names of the witnesses he proposes to call (h) This may be explained by an illustration A deals in drugs bearing the registered trade-mark Herbalin B uses the word *Herbaline* on drugs manufactured by him A sues B for infringement of his trade mark alleging in the plaint that the use of his trade

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| (y) <i>T v W</i> and <i>Tarto</i> (189) 0 W R (Eng) 37 per Kay J  | (z) <i>Hippes v Hippes</i> (18 8) 4 Q B D 1 130                        |
| (a) <i>Sam J v M th Telloppa</i> (15 9) 36 Mad L J 0 111 I C 897 (r 8) A M 940  | (d) <i>Fatel Jfa v Fren</i> s [189] Q B 54 65                          |
| (b) <i>Sp Id v Pcp t L</i> (1888) 38 C D 410 413 <i>S ind re v J es</i> (19) C D 43 431 <i>Thompson v Lurley</i> (1833) 31 W R 30 (Eng) | (e) <i>Humphreys and Co v The Taylor Drug Co</i> (1888) 39 C D 692 693 |
| (c) <i>Middlek v Middlek</i> (1900) 1 Ch 3 6 33 35  | (f) <i>Dal v Warden</i> (1897) L T 6 68                                |
|   | (g) <i>Merritt v CA Mberlain</i> (1896) 17 Q B D 154 161               |
|   | (h) <i>Zuerenbery v Labouchere</i> [1893] 4 Q B 153 164 165            |

mark by *B* is calculated to induce and had in fact induced diverse persons to purchase *B*'s goods as and for *A*'s goods. *B* applies for particulars of the names and addresses of the diverse persons. *B* is entitled to the particulars for the names in this case form part of the *material facts* which constitutes *A*'s case. The whole question in such a case is has the defendant induced *diverse persons* to buy his goods as and for those of the plaintiff (i).

**Fraud and coercion**—Where fraud is charged against the defendant it is an acknowledged rule of pleading that the plaintiff must set forth the *particulars* of the fraud which he alleges. It is not enough to use such general words as *fraud*, *deceit* or *machinations*. General allegations however strong may be the words in which they are stated are insufficient even to amount to an averment of fraud of which any Court ought to take notice (j). Where a plaintiff seeks relief on the ground of fraud but no particulars of the fraud are given in the plaint the Court may allow the plaint to be amended or it may reject the plaint (k) [see O 6 r 17 and O 7 r 11]. A charge of fraud must be substantially proved as laid and when one kind of fraud is charged another kind of fraud cannot upon failure of proof be substituted for it (l). Nor is it proper for the appellate Court to entertain a case of fraud other than the one specifically alleged in the pleadings (m). The same rules apply when *coercion* is charged in the plaint (n).

If the particulars of fraud stated in the plaint are not sufficiently specific the defendant may apply for further particulars under the next rule. Thus where it is alleged by the plaintiffs that the defendants have made false entries in the plaintiff's books for the purpose of defrauding them the plaintiffs may be directed to furnish particulars specifying the entries charged to be false and the nature of their objection to each item (o). See notes to rule 5 below. **Discovery** before particulars ill 1 and notes to O 6 r 17. Amendment by adding plea of fraud.

**Misrepresentation**—Where it is alleged in the plaint that the defendant represented to the plaintiff etc. it should be stated whether the representation was verbal or in writing (p). It is not enough in an action to restrain infringement of a trade mark to allege that diverse persons were induced by the acts of the defendant to purchase his goods as and for those of the plaintiff. The plaintiff should state in the plaint particulars of the names and addresses of those diverse persons (q).

**Breach of trust**—Where breach of trust is charged the pleading must specify the acts constituting the alleged breach of trust. It is not enough to say that the defendant had in various ways misapplied rent and profits of leaseholds which he had received on behalf of the plaintiff and had committed breaches of trust (r).

#### Other cases in which particulars may be necessary —

**Misconduct**—Where the dismissal of a servant or an agent is justified on the ground of misconduct the party so justifying must specify the acts of misconduct (s).

**Negligence**—Where negligence or contributory negligence is charged full details must be given of the acts on which the party pleading relies as constituting negligence (t).

(i) *Ilmp v s v The Tajo Drug Co* (1884) 31 C D 693. See also *Miba & v Midbank* [1900] 1 Ch 376.

(j) *W v J d v The Mut I Society* (1880) 5 App Ca 685 69. *per Lord Selborne L.C.* *J d v d h v Tildal v SA was found* (191) 14 I A 13 151 33 Bom 441 46 31 C 63.

(k) *C v Na v Tel khram* (1908) 15 Cal. 35 151 & 119. *Fah v G g dhar* (190) 5 Bom 55. *Jvoti Prokash v Jhorm* II (1902) 36 Cal 134 11 C 84. *See A. & J v Nam* (1898) 18 Bom 144.

(l) *Abd l Hoster v T rner* (183) 11 Bom

60 14 I A 111

(m) *Mahomed M v Savari Fajaya* (1900) 3 M d 37

(n) *Puru hotam v Pandur g* (1914) 39 Bom. 149 31 C 931

(o) *Veep v SI per v d c Co v Pajmer* (1886) 34 C D 63

(p) *Selvi a v v 108 g* (1884) W N 93

(q) *Ilmp v s v T ylor Drug Co* (1888) 32 C D 693

(r) *Anand v Inre* (1845) 54 L J Ch 1104 (1855) 33 W R 5 [En 1]

(s) *Caundor v Jones* (1) C D 435

(t) *C v v Fajaya* (186) L R 1 C P 31. *M v v M Fajaya* (1906) 1 R 10

**Agreement**—Where an agreement is alleged the pleading should state the date of the agreement the names of the parties to it and whether it was in writing or verbal (u) If it is an implied agreement it should appear from what facts or circumstances it is to be implied (see r 12 below)

**Defamation**—In an action for slander the plaintiff must give particulars of the names of the persons to whom the alleged slander was made (t)

In an action for libel where the charge made against the plaintiff in the alleged libel is general in its nature a defendant who pleads a justification must state in his pleading the facts on which he relies in support of his justification (w) But where in an action of libel the defendant relies on the defence of fair comment and pleads it in the form now commonly known as the rolled up plea—*v* In so far as the said words consist of allegations of fact the said words are in their nature and ordinary meaning true in substance and in fact and in so far as the said words consist of expression of opinion they are fair comment made in good faith and without malice for the benefit of the public upon the said facts which are a matter of public interest the Court will not order the defendant to specify which of the words complained of he relies on as being statements of facts and which as being expressions of opinion. Nor will the Court order him to give particulars of the facts on which he relies as being the basis of his comments if the plea (as above) limits those facts to the said facts for the plaintiff is thereby given all the information on the subject that he can require (x) A sends a book of which he is the author to B for a review B in reviewing the book prints and publishes among other statements the following A is by his own confession a most barefaced liar A sues B for damages for libel B justifies pleading the truth of the alleged libel B must specify in his pleading the passage in A's work on which he relies in support of the defence of justification (y)

**Accounts**—Where a plaintiff claims merely to have a general account taken he need not give particulars as to the items But it is otherwise if the plaintiff claims a definite amount instead of an account In the latter case the plaintiff must give particulars as to the items of which it is composed (z)

**Where a lump sum is claimed**—Where a plaintiff claims a lump sum the defendant is entitled to particulars of the items composing such sum (a) So also where a plaintiff gives credit for a lump sum and sues for the balance (b)

**Particulars of defence**—The general principles upon which the Courts act in requiring particulars to be given of allegations or matters stated in plaints are applicable equally to defences and the rules relating to the giving of particulars are in general applicable to all pleadings though from the nature of the case the occasion for particulars arises somewhat less frequently in regard to defences than in regard to claims. Thus where a defence consists of traverses or denials of allegations in the claim so that the defendant is not taking upon himself the onus of proving any substantive facts but is only denying or requiring proof of those alleged by the plaintiff the occasion for particulars does not arise but where he pleads affirmatively or sets up facts to be proved in answer to the plaintiff's case he may be and in general is as much under obligation to give particulars as if he were alleging such or similar matters in a plaint (c) For instance if a defendant sets up a defence of payments made he has to give particulars of

- (u) *Turquand v Aaron* (1879) 43 L. J. Q. B. 703  
 (v) *Rossell v Buchanan* (1886) 16 Q. B. D. 656  
*Darey v Bertinck* [1893] 1 Q. B. 185 188  
 (w) *Zirrenbe v Labouchere* [1893] 2 Q. B. 183  
*See also Godman v T. M. & Co. Ltd.* [1906] 1 K. B. 773  
 (x) *App. K. & Co. v Times Publishing Co.* [1904] 1 K. B. 675  
 (y) *Deveraux v Clark & Co.* [1891] 2 Q. B. 582.  
 (z) *A. J. & Co. v. W. & Co.* (1880) 16 C. D. 13

- Flocke v Osmund* (1844) 23 C. D. 119  
*Kemp v Goldsberry* (1837) 36 C. D. 505.  
 0  
 ( ) *Philips v Phillips* (1873) 4 Q. B. D. 177  
 133  
 (b) *Godden v Corsten* (1879) 5 C. P. D. 17  
 ( ) *Fabre v Owe* (1890) 6 Times L. R. 170  
*J. & Co. v. J. & Co. County Council* (1890)  
 6 Times L. R. 10

th dates and amounts of such payments. So if he justifies a libel he must state the facts fully in his pleadings or give particulars (d). Similarly where he alleges that he released from or exonerated and discharged from the performance of his contract he must in his written statement give sufficient information to his opponent as to how and when he was so released or discharged [Bullen and Leake *Precedents of Pleadings* 6th ed. 532-533]. But where the onus of establishing a positive or negative allegation lies on the plaintiff the Court will not order the defendant to give particulars of his traverse of the allegation. Thus where the plaintiff alleged that the committee of the Stock Exchange in declining to re-elect him as a member of the exchange did not act *bond fide* fairly, reasonably or judiciously in coming to the conclusion they did and the committee in their defence alleged that they acted *bond fide* and honestly it was held that the onus of proving that the committee had not acted *bond fide* being on the plaintiff he was not entitled to particulars of the facts or grounds upon which the committee based their decision (e).

Failure to give particulars after order—If the order directing a party to give particulars is not obeyed then if the plaintiff is in default he should have his action stayed and if the defendant is in default his defence should be struck out (f).

**5** [New R S C O 19, r 7] A further and better statement of the nature of the claim or defence, or further and better particulars of any matter stated in any pleading may in all cases be ordered, upon such terms, as to cost and otherwise, as may be just

Further and better statement of particulars

Application for particulars—The object of particulars is to prevent surprise at the trial and to limit the inquiry at the trial to the matters set out in the particulars. So I think particulars ought to be encouraged. They tend to narrow the issues (g). If a party does not state in his pleading all the particulars required by r 4 the other party may apply under this rule for further and better particulars. In the English practice it is to be followed here the application need not be supported by any affidavit except perhaps in a special case (h).

When application should be made—is a general rule a defendant who claims particulars should apply for them with reasonable promptitude (i) and before putting in his defence but he does not by putting in his defence waive his right to particulars (j). Indeed in a proper case the Court may order an application for particulars to stand over till a written statement has been put in to enable the Court to know what the points raised by the defence are as where the defendant is the plaintiff's agent and the particulars in question are all in the knowledge of the defendant but not in the knowledge of the plaintiff (k).

Discovery before particulars—The question often arises where a defendant has applied for particulars whether the plaintiff should deliver particulars before obtaining discovery and inspection of the defendant's books or whether discovery should

(f) *Zureberg v Labouchere* [1893] 1 Q.B. 183

(g) *Hendry v Inglis* [1918] 1 Ch. 133

(h) *Gauri Shanker v Mt Waikare* (1903) 45 All E.R. 741 C. 466 (1) A.A. 17

(i) *Thompson v Biley* (1883) 31 W.R. [Eng.] 30 per Watkins Williams, J.

(j) *Thompson v Biley* (1883) 31 W.R. [Eng.] 230 where the action was for seduction and the defendant applied for particulars of the alleged immoral intercourse, but

the Court refused to make any order unless he made an affidavit that he had not seduced the girl—approved in *Sack v Spelman* (1857) 37 C.D. 295 300. But see *K. Ly v Briggs* 85 L.T. Journal 78.

(k) *Gouraud v Fitzgerald* (1888) 37 W.R. [Eng.] 65.

(l) *Sack v Spelman* (1857) 37 C.D. 295 300.

(m) *Sack v Spelman* (1857) 37 C.D. 295 300.

be given before particulars are delivered. There is no hard and fast rule as to the class of cases in which particulars should precede discovery or discovery be ordered before particulars but the Judge must exercise a reasonable discretion in every case after carefully looking at all the facts and taking into account any special circumstances. (f) The result of the authorities appears to be that where the party pleading does not know the facts necessary to enable him to give the particulars but his opponent knows them the party applying for particulars may be ordered to give discovery before the party pleading is required to deliver particulars and the application for particulars may be postponed till after discovery. It is good practice and good sense that where the defendant knows the facts and the plaintiffs do not the defendant should give discovery before the plaintiffs deliver particulars. (m)

1 *Suit by principal against agent for accounts charging agent with fraud*—A employs B to purchase goods as his agent at the lowest possible price. A sues B for an account alleging in the plaint that B had purchased goods at prices higher than the current prices and had secretly received commission from the vendor. The charges against B are stated in general terms no particulars being given. A is unable to state the particulars of the fraud charged until he sees B's books. A is entitled to inspection of B's books before he can be called upon to deliver particulars of the fraud. (n)

2 *Suit by a wife's executor against husband*—A who is the executor of J sues B J's husband to recover from him all the furniture and other chattels purchased by J with her separate income and included in an inventory of all the goods in B's house made sometime before J's death. B applies for particulars of the furniture. He is not entitled to the particulars until he declares by an affidavit which of the articles comprised in the inventory belonged to his wife. Where the plaintiffs are executors who do not know and the defendant a person who does know it is right that discovery should come first. (o)

3 *Suit by a colliery company against a colliery merchant*—A colliery company sues R a coal merchant for damages for fraudulently passing off coal not gotten from the company's mines as coal gotten from the company's mines. The plaintiffs in their plaint give one specific instance of fraud and allege that on divers other occasions the defendant had taken orders from divers other persons for coal to be supplied from the company's mines and fraudulently sold coal not purchased from the plaintiff as coal gotten from the company's mines. R applies for particulars of the names and dates. The company then applies for inspection of R's books. The company is entitled to discovery before delivering particulars. Chitty J said. Having regard to the circumstances that many of these alleged frauds are within the defendant's means of knowledge and are not within the knowledge of the plaintiffs I think discovery ought to precede particulars. (p)

The practice followed in the above cases was sought to be applied in a libel case where A sued B for calling him a charity swindler and imposter and B pleaded justification and, when called upon to give particulars of the charge said that he could not unless he was allowed inspection of A's books of account. The Court held that B was not entitled to discovery before he had delivered particulars. Kay L.J. said. To apply this practice to the case of a libel would be to sanction the publication of a libel when the libeller knew no facts justifying the libellous statement because he believed he could by the process of discovery elicit such facts. (q)

|   |  |
|---|--|
| (f) <i>Wyn v Marthe Co v Radford &amp; Co</i> [1896] 1 Ch 29, 33.                     | (g) <i>Muller v Harper</i> (1822) 29 L D 110.  |
| (m) <i>Muller v Harper</i> (1822) 29 L D 110, 11.                                     | (p) <i>Wayn Marther C v Jellist &amp; Co</i> [1896] 1 Ch 2. See also <i>Marion Vordersell &amp; Co v Vordersell</i> [1897] 3 Cl 1. |
| (n) <i>Abbott</i> (1861) 31 C D 374. See also <i>Sachs v Sperma</i> (1883) 37 C D 72. | (q) <i>Zierenberg v Labouder</i> [1893] = Q B 193.   |

Further particulars granted—For cases in which further and better particulars have been ordered see notes to r 4 above Other cases in which particulars may be necessary

### Objections to particulars —

- 1 4 applies for particulars from B under this rule It is a valid objection to the application that the particulars applied for by A relate to the *modes* in which B's case is to be proved and not to *material facts* constituting B's case See notes to r 4 above Object of particulars
- 2 Particulars will only be ordered of *material facts* constituting a party's case but not of any *immaterial* allegation (r)
- 3 Particulars will only be ordered of *material facts alleged* by a party in his pleading but not of those *denied* by him See notes to r 4 above Particulars of defence
- 4 4 applies for particulars from B under this rule It is no objection to the application that A must know the true facts of the case better than B (s)
- 5 Where a party from whom particulars are sought is unable to give the particulars without laborious inquiry the practice is to make an order for the best particulars the party can give (t) This is usually the case where the party fills a representative character (u)

Upon such terms as to costs or otherwise —Thus an order may be made directing that unless particulars are delivered within a certain time the suit shall be dismissed (z)

Amending or delivering further particulars—Where a party who has delivered particulars under an order afterwards desires to amend them or to deliver further particulars the proper course for him is to obtain an order giving him leave to do so (w) And leave will in general be granted where the amendment will cause no injury to the opposite party except such as can be sufficiently compensated for by costs (x) Leave to amend may be refused where it is sought to introduce a new cause of action (y) or to add to the amount claimed after the defendant has paid into Court the full amount originally claimed ( ) In application to amend particulars will as a rule be refused if made at the trial of the suit (a) See s 153 and r 17 of this Order

## 6 [New R S C O 19, r 14] Any condition precedent, the performance or occurrence of which is intended to be contested shall

be distinctly specified in his pleading by the plaintiff or defendant, as the case may be, and, subject thereto, an averment of the performance or occurrence of all conditions precedent necessary for the case of the plaintiff or defendant shall be implied in his pleading

(1) *Cole v Turner* (1865) 5 L T 51 (Cassels v Norma (1840) Tinn I R 66  
(2) *H. v. d. M. & Co* (1841) 1 L T 411  
(3) *M. Hall v. d. M. & Co* (1842) 1 L T 411  
(4) *H. v. d. M. & Co* (1843) 1 L T 411  
(5) *H. v. d. M. & Co* (1844) 1 L T 411  
(6) *H. v. d. M. & Co* (1845) 1 L T 411  
(7) *H. v. d. M. & Co* (1846) 1 L T 411  
(8) *H. v. d. M. & Co* (1847) 1 L T 411  
(9) *H. v. d. M. & Co* (1848) 1 L T 411  
(10) *H. v. d. M. & Co* (1849) 1 L T 411

(11) *Q. R. 114 153 London v L. R. 114 153*  
(12) *Cl. v. d. M. & Co* (1840) 1 L T 411  
(13) *Cl. v. d. M. & Co* (1841) 1 L T 411  
(14) *Cl. v. d. M. & Co* (1842) 1 L T 411  
(15) *Cl. v. d. M. & Co* (1843) 1 L T 411  
(16) *Cl. v. d. M. & Co* (1844) 1 L T 411  
(17) *Cl. v. d. M. & Co* (1845) 1 L T 411  
(18) *Cl. v. d. M. & Co* (1846) 1 L T 411  
(19) *Cl. v. d. M. & Co* (1847) 1 L T 411  
(20) *Cl. v. d. M. & Co* (1848) 1 L T 411

Neither party need allege the performance of any condition precedent.—*A* agrees to build a house for *B* at certain rates specified in the contract. It is a condition of the agreement that payment to *A* should only be made upon a certificate signed by *B*'s architect as to the amount due. *A* demands payment upon completion of the building but *B* refuses to pay. *A* sues *B* claiming Rs 5 000. Here the obtaining of the architect's certificate is a condition precedent to *A*'s right of action. Under the present rule it is not necessary for *A* expressly to aver in his pleading that he has obtained the architect's certificate. Such averment the rule says shall be implied in his pleading. The rule further provides that if *B* intends to contest the fulfilment of the condition precedent he must distinctly specify the condition precedent in his written statement. He must plead that the architect has not certified the amount claimed in the suit. If *B* does not plead the non performance of the condition it will be presumed that the condition has been duly performed. If *B* pleads non performance the burden of proving due performance will be on *A*.

A condition precedent it must be observed *does not strictly speaking form part of the cause of action*. Thus in the case put above *A*'s cause of action consists of the making of the contract and of the breach thereof by *B*. The condition of obtaining the architect's certificate is but an additional formality introduced by the express agreement of the parties *suspending* *A*'s right to sue until the condition has been performed.

The Lahore High Court has held that in a suit for damages for breach of contract the plaintiff is dispensed by this rule from pleading his readiness and willingness to perform his part of the contract (b).

History of the rule.—This rule is a reproduction of O 19 r 14 of the English Rules. Before the year 1852 it was a recognized rule of English pleadings that the plaintiff should allege *expressly* the performance of each necessary condition precedent to the rights claimed. Then came the Common Law Procedure Act 1852 which modified the earlier practice by enabling the plaintiff to aver performance of conditions precedent *generally*. For this purpose the form in use was all conditions were performed, and all things happened and all times elapsed necessary to entitle the plaintiff to have the said promise performed by the defendant and to maintain his action for the breach thereof hereinafter alleged. The present rule does away with the necessity of even a general averment of performance of condition precedent. A plaintiff need not now allege the performance of any condition precedent. It is for the *defendant* to object if he intends to dispute the performance of any condition precedent.

Distinctly.—This rule requires that where a party intends to contest the performance of any condition precedent he must *distinctly* specify the condition precedent in his pleading. An allegation in general terms that there was an express condition is not enough. The pleading must state the terms of the condition the names of the parties to it and whether it was in writing or verbal (c).

7 [New R S C, O 19 r 16] No pleading shall, except by way of amendment, raise any new ground of claim or contain any allegation of fact inconsistent with the previous pleadings of the party pleading the same.

Departure

Departure in pleading.—This rule provides against what is called "a departure in pleading". It is a reproduction of O 19 r 15 of the English Rules. Its

(b) *Farm Khana Ekan v Farm Gopal Lal* (1905) 7 Lab 48 24 I C 51 (1905) A.L. (c) *Atke v Matheson & Co* 104 L.T. Journal 68

importance in this country is not likely to be so great as in England where the practice is for each party in turn to state his own case and answer that of his opponent before the hearing. Not that the Code does not recognize *subsequent pleadings* (see O 8 r 9) but such pleadings are seldom resorted to in this country even in the Presidency towns. The general principles on which the system of pleading in England is founded are as follows —

- 1 The plaintiff by his *statement of claim* alleges the material facts on which he relies in support of his case.
- 2 The defendant in answer thereto delivers a *defence* in which he may take all or any of the following courses —  
*first* he may deny or refuse to admit the facts stated by the plaintiff  
*secondly* he may confess or admit them and avoid their effect by answering fresh facts which afford an answer thereto  
*thirdly* he may admit the facts stated by the plaintiff and may raise a question of law as to their legal effect  
 If the defendant adopts the first or third of these three courses a question of fact or of law is at once raised between the parties
- 3 If the defendant adopts the second of the three courses the plaintiff may *reply*—  
*first* by denying the fresh facts alleged by the defendant or  
*secondly* by admitting them and alleging other facts which avoid their effect or  
*thirdly* by raising a question of law as to their effect.
- 4 If the plaintiff pleads a reply of the second kind, that is if he replies by way of confession and avoidance the defendant has the same courses open to him in pleading a *rejoinder* (d). A rejoinder is now seldom pleaded.
- 5 It is very seldom that further proceedings are taken, but there may be *sur-rejoinders* *rebutters* and *surrebutters*

Under the Code a plaintiff commences his suit by presenting a *plaint*. The defendant then puts in his *written statement* in answer to the plaintiff's claim. There is nothing corresponding to a *Reply* or *Rejoinder* in our system of pleadings. But the plaintiff may with the leave of the Court tender a *written statement* and the defendant may with like leave tender an *additional written statement* (O 8 r 9). The Code of 1882 also contained a similar provision (e) but pleadings in this country seldom go beyond the defendant's written statement.

The word *pleading* at the commencement of this rule refers to *subsequent pleadings*. Thus in England a plaintiff may not raise in his *Reply* a ground of claim different from that raised in his *Statement of Claim* nor can he in his *Reply* set up facts inconsistent with those set up in his *Statement of Claim*. A reply is not the proper place in which to raise new claims. A plaintiff who wishes to add new claims can do so only by amending the *Statement of Claim*. Similar remarks apply to a defendant's *Rejoinder*. As a plaintiff's *Reply* must be consistent with his *Statement of Claim* so a defendant's *Rejoinder* must be consistent with his *Defence*. Thus if a plaintiff alleges merely a negligent breach of trust in his *Statement of Claim* the *Reply* must not assert that the breach of trust was *fraudulent* (f). Similarly if the *Defence* alleges that the arbitrators

(d) Bullen and Leake *Precedents on 11 editions*, 6th ed. pp 32

(e) See Code of 1882 s 31a

(f) *Exington v Corker* [1897] 2 Q. B. 118, 361



did not make any award the Rejoinder must not assert that the award was not tendered by the proper time for it is one thing not to make an award, and another thing not to tender it when made (g) Upon the same principle a plaintiff who claims rent on the basis of a lease cannot claim the same sum in his Reply as damages for unlawfully holding over for by his Statement of Claim he treats the defendant as his tenant and he cannot turn round in his Reply and say If the defendant is not liable as a tenant he is liable as a trespasser (h)

8 [New R S C, O 19, r 20] Where a contract is alleged in any pleading, a bare denial of the same by the opposite party shall be construed only as a denial in fact of the express contract alleged or of the matters of fact from which the same may be implied, and not as a denial of the legality or sufficiency in law of such contract

Denial of contract

Denial of contract—All matters which go to show that the contract sued on is void or unlawful must be specifically pleaded If such matters are not expressly pleaded no evidence thereof can as a rule be given at the trial Thus if A sues B on a contract and B in his written statement merely denies the contract such denial will be taken to mean only that there was in fact no such contract as alleged it will not be construed as a denial of the legality of the contract The result is that if A proves the contract sued upon B will not be allowed to contend at the hearing that the contract was a wagering contract and therefore void B ought to have specifically pleaded in his written statement that the contract was a wagering contract (i) But where at the hearing of a suit the plaintiff's case discloses that the transaction which is the basis of his claim is illegal the Court cannot properly ignore the illegality even if the illegality be not pleaded or relied on by the defendant (j) No Court ought to enforce an illegal contract or allow itself to be made the instrument of enforcing obligations alleged to arise out of a contract or transaction which is illegal if the illegality is duly brought to the notice of the Court and if the person invoking the aid of the Court is himself implicated in the illegality It matters not whether the defendant has pleaded the illegality or whether he has not If the evidence adduced by the plaintiff proves the illegality the Court ought not to assist him (k) Note that an agreement by way of wager is void but not illegal [see Indian Contract Act 1872 ss 23 and 30] See O 8 r 2

9 [New R S C, O 19, r 21] Wherever the contents of any document are material, it shall be sufficient in any pleading to state the effect thereof as briefly as possible, without setting out the whole or any part thereof, unless the precise words of the document or any part thereof are material

Effect of document to be stated

Effect of document to be stated—This rule directs what should be the proper method of pleading where a material fact (r 2) is evidenced by a document (l) The intention expressed by the first part of the rule seems clearly to be that where a

(g) *Robert v Marit* (1871) 6 Wms Saund 188  
(h) *Duckworth v McClelland* (1878) L P Ir 57  
(i) *Colborne v Stoddard* (1795) 1 Str 493  
*Gratwood v Blane* (1851) 11 C B 56  
*Wulfe v Lovick* (1901) 2 K B 195 *Bull v Chapman* (1835) 8 Ex 444

(j) *Cledge v Post Exchange Assurance Corporation* [1906] 2 Q B 214 *Atire Mary Hill v Clarke* (1901) 27 All 66

(k) *Scott v Froun Dring Co* [189] 2 Q B 749

(l) *D. Byshire v La gā* [1896] 1 Q B 554 57

document is material it shall not be necessary to set it out at length but only to state the legal effect of it the object apparently being to prevent long pleadings (m). Thus it is sufficient if a plaintiff in a suit for the recovery of immovable property under a will states in his plaint the effect of the will under which he claims. He is not bound to set out the precise words of the will although a question has arisen as to the true construction of those words (n). At the same time it is not enough for a plaintiff to say that under and by virtue of a certain deed he is entitled to the property claimed by him. He must state the effect of the document on which he relies (o).

Precise words.—In an action of libel or slander it is always necessary to set out the exact words alleged to be libellous (p).

**10** [*New R S C O 19, r 22*] Wherever it is material to allege malice, fraudulent intention, knowledge or other condition of the mind of any person, it shall be sufficient to allege the same as a fact without setting out the circumstances from which the same is to be inferred.

Malice knowledge &c

Condition of mind.—Rules 10 11 and 12 are no more than practical applications of the general principle laid down in r 2 above. Malice fraudulent intention knowledge etc constitute in some cases the material facts of a party's case they must therefore be alleged in the party's pleading. But the circumstances from which they are to be inferred need not be stated in the pleading.

Malice.—Malice is a necessary part of the cause of action in suits for slander of title and for malicious prosecution. It must therefore be alleged by the plaintiff in his plaint. Similarly where a defendant in an action of libel claims privilege alleging that the words complained of were used on a privileged occasion the plaintiff may allege and prove malice that is improper motive.

Fraudulent intention.—See notes to r 4 above. Fraud and coercion.

Knowledge.—In a suit by a servant against his master for injury caused by the dangerous condition of a building where he is employed the plaint must not only affirm the master's knowledge of the danger but must also negative the servant's knowledge of it (q). To support an action for damages for the bite of a dog the plaintiff must allege and prove that the dog had to the defendant's knowledge bitten or attempted to bite some person before it bit the plaintiff (r).

**11** [*New R S C O 19, r 23*] Wherever it is material to allege notice to any person of any fact, matter or thing, it shall be sufficient to allege such notice as a fact, unless the form or the precise terms of such notice, or the circumstances from which such notice is to be inferred, are material.

Notice

Notice as part of cause of action.—Notice where it forms part of the cause of action must be pleaded as a fact e.g. notice of suit proposed to be brought against the Secretary of State for India [see s 50] or against a Railway Company (s) or against a Municipality notice of dishonour of a bill of exchange notice to a tenant to quit etc. It is not necessary to set out the notice verbatim in the plaint.

(m) *Darbyshire v. Laish* (1896) 1 Q B 351 p 358  
(1896) 1 Q B 351 supra

(n) *Phillips v. Phillips* (1878) 4 Q B D 17

(o) *Harris v. Harris* (1879) 4 C P D 15

(q) *C. Fife v. London and St. Katherine Dock & Co* (1881) 13 Q L D 259

(r) *Thomas v. Mordaunt* (1835) 4 Dowl. 223

*O'Brien v. Chocquet* (1896) 2 Q B 109

(s) Indian Railways Act 1900 ss. 77 140

**12** [*New* R S C, O 19, r 24] Whenever any contract or any relation between any persons is to be implied from a series of letters or conversations or otherwise from a number of circumstances, it shall be sufficient to allege such contract or relation as a fact, and to refer generally to such letters, conversations or circumstances without setting them out in detail. And if in such case the person so pleading desires to rely in the alternative upon more contracts or relations than one is to be implied from such circumstances, he may state the same in the alternative.

Implied contract or relation

**Implied contract**—A contract may be expressed in one document or it may have to be implied from a series of documents or conversations or from a number of other circumstances. Rule 9 applies in the former case the present rule in the latter case. Circumstances in the conduct of two parties may establish a binding contract between them although the agreement reduced into writing as a draft has not been formally executed by either (i). As regards contracts to be implied from a series of letters it is to be noted that where a Court has to find a contract in a correspondence and not in one particular note or memorandum formally signed the whole of that which has passed between the parties must be taken into consideration (u).

**13** [*New* R S C, O 19, r 25] Neither party need in any pleading allege any matter of fact which the law presumes in his favour or as to which the burden of proof lies upon the other side, unless the same has first been specifically denied (e.g., consideration for a bill of exchange where the plaintiff sues only on the bill, and not for the consideration as a substantive ground of claim).

Presumption of law

**Presumptions of law**—A plaintiff need not in his plaint allege the consideration for which a bill of exchange was given to him when he sues *only on the bill* for it will be presumed in his favour that the bill was made for consideration (i). It will be for the defendant to plead that there was no consideration for the bill. But if the plaintiff sues *on the consideration* as a substantive ground of claim he must allege the consideration specifically.

**14** [Ss 51, 115] Every pleading shall be signed by the party and his pleader (if any) provided that where a party pleading is, by reason of absence or for other good cause, unable to sign the pleading, it may be signed by any person duly authorized by him to sign the same or to sue or defend on his behalf.

Pleading to be signed

(i) *Brogden v Metropolitan Railway Co* (1877) 2 App Cas 666  
(u) *Hussey v Horne Payne* (1891) 4 App Cas

311  
(r) See Negotiable Instruments Act 6 of 1831 s 218

**Omission to sign plaint**—The signing of plants is merely a matter of procedure (w) If a plant is not signed by the plaintiff or by a person duly authorized by him in that behalf and the defect is discovered at any time before judgment the Court may allow the plaintiff to amend the plant by signing the same If the defect is not discovered until the case comes on for hearing before an appellate Court the appellate Court may order the amendment to be made in that Court The appellate Court ought not to dismiss the suit or interfere with the decree of the lower Court merely because the plant has not been signed The omission to sign or verify a plant is not such a defect as could affect the merits of a case or the jurisdiction of the Court (x) see s 99

**15** [Ss 51 52 115] (1) Save as otherwise provided by any law for the time being in force, every pleading shall be verified at the foot by the party or by one of the parties pleading or by some other person proved to the satisfaction of the Court to be acquainted with the facts of the case

(2) The person verifying shall specify, by reference to the numbered paragraphs of the pleading, what he verifies of his own knowledge and what he verifies upon information received and believed to be true

(3) The verification shall be signed by the person making it and shall state the date on which and the place at which it was signed

**Verification of plaint**—The verification of a plaint is not evidence on which a suit can be decreed even if the defendant does not appear (y)

**Omission to verify pleading**—A pleading which is not verified in the manner required by this rule may be verified at a later stage of the suit even after the expiry of the limitation period The omission to verify a pleading is a mere irregularity within the meaning of s 99 of the Code (z) See notes to r 14 above

**16** [New R S C O 19, r 27] The Court may, at any stage of the proceedings order to be struck out or amended any matter in any pleading which may be unnecessary or scandalous or which may tend to prejudice, embarrass or delay the fair trial of the suit

**Amending your opponent's pleading**—This rule deals with amendments which a party desires to be made in his opponent's pleading The next rule deals with amendments which a party desires to make in his own pleading

(w) *Burke & Co. v. the East India Co.* (1914) 40 All 147 141 C 5  
(z) *J. Lee v. Smith* (1900) 11 All 5 11 All 5 (153) 17 Cal 580 (1 C) 11 All 5  
*Nguyen v. Ma Hing* (1933) 11 All 5 71  
1 C 101 (3) A 1  
(y) *J. & L. v. Smith* (1916) 43 C 1 101

1010 101. 31 C 2.  
(z) *Sh. & Co. v. J. & Co.* (1911) 11 All 5 640 671 C 9. (2) A 1. 11 All 5  
11 All 5 (1911) 11 All 5 640 671 C 9. (2) A 1. 11 All 5  
11 All 5 (1911) 11 All 5 640 671 C 9. (2) A 1. 11 All 5  
11 All 5 (1911) 11 All 5 640 671 C 9. (2) A 1. 11 All 5

16

**Striking out and amending pleadings**—It seems to me said Bowen, L J in *Knowles v Roberts* (a) that the rule that the Court is not to dictate to parties how they should frame their case is one that ought always to be preserved sacred. But that rule is of course subject to this modification and limitation that the parties must not offend against the rules of pleading which have been laid down by the law and if a party introduces a pleading which is unnecessary and it tends to prejudice, embarrass and delay the trial of the action it then becomes a pleading which is beyond his right. It is a recognized principle that a defendant may claim *ex debito justitiæ* to have the plaintiff's case presented in an intelligible form so that he may not be embarrassed in meeting it and the Court ought to be strict even to severity in taking care to prevent pleadings from degenerating into the old oppressive pleadings of the Court of Chancery. (b)

**Unnecessary**—This rule has been reproduced verbatim from O 19 r 2, of the English Rules. According to the English practice the mere fact that a pleading contains matters which are unnecessary is no ground for striking out those matters (c). It only affects the costs of the pleading (d). An allegation in a pleading will not be struck out merely because it is unnecessary unless it is scandalous or tends to prejudice, embarrass or delay the fair trial of the action. Thus where in a suit against a Local Board the plaintiff alleged that a member of the Board had used his influence with the Board for his own private interest and that in consequence thereof the Board had declined to meet the just demands of the plaintiffs the allegations were ordered to be struck out (e). In such a case the allegations are not only unnecessary but they are scandalous. For the same reason unnecessary allegations of dishonest conduct made against the defendant will be struck out under this rule (f). In an action to enforce a compromise of a former action it is unnecessary and embarrassing to set out in the plaint the original disputes between the parties such allegations will therefore be struck out (g). Where a statement of claim contained immaterial facts and set out at great length documents which could not be material except as evidence by way of admission so that the defendant could not know what case he had to meet it was held that the whole statement of claim should be struck out as being unnecessarily prolix and embarrassing (h). In a action for slander it is unnecessary and embarrassing for the defendant to state in his defence that he did not say the words alleged in the plaint but that he said something else and that the something else which he said was true such statements will therefore be struck out (i).

**Scandalous**—Every Court has an inherent power quite independently of this rule to strike out scandalous matter in any record or proceedings. The Court has a duty to discharge towards the public and the authors in taking care that its records are kept free from irrelevant and scandalous matter (j). Scandal is calculated to do great and permanent injury to all persons whom it affects by making the record of the Court the means of perpetuating libellous and malignant slanders and the Court in aid of the public morals is bound to interfere to suppress such indecencies which may stain the reputation and wound the feelings of the parties and their relatives and friends (k). Thus where an application for bail to the High Court contained defamatory allegations against the trying Magistrate which were all irrelevant the High Court of Bombay refused to allow the application to be filed and ordered it to be returned (l). Similarly where a memorandum of appeal alleged partiality against the Judge whose decree was in question the High Court of Madras ordered the objectionable passages to be

(a) (1888) 38 C D 26 at pp 270 271

(b) *Dary v Grett* (188) 7 C D 473 486

(c) *Pock v Russell* 84 L T Jo 45 *Heap v Morris* (1876) 2 Q B D 630 633

(d) *Brymoth v J C* (1885) 1 Times Rep 809

(e) *Murphy v Ep on Lee* 1 Board [188] 1 Ch 35

(f) *Brooking v Maudslay* (1886) 53 L T 343

(g) *Furley v F Lewis* (1888) 38 C D 63

(h) *Dry v Carr* (188) 7 C D 43 F 271 v

*Maurice Al* (189) 7 All LJ 40

(i) *Rossom v E de* [1893] 1 Q B 51

(j) *Christ v Ch* (189) L P 8 Ch 490

(k) *Story v Equity Pl* d 10th 11 sec 0

(l) *Cl v Dur* 1 In re (1891) 1 Lom 488

expunged (m) It must however be noted that nothing can be scandalous which is relevant (n) Thus matters in aggravation of damages are relevant they will not therefore be struck out though scandalous (o) Similarly allegations of dishonesty or fraud or conspiracy will not be struck out as scandalous if they are relevant to the facts in issue They will be struck out only if they are irrelevant (p) An application to strike out scandalous matter may be made by any person whether or not he is a party to the suit or personally affected by the scandalous matter (q)

Tend to prejudice embarrass or delay the fair trial of the suit — In considering the question whether a pleading tends to prejudice embarrass or delay the fair trial of the suit a liberal interpretation should be given to the words trial of the suit Hence not only a pleading which tends to prejudice or embarrass a party at the actual trial of a suit but a pleading which tends to prejudice or embarrass a party at any stage of the proceedings in the suit would be within this rule (r)

A pleading is embarrassing if it is so drawn that it is not clear what case the opposite party has to meet at the trial (s) But a pleading is not embarrassing merely because it is prolix (t) Nor is a pleading embarrassing merely because it contains allegations that are inconsistent or stated in the alternative (u) See notes to r 2 above Alternative and inconsistent allegations See also notes above Unnecessary

The power of the Court under this rule should be exercised with great care and caution Where a defendant set up a contemporaneous oral agreement the Court should not strike out his pleading on the ground that evidence of such agreement is inadmissible under s 92 of the Indian Evidence Act 1872 and that the pleading is therefore embarrassing Whether an oral agreement contemporaneous with a written document is admissible in evidence depends to some extent as to how the case is presented at the trial (v)

At any stage of the proceedings —The application under this rule should be made with reasonable promptitude and as a rule before the close of the pleadings If it is not so made the Court may in its discretion refuse to make the order though the rule expressly states that an order may be made at any stage of the proceeding The reason is that the power to make the order under this rule is discretionary (w) Leave to amend has been refused in second appeal (x)

Appeal —An order refusing to strike out pleadings as scandalous is not appealable as a judgment under the Letters Patent (y)

Practice —The Court may under this rule order the whole pleading to be struck out as was done in the unmentioned cases ( ) where the statement of claim consisted partly of unintelligible matters partly of irrelevant matters and the rest of scandalous matter or it may order the objectionable matter only to be struck out which appears

- (m) *Z. Munda v. T. S. v. Lerrayana* (1899) — Mad 155  
 (n) *F. A. v. Owen* (18 8) 8 C D 645 651 per C. J. n. L. J.  
 (o) *M. H. v. J. J. v. J. J.* (1900) 6 Q B D 190  
 (p) *Christie v. Christie* (1 3) L R 8 Ch 493  
 (q) *Illegality of fraud in the Court of Equity* (18 1) L R 14 Q B 413 (affirmation of fraud in the Court of Equity)  
 (r) *Illegality of fraud in the Court of Equity* (18 1) L R 14 Q B 413 (affirmation of fraud in the Court of Equity)  
 (s) *Illegality of fraud in the Court of Equity* (18 1) L R 14 Q B 413 (affirmation of fraud in the Court of Equity)  
 (t) *Illegality of fraud in the Court of Equity* (18 1) L R 14 Q B 413 (affirmation of fraud in the Court of Equity)  
 (u) *Illegality of fraud in the Court of Equity* (18 1) L R 14 Q B 413 (affirmation of fraud in the Court of Equity)  
 (v) *Illegality of fraud in the Court of Equity* (18 1) L R 14 Q B 413 (affirmation of fraud in the Court of Equity)  
 (w) *Illegality of fraud in the Court of Equity* (18 1) L R 14 Q B 413 (affirmation of fraud in the Court of Equity)  
 (x) *Illegality of fraud in the Court of Equity* (18 1) L R 14 Q B 413 (affirmation of fraud in the Court of Equity)  
 (y) *Illegality of fraud in the Court of Equity* (18 1) L R 14 Q B 413 (affirmation of fraud in the Court of Equity)

- the application was made by a co-defendant  
 (r) *Herdson v. Greenwood* (18 3) 9 L R D 101  
 (s) *Br. A. L. d. Association v. J. J. v. J. J.*  
 (t) *Illegality of fraud in the Court of Equity* (18 1) L R 14 Q B 413 (affirmation of fraud in the Court of Equity)  
 (u) *Illegality of fraud in the Court of Equity* (18 1) L R 14 Q B 413 (affirmation of fraud in the Court of Equity)  
 (v) *Illegality of fraud in the Court of Equity* (18 1) L R 14 Q B 413 (affirmation of fraud in the Court of Equity)  
 (w) *Illegality of fraud in the Court of Equity* (18 1) L R 14 Q B 413 (affirmation of fraud in the Court of Equity)  
 (x) *Illegality of fraud in the Court of Equity* (18 1) L R 14 Q B 413 (affirmation of fraud in the Court of Equity)  
 (y) *Illegality of fraud in the Court of Equity* (18 1) L R 14 Q B 413 (affirmation of fraud in the Court of Equity)

to be the usual practice (a) Where the defect can be remedied by amendment the Court may give leave to amend (b) Where a pleading is not so specific as it ought to be the Court may direct the party to amend his pleading or give further particulars (c)

**17** [New R S C O 28, r 1] The Court may at any stage of the proceedings allow either party to alter or amend his pleadings in such manner and on such terms as may be just, and all such amendments shall be made as may be necessary for the purpose of determining the real questions in controversy between the parties

Amendment of pleadings

Different kinds of amendment—The occasion for amendment arises in five different ways, namely—

- 1 S 153 [amendment of clerical and arithmetical mistakes in judgments decrees and orders]
- 2 S 153 [amendment of proceedings in a suit by the Court whether moved thereto by the parties or not for the purpose of determining the real question or issue between the parties]
- 3 O 1 r 10 sub r (2) [striking out or adding parties]
- 4 O 6 r 16 [amending your opponent's pleading compulsory amendment]
- 5 O 6 r 17 [amending your own pleading voluntary amendment].

Amending your own pleading—The preceding rule deals with amendments which a party desires to be made in *his opponent's pleading* as where the pleading contains irrelevant and scandalous matter or where it may tend to prejudice embarrass or delay the fair trial of the suit. The present rule deals with amendments which a party desires to make in *his own pleading*

### LEAVE TO AMEND WHEN GIVEN

As a general rule leave to amend will be granted so as to enable the *real question in issue* between the parties to be raised on the pleadings where the amendment will occasion *no injury to the opposite party* except such as can be sufficiently compensated for by costs or other terms to be imposed by the order (d) I have had much to do in Chambers said Bramwell L J with applications for leave to amend and I may perhaps be allowed to say that this humble branch of learning is very familiar to me My practice has always been to give leave to amend unless I have been satisfied that the party applying was acting *mala fide* or that by his blunder he had done some injury to his opponent which could not be compensated for by costs or otherwise (e) It does not matter that the original omission arose from negligence or carelessness However negligent or careless may have been the first omission and however late the proposed amendment the amendment should be allowed if it can be made without injustice to the other side *There is no injustice if the other side can be compensated by costs* (f) I have found in my experience said Bowen L J that there is one panacea which heals every sore in litigation and that is costs (g) It is immaterial whether the error sou-

( ) *Christ v Christ* (1873) L. R. 8 Ch 499  
*Leary v Gra* (1872) L. R. 13 Eq 443  
*Brooking v Maudslayi* (1886) 65 L. T. 343  
*Murray v Epsom Local Board* [1891] 1 Ch 3  
*Rasam v Budget* [1893] 1 Q. B. 51

(b) *Eccles v Roberts* (1888) 39 C.D. 63 63

(c) *In re Morgan Owen v Morgan* (1887) 35 C.D. 40 500

(d) *Tiddley v Harper* (1889) 10 C.D. 393

*Steward v North Metropolitan Tramways Co* (1885) 16 Q.B.D. 18 180 and 1 C.A. p. 853  
*Atkinson Steam Navigation Co v Smith* (1889) 154 App. Cas. 319  
*30 Ku ndas v Ruchappa* (1909) 33 Bom. 644 645 41 C. 78

(e) *Tiddley v Harper* (1878) 10 C.D. 393

(f) *Clayton v Commercial Union Assurance Co* (1883) 3 W. R. (P.) 62 63 11 11  
*Veit* (1837) 19 Q. B. D. 394 39d

(g) *Cropper v Smith* (1884) 26 C.D. 00 11

0

### LEAVE TO AMEND WHEN REFUSED

It follows from what has been stated above that leave to amend should be refused—

- (1) Where the amendment is not necessary for the purpose of determining the real questions in controversy between the parties as where it is—
  - (i) merely technical or
  - (ii) useless and of no substance
- (2) Where the plaintiff's suit would be wholly displaced by the proposed amendment
- (3) Where the effect of the amendment would be to take away from the defendant a legal right which has accrued to him by lapse of time
- (4) Where the amendment would introduce a totally different new and inconsistent case and the application is made at a late stage of the proceedings
- (5) Where the application for amendment is not made in good faith

1 Leave to amend will be refused where the amendment is not necessary for the purpose of determining the real questions in controversy between the parties —This happens where the amendment is merely (1) technical or (2) of no substance

*Where the amendment is merely technical*—If after the evidence for the plaintiff has been taken the defendant applies for an amendment merely for the purpose of enabling him to raise a purely technical objection to the plaintiff's right to sue the

- (1) (1884) 6 C D 700 10 11 *in pra*  
(2) *Gun obj v M Janj* (1910) 34 Lom  $\rightarrow$  31 C 159  
(3) *See M J* v *Furten* 1913 Ch  $\rightarrow$  6 238  
(4) *I J Graith v Ch Jra* (1927) 70 All LJ 159  
(5) 66 I C 208 (1884) 81  
(6) *Old ley v Harper* (1844) 10 C D 365 39



17 application should be refused (p) *B* and *C* wrongfully remove *A*'s furniture. *A* sues *B* for damages and recovers judgment against him [*B* and *C* being joint wrong doers the judgment against *B* according to English law precludes *A* from suing *C* for the same wrong] *A* afterwards sues *C* for damages for the same wrong. *C* does not plead the judgment against *B* in his defence but after the evidence for *A* has been taken applies for leave to amend his written statement by pleading that the judgment against *B* is a bar to the suit against him. The application must be refused (q) for the amendment is not necessary to bring out the real questions between the parties but purposes merely to enable *C* to avail himself of a technical rule of law (r).

Here the amendment is useless and of no substance.—As the object of the present rule to enable the real questions in dispute to be raised on the pleadings leave to amend should be refused to the plaintiff where the proposed amendment would not help him in substantiating his claim (s) and to the defendant where the proposed amendment would not help him in supporting his defence (t). Thus where *A* sued *B* and finding that the suit against *B* would fail applied to join *C* as a defendant the application was refused on the ground that even if the plaint were amended by adding *C* as a party the nature of the case precluded *A* from claiming relief even against *C*. In refusing leave to amend Vaughan Williams L.J. said: One good reason for our not doing so is that looking at the case that he [plaintiff] tells us he would wish to present that case if presented by amendment would in my judgment also fail so that there is nothing to be gained by amendment (u). Similarly where *A* sued *B* for a libel and *B* pleaded justification and *B* afterwards applied to amend his defence by adding a paragraph which virtually contained a plea in mitigation of damages but was no answer to the action the application was refused (v). See notes to r 2 above. Matters affecting damages.

2 Leave to amend will be refused if the plaintiff's suit would be wholly displaced by the proposed amendment.—In *Steward v The North Metropolitan Tramways Co* (w) the plaintiff sued a tramway company for damages caused by their negligence in allowing their tramway to be in a defective condition. By their defence the company denied negligence. It was no part of the defence that the company were not the proper parties to be sued. More than six months after the delivery of the defence the company applied for leave to amend the defence by adding an allegation that by a contract between the company and the local authority of the district the liability to maintain the roadway had been transferred to the local authority and that the company had ceased to be responsible for the roadway. At the date of the application the plaintiff's remedy against the local authority had become barred by limitation. If the allegation had been pleaded earlier the plaintiff could have maintained an action against the board. Under these circumstances the application was refused. It is clear from the above facts that if the amendment were allowed the plaintiff might fail against the company as they were not the proper defendants and if he brought an action against the local authority it would be too late. That would be an injury to the plaintiff such as could not be compensated for by any costs that the Court might order the company to pay to the plaintiff. The test as to whether the amendment should be allowed, said Pollock B. is whether or not the defendant can amend without placing the plaintiff in such a position that he cannot be recouped as it were by any allowance of costs or otherwise. Here the action would be wholly displaced by the proposed amendment and I think it ought not to be allowed.

(p) *Collette v Good* (188) 7 C D 84 847

(q) *Eder in v Cohen* (1889) 43 C D 18 in app from 41 C D 563

(r) (1889) 43 C D 187 190 *supra*

(s) *Morrell Brothers and Co Ltd v Westmoreland* (1903) 1 K B 64 77 (1904) A C 11  
*Snel v James* (1894) 3 Ch 54 557

*La Croix v Lord Norreys* (1893) 33 C D 13 235

(t) *Macdonald v Fontes* [1897] 2 Q B 31

(u) *Jones v Hughes* [1903] 1 Ch 180 187  
*Ganesha Singh v Mundi Forest Co*  
 (1899) 21 All 316 318

(v) *Wood v E. of Du A. m.* (1858) 21 Q B D 501  
 (w) (1886) 16 Q B 1 178

3 Except in very special cases—Leave to amend will be refused where the effect of the proposed amendment is to take away from the defendant a legal right which has accrued to him by lapse of time (z)—The leading English case on the subject is *Weldon v Veal* (y) The facts of that case may be stated in the form of an illustration A sues B for damages for slander A afterwards applies for leave to amend the plaint by adding fresh claims in respect of assault and false imprisonment These claims are at the date of the application barred by limitation although they were not barred at the date of the suit The application should be refused for the effect of allowing it would be to take away from B the defence under the law of limitation and therefore unjustly to prejudice him We must act said Lord Esher M P on the settled rule of practice which is that amendments are not admissible when they prejudice the rights of the opposite party as existing at the date of such amendments Under very peculiar circumstances the Court might perhaps have power to allow such an amendment but certainly as a general rule it will not do so In *Charan Das v Amir Khan* ( ) their Lordships of the Privy Council said Though [the power of a Court to amend the plaint] should not as a rule be exercised where its effect is to take away from a defendant a legal right which has accrued to him by lapse of time yet there are cases where such considerations are outweighed by the special circumstances of a case *Charan Dass* case was such an exceptional case and their Lordships having regard to special circumstances upheld an amendment of the plaint allowed by the Judicial Commissioner of the North West Frontier Province in second appeal In that case the plaintiffs sued for a declaration of their right of pre-emption over certain land but omitted to ask for consequential relief namely possession as required by s 42 of the Specific Relief Act 1877 The trial Judge and the first appellate Court refused to allow the plaint to be amended by claiming possession on pre-emption since the time had expired for bringing a suit to enforce that right Upon a second appeal the Court allowed the amendment to be made and this was confirmed by the Privy Council There was no ground for suspecting that the plaintiffs had not acted in good faith all that happened was that the plaintiffs through some blundering attempted to assert rights that they undoubtedly possessed under the statute in a form which the statute did not permit The case of *Kisandas v Rachappa* (a) decided by the High Court of Bombay is another instance in which such an amendment was allowed on the ground that the circumstances of the case were so peculiar that it should properly be excepted from the general rule The facts of the case may be stated in the form of an illustration A alleging that he had brought in Rs 4 000 as capital under a partnership agreement between him and B sues B for dissolution of partnership and for accounts It is clear from the proceedings before the Court of first instance that though the suit was in form one for dissolution and accounts A intended from the first to sue only for the recovery of his money and B had actually pleaded to the money claim on which an issue had been framed and evidence taken The lower Court finds as a fact that the sum was due but dismisses A's suit on the technical ground that the agreement set up by A did not constitute a partnership between A and B A appeals from the decree and applies for the first time in appeal for leave to amend the plaint by adding a prayer for the recovery of Rs 4 000 At this date the claim for

O 6, r

(z) *Charan Das v Amir Khan* (1904) 4 I A 25  
45 Cal 110 57 I C 805  
(y) (1880) 19 Q B 131 followed in *Jadhav  
Shah Prasad* d (1916) 43 Cal 9 3 I C  
19 B 11 d v *Girja* (1915) 36 All 21  
\* I C 255, *Kat Dasa v Draupadi*  
(1911) \* (Cal W N 104 43 I C 833  
*Ibati v Hathi Chandra* (1919) 24 Cal  
W N 49 51 59 I C 605 *Ganesh  
v Pare v Ath* (1911) 30 Cal W N 73  
65 I C 39 (—) A C 255 *Arunka  
Aval* (1911) 25 Cal W N 1009 10 I  
83 I C 110 (—) A C 67 *Iti v Derr* )

*d Co v Munnayyan* (1911) \* 1a 414  
84 I C 25 (—) A C 42 *Srinivas  
v Kuri* i (1911) 41 Mad L J 25 1  
I C 20  
(z) (1904) 4 I A 25 43 Cal 110 1 I C 606  
(a) (1909) 33 Bom 614 4 I C 78 *Muhammad  
v Abd El Mufid* (1911) 33 All 616 10  
I C 476 *Jalal Dina v Qamir* (1911)  
Punj Rec no 6 p 211 5 I C 432  
*Satchidananda v Venky Vath* (1913)  
50 Cal 878 891 9 I C 257 (—) A C 435  
*Iti v Derr* (1911) 33 Bom. L J  
15 114 I C 26 (—) A B 51

17 money is barred by limitation. The amendment must however be allowed for the point of limitation could not have been taken if the pleading had not been defective. No fresh claim was set up as in *Weldon v Acal* and *B* knew all along what *A*'s claim was, though the suit was wrongly framed. Similarly where the plaintiff sued in the first instance for possession of the books of accounts of his shop from the defendants who he alleged were his servants and stated in the plaint that he would bring a separate suit for the money due by them but subsequently applied for leave to amend the plaint by adding a further relief namely recovery of money it was held that the amendment should be allowed even though the money claim was barred by limitation between the date of the plaint and the date of the application for amendment (b).

4 Leave to amend will be refused where the amendment would introduce a totally different new and inconsistent case—In *Ma Shwe Mya v Mounng Mo Hnaung* (c) their Lordships of the Privy Council said. All rules of Court are nothing but provisions intended to secure the proper administration of justice and it is therefore essential that they should be made to serve and be subordinate to that purpose so that full powers of amendment must be enjoyed and should always be liberally exercised but none the less no power has yet been given to enable one distinct cause of action to be substituted for another nor to change by means of amendment the subject matter of the suit. This proposition follows directly from r 17. The object of r 17 is to allow an amendment for the purpose of determining the real questions in dispute between the parties. That being the purpose for which an amendment is allowed, no amendment should be allowed which would introduce a totally new and different case (d). Thus where a suit is brought against the members of a joint Hindu family for specific performance of an agreement for the sale of family property alleged to have been made by the karta or for damages namely the earnest money with interest and the karta dies pending the suit and the suit title is amended by adding as his heirs his sons and grandsons who are already parties it is not permissible by amendment to change the suit into one for money had and received or a one to recover a debt (e). The result of the English cases is thus summed up in Bullen and Leake's Precedents of Pleadings (f).

Leave to amend may be refused where at the trial or hearing the party seeks to alter the whole nature of his case by an unexpected amendment which may require further evidence to be adduced by his opponent.

The above proposition may be split into two parts —

- A Leave to amend a *plaint* should not be granted if the amendment would convert the suit into another of a different and inconsistent character.
- B Leave to amend a *written statement* should not be granted, if the amendment would convert the defence into another of a different and inconsistent character.

We shall deal with these propositions in order.

A Leave to amend a *plaint* should not be granted if the amendment would convert the suit into another of a different and inconsistent character—*A* institutes a suit against *B*. *B* files his written statement. At the hearing of the suit *A* finds that his case as laid in the plaint must fail and that he can only succeed on a different case. He then applies for leave to amend the plaint. Should the leave be granted? It has been

(b) *Serug m v Krishna* (1913) 36 Mad 378  
13 I C 263

(c) (1914) 48 I A 214 16 17 48 Cal. 83, 835  
63 I C 914

(d) *Lard v Priggs* (1880) 16 C D 440 446  
*Neub v Sh rpe* (1876) 8 C D 39  
*Upendra v Jan F Nath* (1918) 45 Cal.  
305 317 318 47 I C 19 *Padma v*  
*Gurish Chand a* (1919) 46 Cal 168 171  
17, 45 I C 213 *Mohesh Chandra v*  
*Ladha Kulkore* (1908) 1 L Cal W 13

36 37 *Mau g Da Thain v Ma Than*  
*Ayint* (1906) 3 Rang 483 9 I C 253, 254  
A L 49 *Hadhara v Irtap* (1923)  
10 Lah J 634 (13) A L 933  
*Salam v Chima das* (1908) 82 Bom  
610 (28) A L 516

(e) *Pamerson Mand r v Mahabir Sahu* (1907)  
54 I A 5 61 at 53 100 I C 66 (27)  
A P L 18

(f) 6th Ed p 16

held under the corresponding English rule that no amendment should be allowed if it would introduce an entirely different case from that which the defendant came to meet (g) or to put it in another form if it would change one action into another of a substantially different character (h) Section 53 of the Code of 1882 which dealt with amendment of plaints expressly provided that a plaint shall not be amended so as to convert a suit of one character into a suit of another and inconsistent character That section has been omitted in this Code and the present rule (which is a reproduction of O 28 r 1 of the English Rules) now takes its place But the decisions under the old section on the point now under consideration are still good law and should be considered

It must be observed at the outset that a plaintiff must in general be limited to the case which he puts forward in his plaint There are however cases in which by some mistake or misapprehension the plaintiff has failed to state his case correctly and properly in the plaint In such cases the Court may allow the plaint to be amended (i) for if the amendment is refused the plaintiff may have to bring another suit and the object of the rule allowing amendment of plaints is to avoid multiplicity of suits (j) But the Court cannot allow an amendment if the suit is premature (k) and ought not to allow an amendment if it would convert the suit into another of a different and inconsistent character We cannot countenance the notion said Straight J that a plaintiff coming into Court with one case and hopelessly failing to prove it should be permitted to succeed upon another and that directly in antagonism with his primary allegation (l) The law prohibits every amendment that would change the fundamental character of the suit (m) It is not however to be supposed that if the fundamental character of the suit is not altered a plaintiff is entitled as of right to amend the plaint As stated by the High Court of Bombay the power to get a plaint amended is subject to the discretion of the judge and is not claimable as a right of the *sutor* in all circumstances (n)

Rules — The general rule is that any amendment allowed must be such as is either raised in the pleadings or is consistent with the case as originally laid and that the state of facts and the equities and ground of relief originally alleged and pleaded by the plaintiff should not be departed from This is the rule laid down by their Lordships of the Judicial Committee in the case of *Eshen Chunder Singh v Shama Churn Bhutto* (o) and this rule has been followed in numerous decisions of our Courts (p)

From the general rule stated above we deduce the following three rules each of which is borne out by the cases cited under it —

**Rule I** — Where a plaintiff bases his claim upon a specific legal relation alleged to exist between him and the defendant he may not be allowed to amend the plaint so as to base it on a different legal relation.

**Note** — Even if the legal relation between the plaintiff and the defendant remains unchanged the plaint will not be allowed to be amended if it completely alters the cause of action (q) (7)]

**Rule II** — Where a plaintiff bases his claim on a specific title he may not be allowed to amend the plaint so as to base it on a different title But this is subject to Rule I and when the title by which the plaintiff claims remains unaltered the plaint will not be allowed to be amended if it completely alters the cause of action

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>(g) <i>Ellis v M. Act. C. r. j. C.</i> (1876) 1 C. 1 D. 11 10 <i>H. p. j. a. e. C.</i> (1885) 18 C. 1 D. 30 301 <i>Ne. b. j. v. Jarpe</i> (18 8) 8 C. 1 D. 39 19 <i>Cl. k. v. Hay</i> (18 4) 31 C. 1 D. 64</p> <p>(A) <i>Falech v Co. Jen</i> (1894) 1 C. 3 81</p> <p>(i) <i>Lal Ambh. v. H. m. (15) 9 B. H. C. 1</i></p> <p><i>Jayro v. Leit. ce</i> (18 1) 16 W. I. 1, 3</p> <p><i>Hunooma per sud. v. Jhus mal. Koo</i></p> <p><i>werre</i> (15 6) 6 M. L. A. 393 410</p> <p>(j) <i>S. ral Chand v. Motun Bids</i> (1894) Cal S. 1</p> | <p>(k) <i>J. g. d. A. s. v. C. r. j. (19 3) 49 All. 599</i></p> <p>101 1 C. 507 ( ) 4 4 451</p> <p>(l) <i>Ham. H. n. v. T. b. L. n. J. m. r. p. e. t. f. India</i></p> <p>(18 3) 411 458 4 0</p> <p>(m) <i>Ha. m. th. v. A. d. r. (1 23) 3 Cal. 81</i></p> <p>( ) <i>T. p. l. m. v. Sada</i> (1 9) 1 Bom. 77</p> <p>( ) (1 60) 11 M. I. A. <i>M. y. apo. v. J. n. ley</i></p> <p>(1 1) 11 Cal. 01 11 1 1 1 1</p> <p>(j) <i>M. H. m. v. J. m. e. v. Land. M. v. J. e. Lant</i></p> <p>(1 1) 15 All. 4 6</p> |
|--|--|

- 17 **Rule III**—When one kind of fraud is charged another kind of fraud cannot upon failure of proof be substituted for it

*Illustrations of Rule I*

1 A alleging that B hired cargo boats from him and that a balance of Rs 3 000 is due to him on that account sues B for the amount. It is proved at the hearing that B did not himself hire the boats but that he was merely A's agent to let the boats on hire. A then applies to amend his plaint by claiming an account from B on the footing that B was A's agent. The amendment should not be allowed because in the one case the legal relation between A and B is that of *letter and hire* and in the other that of *Principal and agent*. *Shibkrishna v Abdool* (1880) 5 Cal 602

2 A sues B for the rent of a house alleged to have been let by A to B. B denies the lease and contends that he is the owner of the house. A will not be allowed to amend the plaint by converting the suit into one for a declaration of ownership. *Bai Shri Mayrayba v Maganlal* (1890) 19 Bom 303

3 A sues B for damages for wrongful occupation of his land and for injury done to his land. After the issues are framed A applies to amend the plaint by claiming from B rent for the land on the basis of a subsisting tenancy. The amendment should not be allowed because it will convert a claim based on *trespass* into a claim on the basis of a subsisting lease. *Narayan v Hari* (1889) 13 Bom 664. *Jhars Singh v Pirbhai* (1917) 3 Pat L J 60. 38 I C 191 (q). See ill. (u) below.

4 A suit for possession on the footing of a subsisting lease cannot be converted at a late stage of the proceedings into a suit for ejectment. *Leuby v Sharp* (1818) 8 C D 39 40. *Lard v Briggs* (1880) 16 C D 440

5 A suit for rent will not be allowed to be converted at the hearing into a suit for use and occupation. A sues B to recover Rs 1 000 alleged to be the rent due under a lease executed by B. The Court finds that B was in occupation of the premises during the period for which the rent is claimed but that the alleged lease was not executed by B. At this stage A applies to amend his plaint by alleging that though the lease was not executed by B he is entitled to recover the amount for use and occupation of the premises. The amendment will not be allowed. (r)

6 A suit for possession will not be allowed to be converted into a suit for redemption. In the former case the plaintiff sues as owner of the land in the latter as mortgagor. *Laxmishankar v Hanjabbai* (1900) 44 Bom 310. 37 I C 426

7 A who is P's agent to manage certain property belonging to P appoints S to act as a sub agent for P and gives him Rs 1 000 belonging to P for the payment of Government revenue and other purposes. S fails to account for the money. P sues A to recover the amount paid by A to S claiming the same on the ground that S was appointed sub agent without P's authority. It is found at the hearing that S was appointed sub agent with P's authority. P will not be allowed to amend the plaint so as to base his claim on the ground that A had not exercised ordinary prudence in selecting S as a sub agent for P. *Hamilton v Land Mortgage Bank* (1883) 5 All 406. [This is an illustration of the proposition that rule 11 is subject to Rule 1. If the amendment were allowed the legal relation between the plaintiff and the defendant which is that of principal and agent would no doubt remain unchanged but the cause of action would be completely changed.]

(q) See also *Carr v A. v. H. m.* (1894) 18 Lam 611. *Merchant v A. deo* (1886) 10 Ho 451.  
(r) *Lukra v A. v. Meerul* (181) 13 W P 13. *Lakshmi v Ha* (14) 9 H H C 1. *End v A. v. Bk Lal*

(19) 1175. *A. A. L. pendra* (1900) 7 Cal 109. *Errat* 5. *Al L J* 333. *th. v. C. 97* (1907) 33. *Al L J* 333. *Dist. J. 1. Palm k. d. v. Dal* (1902) 5 All 495.

*Illustrations of Rule II*

1 *A* alleging that *B* was the adopted son of *C* and that he (*A*) is the heir of *B* sues *D* to recover certain property forming part of the estate of *B*. The Court finds that the adoption of *B* was not valid. *A* then contends for the first time in appeal to the Privy Council that even if the adoption was not valid he is entitled to recover the property as the heir of *C*. This is a totally new case and *A* cannot be permitted in appeal to set up an entirely new case. *Copce Lal v Chundralee* (1872) 10 W. P. 12 I. A. Sup. Vol. 131.

2 *A* obtains a decree against *X* and after the death of the latter attaches certain immovable property in execution of the decree. *B* and *C* sons of *X* sue *A* for a declaration that the property is joint family property and it is not liable to be attached and sold in execution of the decree against the father on the ground that the debts contracted by their father were for immoral purposes. It is proved that the debts were not incurred for immoral purposes. Thereupon *B* and *C* apply to amend the plaint by alleging that they had separated from their father before the date of the decree and that they were not therefore liable to pay the amount of the decree. The amendment cannot be allowed because the plaintiff's claim as originally laid was on the footing that there was no partition between them and their father. *Varayanrai v Jathariahu* (1888) 1 L. Bom. 431.

3 *A* a Hindu, claiming as the heir of his uncle sues the executors of his uncle's widow for possession of property left by the widow alleging that the same belonged to the estate of his uncle and that the widow had no power to dispose of it by will. The Court holds that the widow had power to will away the property. *A* will not be allowed to amend the plaint by adding that even if the widow had the power to dispose of the property by her will he was entitled to the residue as his uncle's heir as the same was left to charitable objects of an unspecified and general character and could not therefore be legally applied to charity. *Dinodar v Purmanandas* (1883) 7 Bom. 150. [This is an illustration of Rule 11 being subject to Rule 1. If the amendment were allowed the title by which the plaintiff claims namely as his uncle's heir would no doubt remain unchanged but the cause of action would be completely altered.]

4 A suit founded on a *hritima* adoption cannot be allowed to be converted into one based on a *sapathitta* adoption. *Maung Ba Than v Ma Than Myin* (1925) 3 Rang. 483 92 I. C. 253 (5) A. P. 49.

*Illustration of Rule III*

*A* the official assignee of the estate of a deceased insolvent sues *B* to recover Rs. 1,00,000 alleged in the plaint to be unlawfully withheld from the estate in consequence of a payment fraudulently concealed from *A* a predecessor in office. It is proved that *A* a predecessor was aware of the payment. *A* applies to amend the plaint by alleging that though his predecessor consented to the payment such consent was illegal as being a fraud though of a different kind upon the Court. The amendment cannot be allowed because to allege fraud of one kind and to substitute fraud of another kind is to convert the suit into one of an inconsistent character. *Abdul Hossain v Turner* (1887) 11 Bom. 620 14 I. A. 111. See Notes to O. G. r. 4. Fraud and coercion p. 483 above.

*B* Leave to amend a written statement should not be granted if the amendment would convert the defence into another of a different and inconsistent character — As in the case of a plaint so in the case of a written statement the Court will not allow an amendment that would involve a complete change of front in the defence. (s)

*A* agrees to grant a lease of a brickfield to *F*. No lease is executed but *B* enters into possession under the agreement. *B* then sues *A* for specific performance of the agreement alleging that *A* though frequently asked to do so had neglected and refused

17 to grant the lease *A* denies that he was asked to grant the lease and expresses his readiness to execute the lease *A* also counter claims for Rs. 1500 by way of rent After the suit is set down for trial *A* applies for leave to amend his defence and counter claim and to join therewith a claim for possession of the land. The application must be refused. To allow *A* to amend would be to allow him to present a totally distinct new and inconsistent case *Clark v Wray* (1886) 31 C D 68

5 Leave to amend will be refused where the application for amendment is not made in good faith—Leave to amend will not be given if the party applying is acting *mala fide* (i) as where there is no substantial ground for the case proposed to be set up by the amendment (ii) Want of *bona fides* may be inferred from a great delay in making the application (i)

Amendment of plaint by adding new reliefs—The amendment of a plaint by adding a new prayer may or may not convert the suit into another of a different and inconsistent character. If the amendment converts the suit into another of a different and inconsistent character it will not be allowed. If the amendment does not convert the suit into another of a different and inconsistent character it may or may not be allowed at the discretion of the Court. In the exercise of this discretion the Court will not allow an amendment if the application for amendment is made at such a late stage of the proceedings that if allowed it would necessitate practically trying the case *de novo* (w) otherwise the amendment may be allowed (x) Thus a mortgagee suing for sale of the mortgaged property may be allowed to amend the plaint by asking merely for a simple money decree against the mortgagor. In such a case the character of the suit is not fundamentally altered, nor could the defendant be possibly taken by surprise (y) Similarly a purchaser suing for specific performance may be allowed to amend his plaint by asking in the alternative for a refund of the earnest money (z) Where a plaintiff has framed his suit *bona fide* believing that consequential relief is not open to him and that he is entitled to a declaration the plaint may be allowed to be amended even in appeal by adding a prayer for possession (a) But leave will be refused if the frame of the plaint was a device to avoid payment of Court Fee (b) See also note above. Leave to amend will be refused where the effect of the proposed amendment is to take away from the defendant

Amendment by adding a plea of fraud—It is the universal practice except in the most exceptional circumstances not to allow an amendment for the purpose of adding a plea of fraud where fraud has not been pleaded in the first instance (c). Where facts supporting the charge of fraud were disclosed in the cross examination of the defendant leave was given to amend by adding a plea of fraud (d) Similarly where the plaintiff sued on a mortgage and the defendant in his written statement alleged that he was a minor at the date of the mortgage leave was given to the plaintiff to amend the plaint by raising an alternative case that the loan was obtained by the defendant by the fraudulent representation that he had attained majority at the time (e) See Notes to O G r 4 Fraud and coercion

Suit for specific performance and compensation in addition or in substitution.—The Court even at the trial has power to allow the necessary amendment but

(t) *Tildley v Harper* (1878) 10 C D 393  
396-397

(u) *Laurence v Norreys* (1888) 39 C D \*13 235

(v) *Krishna v Pachayappa* (19 i) 47 Mad  
L J 540 8-1 C 49 (\*\*\*) A N 883

(w) *Na yara v Shankunni* (189 ) 15 Mad \* 5  
I m adan v P ikunni (1898) 21 Mad  
289

(x) *Kash aia v S dash* (1893) 20 Cal 805

*S Khdeo v Lachman* (190 ) 21 All 456

(y) *Sukdeo v Lachman* (190 ) 21 All 456

*P M Chettyar v Ma Shue Pon* (1907)  
5 Rang 115 101 I C 6-8 (\*\*\*) A R 154

(z) *Brahambhai v Fletcher* (1897) 21 Bom 8\*\*

(a) *Satopujan v Maharaja* (19 3) 2 Pat. 919 76  
I C 317 (24) A L 310

(b) *Hakim Sai v Firm Ishar* (1907) 8 Lab 531  
100 I C 46 (27) A L 499

(c) *Bendley v Black* (1893) 9 Times Rep 590

(d) *Riddi v H w k na* (1890) 14 P D 56

(e) *Sa at Chand v Mohun Bibi* (1893) 2 C W \*  
201

that power must be exercised most carefully and jealously and with due regard to the position of both the plaintiff and the defendant. An amendment should not be allowed when the suit has been pending as one for specific performance for a long period during which the defendant has been prevented by sec 27 (b) of the Specific Relief Act 1877 from dealing with the property. An amendment which leaves standing an averment that the plaintiff is ready and willing to perform the contract and the claim to specific performance does not make the plaint appropriate to a suit for damages for its breach (f)

### AT ANY STAGE OF THE PROCEEDINGS

Leave to amend may be granted at any stage of the proceedings. It may be granted on appeal [s 107 sub s (2)] (g) or even on second appeal (s 108). In the under mentioned case (h) the plaintiff was allowed to amend his plaint in appeal before the Privy Council. In a later case where the suit was brought upon a mortgage of the property of a joint Hindu family and the suit was dismissed on appeal to the High Court on the ground that necessity was not proved the Privy Council refused to entertain a new contention raised before them for the first time that the plaintiff was at least entitled to a decree against the mortgagor manager upon his personal consent on the ground that it involved a radical amendment of the plaint *Gajadhar v Ambika Prasad* (1925) 47 ALL 459 P C 87 I C 292 (2) A PC 169. The appellate Court may allow an amendment whether leave to amend was asked for in the Court below or not. It may also allow an amendment even if the Court below offered leave to amend but the offer was declined (i).

Mere delay is not a ground for refusing an amendment. As a general rule however late the amendment is sought to be made it should be allowed except in the five cases mentioned above (j). Before the hearing there is as a rule little difficulty in ordinary cases in a party obtaining leave to amend on payment of the costs of and occasioned by the amendment and the application (k). Leave to amend may also be given at the hearing on proper terms as to the costs and the postponement of the hearing if necessary except again in the five cases mentioned above. Thus leave to amend has been granted at the trial where there was a defect in the parties and it became necessary to amend the proceedings in the suit (l). It would also be granted where both parties knew what the case was and there was no surprise (m). In a recent Rangoon case A sued B on a promissory note for Rs 175. B denied execution of the note but admitted receipt of Rs 100 only. No alternative cause of action on the original consideration was pleaded. A failed to prove execution of the note. It was held that the plaint could be amended at any stage of the proceedings by the addition of the alternative plea and a decree passed for the plaintiff for the Rs 100 after the plaint was amended (n).

Revision.—See notes to s 115. Interlocutory orders.

Appeal.—No appeal lies under cl 15 of the Letters Patent from an order amending the title of a plaint by omitting the word Summary before the word Suit and transferring the case to the Short Causes List (o).

- (f) *Mama v Sussoon* (19 9) 5 I A 360 50 Bom 597 111 I C 413 (3 A I C 08)  
 (g) *Seretary f Stit v Vaha t* (19 6) 1 Luck 33 91 I C 9 7 (-5) A O 98  
 (h) *Moh ramud Zahoor Ali Khan v Rulla Koer* (1907) 11 M I A 468 496  
 (i) *Eckl v Little* (1887) 19 Q B D 391  
*Kisandas v Nachappa* (1909) 33 Bom 614 41 C 7 5  
 (j) *Clarepale v Commercial Union Association* (1833) 3 W R 50 [Eng]  
 (k) *Steward v North Metropolitan Tramways Co* (1886) 10 Q B D 506

- (l) *Lydall v Martineau* (1877) 5 C D 780  
*Dowdell v Do daniel* (1878) 9 C D 91, *Bowden v Patents Syndicate Ltd v Herbert Smith & Co* [1901] 1 Ch 86  
 (m) *Greer v Serrin* (1879) 13 C D 589 505. See also *Yodd v Zepherus C v Jones & Co* (1850) 17 C D 71 [cause of action allowed to be added after evidence of defendant]  
 (n) *Mangung Sah Myat v Mangung Po Sin* (1925) 3 Rang 153 59 I C 4-5 (25) A R, 2- [F B]  
 (o) *Mamul v Mamul* (1925) 97 Bom L R 92 66 I C 100 (25) A B 159



- 8 18 [*New* R S C, O 28, r 7] If a party who has obtained an order for leave to amend does not amend accordingly within the time limited for that purpose by the order, or if no time is thereby limited then within fourteen days from the date of the order, he shall not be permitted to amend after the expiration of such limited time as aforesaid or of such fourteen days, as the case may be, unless the time is extended by the Court

## ORDER VII

### *Plaint*

Particulars to be contained in plaint 1 [S 50 para 1] The plaint shall contain the following particulars —

- (a) the name of the Court in which the suit is brought,
- (b) the name, description and place of residence of the plaintiff,
- (c) the name, description and place of residence of the defendant, so far as they can be ascertained,
- (d) where the plaintiff or the defendant is a minor or a person of unsound mind, a statement to that effect,
- (e) the facts constituting the cause of action and when it arose,
- (f) the facts showing that the Court has jurisdiction,
- (g) the relief which the plaintiff claims,
- (h) where the plaintiff has allowed a set off or relinquished a portion of his claim, the amount so allowed or relinquished, and
- (i) a statement of the value of the subject matter of the suit for the purposes of jurisdiction and of Court fees, so far as the case admits

Facts constituting the cause of action — As to the meaning of cause of action, see notes to s 20 Cause of action See also notes to O 6 r 2

Facts showing that the Court has jurisdiction — See ss. 16 19 and 20 and cl 12 of the Charter set forth in Appendix II

Relief which the plaintiff claims — See r 7 below and notes thereto

Relinquished a portion of his claim —See O 2 r 2 sub r (2)

Statement of value —See notes to s 15 Where the subject matter of a suit does not admit of being satisfactorily valued

2 [S 50 paras 2, 3] Where the plaintiff seeks the recovery of money, the plaint shall state the precise amount claimed

In money suits

But where the plaintiff sues for mesne profits, or for an amount which will be found due to him on taking unsettled accounts between him and the defendant, the plaint shall state approximately the amount sued for

Suit for mesne profits or accounts —See notes to s 6 Pecuniary jurisdiction in passing decrees

3 [New] Where the subject matter of the suit is immovable property, the plaint shall contain a description of the property sufficient to identify it, and, in case such property can be identified by boundaries or numbers in a record of settlement or survey, the plaint shall specify such boundaries or numbers

Where the subject matter of the suit is immovable property

4 [S 50, para 4] Where the plaintiff sues in a representative character the plaint shall show not only that he has an actual existing interest in the subject matter, but that he has taken the steps (if any) necessary to enable him to institute a suit concerning it

When plaintiff sues as representative

Where the plaintiff sues in a representative character —Where a person dies leaving a will the executor named in the will may obtain *probate* of the will Where a person dies intestate his heirs may apply for *letters of administration* The person to whom letters of administration are granted is called *administrator* The executor or administrator as the case may be of a deceased person is his *legal representative* for all purposes and all the property of the deceased vests in him as such A suit by a person as executor or administrator of a deceased person is a suit by him in a *representative* character There are some cases in which the law requires *probate* or *letters of administration* as the case may be to entitle a person suing in a representative character to a decree in respect of the estate of the deceased In a large number of cases however it is not necessary to obtain probate or letters of administration to entitle a plaintiff suing in a representative character to a decree in respect of the estate of the deceased This will appear from the following statement of the law on the subject —

1 *Europeans Parsis Jews and Armenians governed by the provisions of the Indian Succession Act 39 of 1850* —In this class of cases no right as executor or legatee can be established in any Court unless probate has been obtained and no right to any part of the property of a person who has died intestate can be established in any Court unless

letters of administration have first been granted by a Court of competent jurisdiction (p) See Indian Succession Act 1925 ss 212 and 213

2 *Hindu Wills*—Probate is necessary in the case of Hindu wills where such wills are of the class specified in s 57 (1) of the Indian Succession Act 1925 These are wills made by Hindus within the territories which on 1st September 1870 were subject to the Lieutenant Governor of Bengal or within the local limits of the ordinary original civil jurisdiction of Madras and Bombay and wills made outside those territories and limits so far as relates to immovable property situate within those territories or limits No probate is necessary in the case of other wills See Indian Succession Act 1925 s 213 (2)

No letters of administration are necessary where a Hindu dies intestate see Indian Succession Act 1925 s 212 (2) But if a suit is brought to recover a debt due to the estate of a deceased Hindu no decree can be passed against the debtor except on production of a probate or letters of administration or a succession certificate see Indian Succession Act 1925 s 214

3 *Mahomedans*—Neither a probate nor letters of administration are necessary in the case of Mahomedans see Indian Succession Act 1925 ss 212 213 But if a suit is brought to recover a debt due to the estate of a deceased Mahomedan no decree can be passed against the debtor except on production of a probate or letters of administration or a succession certificate see Indian Succession Act 1925 s 214

4 *Indian Christians*—Up to the year 1901 Indian Christians were governed by the provisions of the Indian Succession Act 1865 Hence it was necessary where the deceased left a will that the executor should obtain probate before he could establish any right as such to the property of the deceased [Indian Succession Act 1865 s 187], and if the deceased died intestate it was necessary to obtain letters of administration before any right could be established to any part of the property of the deceased in a Court of law [Indian Succession Act 1865 s 190] In 1901 an Act was passed called the Native Christian Administration of Estates Act (VII of 1901) declaring inter alia that the provisions of section 190 of the Succession Act 1865 shall not apply to any part of the property of an Indian Christian who has died intestate with the result that in case of intestacy letters of administration were no longer necessary Those Acts have now been repealed by the Indian Succession Act 1925 but provisions similar to those above are reproduced in ss 212 and 213 Under s 213 a probate is necessary where the deceased has left a will Under s 212 no letters of administration are necessary where the deceased has died intestate But if a suit is brought to recover a debt due to the estate of a deceased Indian Christian, no decree can be passed against the debtor except on production of a probate or letters of administration or a succession certificate see Indian Succession Act 1925 s 214

Has taken the steps—In those cases where a probate is necessary and those are cases specified in s 213 of the Indian Succession Act 39 of 1925 it has been held by the Privy Council that the grant of probate is not a condition precedent to the institution of the suit and that the executor or legatee may institute the suit without obtaining a probate but that he will not be entitled to a decree until he obtains a probate (g)

If the deceased has left no will and the case is one governed by s 212 of the Indian Succession Act 1925 so that letters of administration are necessary to establish a right

(p) See in this connection *F. M. J. v. Adarji* (1923) 18 Bom 337 and *Ratanbhai v. Varayandas* (19 7) 51 Bom 771 1941 4 94 (\*\*) A B 474  
(q) *Chand v. Kulkarni v. Prasad Kumari* (1911) 38 Cal 377 39 I A 7 9 I C 122 [a case under the Hindu Wills Act 1870] *Jamshedji v. Hirubhai* (1913) 37 Bom 158 19 I C 406 [a case under the Indian Succession Act 1865]

Act 1865] *M. J. v. Adarji* (1923) 18 Bom 337 and *Ratanbhai v. Varayandas* (19 7) 51 Bom 771 1941 4 94 (\*\*) A B 474  
I C 3-3 [a case from Singapore decided with reference to the English law] The contrary view expressed by the High Court of Madras is not followed submitted correct *Bala Krishnaudu v. Varayandas* (1914) 37 Mad 175 180 1 I C 85...

to the property of the deceased in a Court of law the question arises whether it is necessary that letters of administration to the estate of the deceased should be obtained before the institution of the suit or whether it is sufficient if they are obtained before the decree is passed. The High Court of Bombay has held that if letters of administration are not obtained before the institution of the suit and the plaintiff does not show that the plaintiff has obtained letters of administration the plaintiff should be rejected on presentation but if the plaintiff is not rejected and the hearing has been allowed to proceed there is nothing to prevent the Court from passing a decree for the plaintiff if letters of administration are obtained before the decree (r). The English law on the subject may thus be stated in the language of the Judicial Committee in *Meyappa v Subramanian* (s). An administrator derives title solely under his grant and cannot therefore institute an action as administrator before he gets his grant. The law on the point is well settled see Comyn's Digest Administration B 9 and 10 *Thompson v Reynolds* (t) *Woolley v Clark* (u).

Title of suit—See Appendix A (2) Description of Parties in Particular Cases the last two forms See also r 9 (2) below

5 [s 50, para 5] The plaintiff shall show that the defendant is or claims to be interested in the subject-matter, and that he is liable to be called upon to answer the plaintiff's demand

Defendants interest and liability to be shown

6 [s 50 para 6] Where the suit is instituted after the expiration of the period prescribed by the law of limitation, the plaintiff shall show the ground upon which exemption from such law is claimed

Grounds of exemption from limitation law

Grounds of exemption from limitation law—These grounds are set forth in section 12 to 20 of the Limitation Act 1908. If no ground of exemption is shown in the plaintiff and the suit appears from the statement in the plaintiff to be barred by limitation, the plaintiff shall be rejected [see r 11 cl (d) below]. But a plaintiff should not be rejected merely because the exemption is not claimed specifically. All that the rule requires is that the plaintiff shall show the ground of exemption (v). If a plaintiff does not show any ground of exemption the Court of first instance should allow the plaintiff to be amended save under very exceptional circumstances (w). But a plaintiff should not be allowed to rely upon a ground of exemption from the law of limitation for the first time in appeal (x). See notes to O 41 r 2 below.

The High Court of Bombay has held that when a plaintiff does satisfy the requirements of this rule by stating what is in his opinion the ground upon which he intends to get over the bar of limitation he ought not to be precluded from taking another and not inconsistent ground should he be later advised that the latter is the true ground (y).

(r) *Sethna v Hemingway* (1914) 38 Bom 613  
23 I C 114 *Adm Gen of Bengal v Lahit*  
(1904) 1 C. W. N. 738

(s) (1916) 43 I A 113 119 35 I C 33

(t) 3 C & P 13

(u) 5 B & Ald 746

(v) *Paghu Nath v Syed Samad* (1908) 1 C.W.N. 617

(w) *Pam S K Das v Ghulam* (1918) Punj Rec. no 10... p 33 46 I C. 495 *Gyana v Mahanji* (1909) 34 Bom 250 3 I C. 159

(x) *Gobinda M I v Santa* (1914) Punj Rec. no 83 p 293 46 I C. 441 *Utam Chand v Jai Thakur* (1900) 3 Lah 33 69 I C. 419 (72) A. L. 39

(y) *Fakir Ebrahim v Jai Fakhmal* (1908) 10 Bom L R 316

According to the Calcutta ( ) and Lahore (a) rulings a plaintiff who has stated one ground of exemption may be allowed to take another and inconsistent ground

**7 [New R S C, O 20, r 6]** Every plaint shall state specifically the relief which the plaintiff claims either simply or in the alternative, and it shall not be necessary to ask for general or other relief which may always be given as the Court may think just to the same extent as if it had been asked for. And the same rule shall apply to any relief claimed by the defendant in his written statement

Relief to be specifically stated

Relief—Every plaint must state specifically the relief which the plaintiff claims whether it be damages or specific performance or an injunction or a declaration or an account or the appointment of a receiver or possession of land or relief of any other kind. A plaintiff who omits (except with the leave of the Court to sue for all the reliefs to which he may be entitled in respect of the same cause of action will not afterwards be allowed to sue for any relief so omitted [O 2 r 2 sub r (3)] But it is not necessary to ask for general or other relief

Where a relief is claimed upon a specific ground the Court may grant it upon a ground different from that on which it is claimed in the plaint if the ground is disclosed by the allegations in the plaint and the evidence in the case (b). Thus in a case in which a plaintiff claimed an easement by prescription and it was found that he was not entitled to the easement by prescription their Lordships of the Privy Council dealing with the case as a special appeal decreed the claim on the presumption of title arising from a grant (c)

Where a plaint asks for more than what the plaintiff is entitled to the Court may give him only as much relief as he is entitled to but the suit must not be dismissed (d). Where a plaint asks for less than what the plaintiff must be entitled to the Court cannot give him relief in excess of the plaint unless the plaint is amended before judgment. Thus if a suit is brought upon a balance of accounts or for mesne profits and the plaintiff instead of claiming whatever may be found due on the taking of accounts and stating an approximate amount [O 7 r 2] states a specific sum as the amount claimed the Court cannot without an amendment of the plaint [O 6 r 17] pass a decree for more than what is claimed (e)

General or other relief—Under the system of pleadings hitherto followed in India it was usual to add in the plaint a prayer for general relief called *general prayer* which ran thus: The plaintiff claims *such further or other relief* as the nature of the case may require. Under the present rule it is no longer necessary specifically to ask for such relief. Such relief may now always be given to the same extent as if it had been asked for provided it is not inconsistent with that specifically claimed and with the case raised by the pleading (f). In order however to entitle a plaintiff to a relief

- (a) *Hingra v Her mba* (1911) 13 Cal I. J 139  
81 C 81 *C gadhar v Khaja* (1909) 14  
C W 18 21 C 77 explaining  
*Joteshwar Loy v Raj Narain* (1901) 31  
Cal 19
- (b) *Larmesher Das v Fakira* (1911) Lah 13  
80 I C 77
- (c) *Isrul Jehan v Ram Suran* (1895) — Cal  
589 *Haji Khan v Laldeo Das* (1901)  
21 All 60
- (d) *Fajrup v Abdul* (1881) 6 Cal 391 7 I.A.  
240 *Achul v Raj n* (1881) 6 Cal 81

- Secretary of State v Nathuramha* (1890)  
14 Bom 213 0
- (e) *Id mbut v Ha Joy* (1867) 7 W R. 93  
*Lakshman v Ha i* (1880) 4 Bom 581  
*I lamada v Iaruthu* (1858) 11 Mad 91  
97
- (f) *Saorah F w v Colagberry* (1833) — M I A  
114 *Ferdal v Collector of Chittagong*  
(1903) 30 Cal 516 519 But see *K v*  
*ya v Venkata* (1917) 40 Mad 1 7-6  
39 I C 439
- (g) *Carroll v Lower* (1878) 10 C D 507 508

under the claim for general relief it is necessary that the ground for such relief should be disclosed by the allegations in the plaint (g). A plaintiff cannot be entitled to relief upon facts or documents not stated or referred to by him in his pleadings (h). Thus where a plaintiff sues for a declaration of title to certain property under a deed of sale he cannot be allowed to succeed on the basis of title by *adverse possession* (i).

With regard to the nature of the general or other relief which a plaintiff may have the rule is that if the plaint contains allegations offering issues on facts that are material the plaintiff is entitled to the relief which those facts will sustain but he cannot desert the specific relief claimed and under the claim for general relief ask for specific relief of another description unless the facts and circumstances alleged on the pleadings will consistently with the rules of the Court maintain that relief (j).

Where a suit is brought by a reversioner against a Hindu widow (1) for an injunction restraining her from waste (2) for appointment of a receiver and (3) for further relief the plaintiff if he fails in the substantial heads of his claim is not entitled under cover of a request for further relief to obtain a declaration that he is the next reversionary heir (l).

In a suit by a mortgagee for sale of the mortgaged property the mortgagee may relinquish his claim for sale and ask for a simple money decree though such relief is not specifically claimed. This he may do under the claim for general relief. The Court has the power to grant that relief provided the mortgage contains a personal covenant to pay the mortgage debt (m). The Court may also under this rule award interest on a balance of account from the date of the institution of the suit although interest is not specifically asked for in the plaint (n). But the Court has no power under a claim for general relief to grant to a *pro forma* plaintiff the relief claimed by the active plaintiff if it turns out that the *pro forma* plaintiff and not the active plaintiff is entitled to the relief claimed. This may be explained by an illustration. P sells his interest in certain property in the possession of C to A. A and B then sue C to recover possession of the property. B makes no claim and he is joined merely as a formal party to the suit. The Court finds the sale to A void as champertous (Contract Act s. 23). On these facts no decree can be passed in favour of A for possession. Nor should any decree be passed in favour of B awarding possession of the property to him under the claim for general relief though the Court find that C is in wrongful possession of the property and that the person really entitled to the property is B. B must bring a separate suit against C to recover possession (n).

**Alternative relief**—A plaintiff may rely upon several different rights alternatively although they may be inconsistent (o) provided that his pleading is not thereby rendered embarrassing. A pleading is not embarrassing within the meaning of Order 16 because it contains inconsistent sets of facts (p). Thus a plaintiff may in the same suit claim to have a partnership agreement with the defendant cancelled on the ground that he was induced to enter into it by the fraud of the defendant or in the alternative for a dissolution of partnership and accounts (q). Similarly a plaintiff may claim over the same plot of land a right of ownership or in the alternative a right

- (g) *Jagdeo v. Karti* (1904) 1 Cal 116 10 1 *Udhan Lal v. M. ya Lal* (1914) 4 Lab L J 393  
 (h) *M. H. v. Z. Hoer v. Fulta Koer* (1867) 11 M 1 A 464 474  
 (i) *S. S. dora v. Indral* (1908) 31 M 1 531  
 (j) *Hern v. M. H.* (1806) 13 Ves 119 per Lord Ellenborough *Cockrell v. De Lens* (1840) — M 1 A 353 3 J 5 also *K. I. mal v. I. latu p* (1911) 7 Bom L R 87  
 (k) *I. C. 481 (3) A B 14 Raj Gharib v. N. nio* (1911) 5 All L J 15 65 L C 4 (2) 4 4 5

- (l) *Janaki v. Va. vana m.* (1916) 43 I A 07 393 (1) 634 37 I C 161  
 (m) *Sukkle v. Lachma* (1911) 4 All 4 6  
*Abbakke v. K. N. v. vama* (1906) 20 Mad 461  
*Sonendra Mohan v. H. ri. Pro ad* (1916) 5 I A 413 4 P 13 91 I C 1033 (—) 4 P 10  
 (n) *Lup Lam v. Harph* (1911) 4 Lab 56 64  
 (o) *I. C. 836 (1) 4 1 1 5*  
 (p) *Deb Day v. Han Lertap* (1901) 31 Cal 4 3  
 (q) *I. latu p v. I. latu pps* (14) 4 Q B D 1  
 134 per Brett L J  
 (r) *P. Morgan Owen v. Morgan* (1) 3 J C D 49  
 (s) *P. god v. Easton* (1877) C D 1

of easement (r) A plaintiff may in a suit for pre-emption base his claim in the alternative on contract or on custom or on Mahomedan law (s) He may also in such a suit set up an alternative claim as owner (t)

In *Mahomed Balseh v Hosseini Bibi* (u) the Judicial Committee observed that where a plaintiff sues alleging that a deed purporting to be executed by herself is a forgery the Court ought not to admit the inconsistency issue whether it was executed under undue influence These observations were explained away in an Allahabad case where it was held that a plaintiff may sue for the cancellation of a bond on the ground that it was a forgery or in the alternative that it was void for want of consideration (v) But quære whether the allegations of forgery and want of consideration are not inconsistent and embarrassing The High Court of Calcutta has held that a plaintiff may sue to set aside a deed of gift on the ground that she executed it under a fraudulent representation that it was a power of attorney or in the alternative on the ground that it was obtained by undue influence (w)

A plaintiff in a suit for specific performance may claim in the alternative that if the contract cannot be enforced it should be rescinded and delivered up for cancellation (x) A purchaser in a suit for specific performance may claim in the alternative a return of the earnest money and he may at the hearing give up his prayer for specific performance and ask for a return of the earnest money (y) In England in a case under the old practice it was held that a suit to set aside a transaction for fraud or in the alternative for specific performance of a compromise could not be sustained (z) It seems probable that the same conclusion would still be arrived at on the ground that the claims were inconsistent and embarrassing (a)

For a fuller discussion of this subject see notes to O 6 r 2 Alternative and inconsistent allegations

Relief not founded on pleadings—See notes under the same head to O 14 r 1

Events happening after institution of suit—Ordinarily the decree in a suit should accord with the rights of the parties as they stand at the date of its institution But where it is shown that the original relief claimed has by reason of subsequent change of circumstances become inappropriate or that it is necessary to have the decision of the Court on the altered circumstances in order to shorten litigation or to do complete justice between the parties it is incumbent upon a Court of justice to take notice of events which have happened since the institution of the suit and to mould its decree according to the circumstances as they stand at the time the decree is made (b) Leave to amend may be granted under O 6 r 17 for this purpose (c)

8 [New R S C O 20 r 7] Where the plaintiff seeks relief in respect of several distinct claims or causes of action founded upon separate and distinct grounds they shall be stated as far as may be separately and distinctly

Relief founded on separate grounds

See notes to O 6 r 2 Alternative and inconsistent allegations

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| (r) <i>Nanda v Abhor Charan</i> (1907) 34 Cal 51   | with his son on <i>Mosley v Ryan</i> (1901)                             |
| (s) <i>Madd v Shams-un-Nissa</i> (1914) 36 All 456 211 C 45                                  | 3 Ves 181 <i>Stapleton v Scott</i> (1405) 12 Ves 4                      |
| (t) <i>Thacker v Farmak</i> (1914) 36 All 46 1 C 23  | (y) <i>Kanda v Chhotalal</i> (1911) 48 Bom 71 C 7 (4) A 1119            |
| (u) (1881) 15 I A 81 86 15 Cal 634 See also <i>Iyappa v Rama Lakshamma</i> (1890) 13 Mad 549 | (z) <i>Crisley v Earle</i> II t M 50                                    |
| (v) <i>Jano v Manon</i> (1896) 18 All 15   | (a) <i>Fry on Specific Performance</i> 6th ed para 10 c p 494           |
| (w) <i>Official Assignee v Bidjuru dars</i> (1910) 1 Cal W N 145 148 541 C 00                | (b) <i>Murman v Ambura</i> (1917) 41 Cal 47 35 34 I C 869               |
| (x) See s 37 of the Specific Relief Act 1977   | (c) <i>Tallur v Annam</i> (1906) 49 Mad 1 J 479 80 I C 841 (1906) A M 6 |

**9 [S 58]** (1) The plaintiff shall endorse on the  
 Procedure on admitting  
 plaint  
 plaint, or annex thereto, a list of the documents (if any) which he has produced along with it, and, if the plaint is admitted

shall present as many copies on plain paper of the plaint as there are defendants, unless the Court by reason of the length of the plaint or the number of the defendants, or for any other sufficient reason, permits him to present a like number of  
 Concise statements  
 concise statements of the nature of the claim made or of the relief claimed in the suit in which case he shall present such statements

(2) Where the plaintiff sues, or the defendant or any of the defendants is sued, in a representative capacity, such statements shall show in what capacity the plaintiff or defendant sues or is sued

(3) The plaintiff may, by leave of the Court, amend such statements so as to make them correspond with the plaint

(4) The chief ministerial officer of the Court shall sign such list and copies or statements if, on examination, he finds them to be correct

\* Sub rule (2) representative capacity—It is not necessary to state in the title of the suit the representative capacity in which the plaintiff or the defendant sues or is sued although no doubt that is a convenient place to make such a statement. It is enough if the pleading shows that the plaintiff or the defendant sues or is sued in a representative capacity (d) See O 7 r 4 and Appendix A (2) Description of Parties in Particular Cases the last two forms.

**10. [S 57]** (1) The plaint shall at any stage of  
 Return of plaint  
 the suit be returned to be presented to the Court in which the suit should have been instituted

(2) On returning a plaint the Judge shall endorse thereon the date of its presentation and return, the name of the party presenting it, and a brief statement of the reasons for  
 Procedure on returning  
 plaint  
 returning it

Return of plaint.—Where a suit filed in a Revenue Court is not triable by that Court the Court should not dismiss the suit but return the plaint to be presented

(d) *Aurmo v Hanif Ali* (1915) 19 C. W. N. 1193 25 I. C. 818 *Bida J ul Jay a* 404 (1919) 46 Cal. 6 8, 3 30 I. C. 55

*Sonachalam v K m rai* (1925) 54 Mad. L. J. 557 109 I. C. 193 (25) A. M. 445



to the proper Court (e) A suit against two defendants cognizable by a Civil Court as against the first and by a Revenue Court as against the second was filed in a Civil Court. The Patna High Court directed the plaint to be returned for presentation to the Revenue Court and that a copy of it should be retained on the record for trial of the suit as against the second defendant (f)

At any stage of the suit. —These words are new. They have been added to give effect to the undermentioned decision (g) in which it was held that a plaint may be returned to be presented to the proper Court at any stage of the suit even after the trial has begun and concluded. But a plaint should not be returned unless the Court finds that it has no jurisdiction (h)

Court fee —Where a plaint is returned by a Court to be presented to the proper Court the latter Court is bound to give credit for the fee levied by the former Court (i)

Chartered High Courts —This rule does not apply to Chartered High Courts in the exercise of their ordinary or extraordinary original civil jurisdiction [O 49 r 3 cl (1)]

Appeal —An appeal lies from an order returning a plaint to be presented to the proper Court whether the order is made by the Court of first instance [O 43 r 1 cl (a)] or by the Court of first appeal in the exercise of powers conferred upon it by s 107 (j). But no second appeal lies from the order of the first appellate Court (k) [see s 104 (2)]

A files his plaint in a District Munsif's Court. The Munsif returns the plaint for presentation to the proper Court holding that the suit is beyond his pecuniary jurisdiction. On the plaint being presented to a Subordinate Judge's Court it is again returned by that Court on the ground that the Munsif's Court had jurisdiction. Is A entitled to appeal to the District Court from the order of the District Munsif having regard to the fact that he in obedience to that order filed the plaint in the Subordinate Judge's Court? No according to a Calcutta decision the reason given being that by electing to file the plaint in the Subordinate Judge's Court he forfeited his right of appeal (l). Yes according to the Madras High Court (m)

The merits of an order refusing leave under s 20 cl (b) cannot be attacked in an appeal from an order returning a plaint to be presented to the proper Court (n)

**11 [S 54]** The plaint shall be rejected in the following cases —

1. Rejection of plaint

(a) where it does not disclose a cause of action,

(b) where the relief claimed is undervalued, and the plaintiff, on being required by the Court to correct the valuation within a time to be fixed by the Court fails to do so

(1) *Pam J v. Babu* (19) 44 All 686 70 I C 93 (—) A 44 4

(2) *Secretary of State v. Natchar* (19 7) 6 F T 354 103 I C 43 (—) A P 34

(3) *Prabhat Bhai v. Vishrambhar* (1894) 8 Bom 313 [F B] See *Ka. nasram v. Jay (Hambal)* (1918) 41 Mad 701 08 46 I C 63

(4) *Burisha v. Jaghda* (19 0) 48 All 168 90 I C 33 (—) A A 54

(5) *Farmer v. Nar* (191) 33 Mad 567 10 I C 01 [F B] *Fane A v. Tanya* (19) 11 Bom 36 101 I C 343 (—) A B 57

(6) *H. Abdullah v. Kanhaya Lal* (1903) 48 All

171 *Dulip v. Gh v. Kundan Singh* (1914) 36 All 58 I C 614 *Nand Kulkare*

*Abdur I. Am m* (19 0) 4 All 74 5 I C 801 *Go. Bax v. Brij Lal* (1922) 6 Cal 7 (A. sen v. Ka. pf (1 2) 1

Mad 34

(7) *Vali th v. Pal a t* (19—5) 7 Bom L. R. 63 84 I C 53 (—) A B 431

(8) *Pen Madh b v. Jote tra* (190) 35 Cal 1 J 580 doubted 1 *Basku t Nakh v. Nakh*

*Imulla* (190) 6 Cal 1 J 517 556

(9) *V. v. v. Cheria* (1914) 41 Mad 791 45 I C 82

(10) *Allen Brother v. Arum M I* (192) 14 I J 66 84 I C 46 (—) A L 334

- (c) where the relief claimed is properly valued, but the plaint is written upon paper insufficiently stamped, and the plaintiff on being required by the Court to supply the requisite stamp paper within a time to be fixed by the Court, fails to do so ,
- (d) where the suit appears from the statement in the plaint to be barred by any law

**Change of law**—Clause (a) is new. See notes below. Clause (a)

**Chartered High Courts**—Clauses (b) and (c) of this rule do not apply to Chartered High Courts in the exercise of their ordinary or extraordinary original civil jurisdiction. See O 49 r 3(1).

**Duty of Court to examine plaint**—It is the duty of the Court under O 7 to examine a plaint before issuing summonses and to ascertain whether any cause of action has been pleaded and whether any relief has been claimed against the defendants and to determine whether the plaint should be rejected or returned for amendment (1)

Shall be rejected —This rule may be applied at any stage of a suit. Therefore a plant may be rejected under this rule even after it has been numbered and registered as a suit (p)

The provision contained in this rule that the plaint shall be rejected in the four cases mentioned in the rule is mandatory. In a case therefore where the relief claimed was properly valued but the plaint was written upon paper insufficiently stamped and the plaintiff on being required by the Court to supply the requisite stamp paper failed to do so it was held that the plaintiff should not be allowed to amend the plaint by omitting the prayer in respect of which the extra court fee was directed to be paid and that the plaint should be rejected (a).

**Rejection of plaint in part**—This rule does not justify the rejection of any particular portion of a plaint (r)

Clause (a) where plaintiff does not disclose cause of action — Under the Code of 1887, § 33 it was not obligatory upon the Court to reject a plaintiff if it did not disclose cause of action. Under the present rule the Court is bound to reject a plaintiff if it does not disclose a cause of action. As to the meaning of "cause of action" see notes to § 20 Cause of Action on p. 103 above.

Clause (b) Where the relief claimed is undervalued—Even if the correct valuation would render the Court incompetent to entertain the suit the Court should in the first instance require the plaintiff to pay the proper court fee. If the plaintiff does not pay the additional court fee the Court should not proceed under O 7 r 10 but it should reject the plaint. If the plaintiff pays the requisite court fee and the Court finds that the value of the subject matter exceeds its jurisdiction it should return the plaint under O 7 r 10 (a).

- [illegible]

11 Clause (c) Where a plaint is written upon paper insufficiently stamped—The following points are to be noted in connection with this clause—

1 Where a plaint is written upon paper insufficiently stamped, the Court is bound to give the plaintiff time to make good the deficiency This follows from the terms of cl (c) itself (t)

2 If the plaintiff fails to supply the requisite stamp paper within the period fixed by the Court the plaint may be rejected under this rule even after it has been numbered and registered as a suit The reason is that the power to reject a plaint under this rule is not exhausted when the plaint has been admitted and registered (u) See notes above Shall be rejected

3 A plaint is presented on the last day allowed by the law of limitation. It is written upon paper insufficiently stamped The plaintiff is ordered to supply the requisite stamp paper within a week The order is complied with on the fourth day after the date of presentation of the plaint This would necessarily be *after the expiration* of the period of limitation prescribed for the institution of the suit Can the plaint be admitted under these circumstances? Under this Code it can be [see s 149] Under the Code of 1857 there was a conflict of decisions on the point The High Courts of Calcutta (v) Madras (u) and Bombay (x) holding that the Court had power to admit the plaint while the Allahabad High Court held that the Court had no such power (y) The view taken by the Calcutta Madras and Bombay High Courts was that the Court had power under s 54 of that Code at any time and without any regard to limitation to fix a time within which the requisite stamp paper should be supplied and if the stamp was made good within the period fixed by the Court the suit was to be deemed to be instituted when the plaint was first presented and not when the requisite stamp paper was supplied On the other hand the view taken by the Allahabad High Court was that, though the Court had the power to give time to a plaintiff within which to supply the requisite stamp paper it must be a time within limitation and that s 54 did not give any power to the Court to extend the period of limitation This conflict has now been set at rest by the provisions of s 149 of this Code That section gives effect to the Calcutta, Madras and Bombay decisions The Allahabad decisions are no longer law (z) S 149 empowers the Court at any stage to allow a plaintiff to make up the deficiency of court fee, and provides in effect that when the deficiency has been made up the plaint is as valid as if it had been properly stamped when presented It follows from the provisions of s 149 that where a plaint written upon paper insufficiently stamped is presented to the Court on the last day allowed by the law of limitation and the Judge to whom the plaint is presented directs extra court fee to be paid *but fixes no time for payment* and the plaintiff pays the extra court fee though it be *after the expiration* of the period of limitation and the Court accepts it the plaint should be treated as if the full fee had been paid in the first instance and the suit cannot be held to be barred by limitation (a) In a recent Patna case the plaintiff was given a week's time in which to make up the deficiency Before the expiry of the week the Court closed for the vacation The amount in default was tendered two days after the re-opening of the Court and accepted and the plaint was registered The period of limitation for the claim had expired prior to the date of the

- (t) *Ach t v Nagappa* (1914) 38 Bom 41 43  
211 C 337 *Ram Sah v Kishor Lal* (1917) 2 Pat. L J 74 76 38 I C 90  
*Ladd v Kant v Deventra* (19 ) 49 (al  
680 91 C 101 (2) A C 506  
(u) *Prashmowari Das v A d S* (1900) 2 Cal  
36 *Ladman d S v Anu t Lal* (1907)  
34 Cal 20  
(v) *Mol Sah v Chhatr Das* (1852) 19 Cal  
40 *H ri Moh v Na muddi* (1893)  
20 Cal 41 *Kishori Koor v Madan*  
*Moh S gh* (1904) 31 Cal 5  
(w) *A d v Jathumma* (1890) 22 Mad 494

- Gavara gh v Boto K u h a* (1909) 3 Mad  
305, 41 C 507  
(z) *Dhond am v Taba Saradan* (1903) 22 Bom  
300  
(y) *Jainat Prasad v Bux S gh* (1877) 15 All  
63 *D rpa S gh v Buxa h d d* (1878)  
4 All 118  
(z) *F m Bupal v Sher S gh* (1923) 43 All 514  
41 C 34 (3) A A 534  
(a) *G va v Anwar* (1918) 1 Pat L J 420 37 I C  
07 S *Ara B raa d v Ghadd* (1911)  
26 Cal W 321 70 I C 43 (7) A C  
234

acceptance of the deficit. It was held that the acceptance of the fee although tendered late and the subsequent registration of the plaint amounted to an exercise by the Court of its discretion to allow the deficiency to be paid on the day when it was tendered and therefore the suit was not barred by limitation (b)

The procedure prescribed by the present rule is not applicable to a case in which an appellate Court acts under s 12 of the Court Fees Act 1870 (c)

Memorandum of appeal insufficiently stamped—See notes to s 149 Appeals and Applications for review of judgment

Clause (d)—Suit barred by any law—Where a suit appears from state-  
ments in the plaint to be barred by the law of limitation but the plaint is not rejected when presented the Court may in a proper case allow the plaint to be amended at the hearing (d). Where a suit is brought against the Secretary of State without giving the notice required by s 80 the plaint should be rejected under this clause (e)

Enlargement of time—The Court may enlarge the time fixed under cls (b) and (c). See s 148

Appeal—An order rejecting a plaint is a decree [s 2 (2)] and appealable as such (f)

Where a plaint is rejected under cl (b) the order rejecting the plaint is not appealable when the order is based on a question of valuation *pure and simple*. But if the order necessarily involves a decision of the category or class under which a suit falls even though it incidentally decides a question of valuation the order is appealable (g). These decisions turn on s 12 of the Court Fees Act 1870

Revision—In a suit by A against B B raises the objection that the relief claimed is under valued. The Court may in such a case either uphold the objection and require A to pay additional court fee or it may hold that A's valuation is correct. Is this decision open to revision? It has been held by the Chief Court of the Punjab that an order directing a plaintiff to make up the deficiency in Court fee is not open to revision. The reason given is that if the plaintiff believing the order to be wrong does not comply with it it will under this rule result in the rejection of his plaint from which he has a right of appeal for an order rejecting a plaint is appealable as a decree (h). In a recent Calcutta case the Court of first instance held, on an objection raised by the defendant that the valuation put by the plaintiff on his claim was correct. The defendant applied for revision. The High Court held that the decision was not open to revision on the ground that the case did not fall under any of the three clauses of s 115 and also on the ground that the decision could be challenged in appeal from the final decree (i). The High Court of Patna has held that an order demanding an additional court fee involving the jurisdiction of the Court to try the suit is open to revision and that the plaintiff is not bound to wait until his plaint is rejected for non payment of the additional court fee. (j)

Review—In order rejecting a plaint under cl (c) of this section is open to review (k). So also in a proper case an order rejecting a plaint under cl (b) of the section (l)

(b) *I qd and v J m s ler* (1900) 4 Lat 190 51 C 17 (5) A P 111

(c) *I a d t Iry Krish v W h* (1919) 4 Pat 1 J 3 33 36 I C 316

(d) *G aj v Malv ji* (1910) 34 Bom 100 3 1 C 159

(e) *Lach hu v Secretary of State* (1903) 3 All 18

(f) *Sada A v J la Sagh* (1914) Punj Rec no 80 p 4 51 C 365  
Chand am. v Jandro (1919) 4 Pat L J 5 49 I C 44 *Dada v Vagr* (1920)

3 Bom 426 *St dd v Mat* (1901) 3 Cal 334 *Kanara v Komappa* (1921) 14 Mad 163

(g) *Narab v Du* (CA no (191) Punj Rec no 69 p 65 16 I C 47

(h) *Falkner v M r a* (1903) 30 Cal C W 5 6 86 I C 83 (3) A C 814

(i) *Mo i Lal v Durpa i rasad* (19 4) 3 Pat. 930 80 I C 66 (1) (2) A P 763

(j) *Rameshwardhara v S d* (1903) 2 Pat. 504 1 C 67 (2) A P 354

(k) *Adi Prasad v Ramkrishn* (1920) 4 Pat. 100 143 91 I C 13 (2) A P 433

**12 [S 55]** Where a plaintiff sues upon a document in his possession or power, he shall produce it in Court when the plaintiff is presented and shall at the same time deliver the document or a copy thereof to be filed with the plaintiff

Procedure on rejecting memorandum of appeal—The same procedure is to be followed when a memorandum of appeal is rejected (m)

**13 [S 56]** The rejection of the plaintiff on any of the grounds herebefore mentioned shall not of its own force preclude the plaintiff from presenting a fresh plaintiff in respect of the same cause of action

Where rejection of plaintiff does not preclude presentation of fresh plaintiff

### *Documents relied on in plaintiff*

**14 [S 59]** (1) Where a plaintiff sues upon a document in his possession or power, he shall produce it in Court when the plaintiff is presented and shall at the same time deliver the document or a copy thereof to be filed with the plaintiff

Production of document on which plaintiff sues

(2) Where he relies on any other documents (whether in his possession or power or not) as evidence in support of his claim, he shall enter such documents in a list to be added or annexed to the plaintiff

List of other documents

Production of documents relied upon—A horoscope does not require to be entered in the list of documents mentioned in sub r (2) The reason is that it is not a document to be relied upon as a probative document in itself but it is a record made by the maker of the horoscope to which he is entitled to refer for the purpose of refreshing his memory in the witness box (n)

Failure to produce documents—The penalty for not producing the documents referred to in this rule is that prescribed in r 18 below and not the rejection of the plaintiff (o)

Loss of document after production—Where a promissory note sued upon was produced and delivered to the Court as required by this rule but subsequently disappeared from the file the Judicial Committee held that the plaintiff was entitled to give secondary evidence under s 65 (2) of the Evidence Act 1870 without showing how it disappeared (p)

**15 [S 60]** Where any such document is not in the possession or power of the plaintiff, he shall, if possible, state in whose possession or power it is

Statement in case of document not in his possession or power

**16 [S 61]** Where the suit is founded upon a negotiable instrument, and it is proved that the instrument is lost, and an indemnity is given by the plaintiff, to the satisfaction of the Court, against the claims of any other person upon such instrument, the Court may pass such decree as it would have passed if the plaintiff had produced the instrument in Court when the plaint was presented, and had at the same time delivered a copy of the instrument to be filed with the plaint

**17 [S 62]** (1) Save in so far as is otherwise provided by the Bankers' Books Evidence Act, 1891, where the document on which the plaintiff sues is an entry in a shop book or other account in his possession or power the plaintiff shall produce the book or account at the time of filing the plaint, together with a copy of the entry on which he relies

(2) The Court, or such officer as it appoints in this behalf, shall forthwith mark the document for the purpose of identification, and, after examining and comparing the copy with the original, shall, if it is found correct, certify it to be so, and return the book to the plaintiff and cause the copy to be filed

*Original entry to be marked and returned*  
Bankers Books Evidence Act 18 of 1891.—The Bankers Books Evidence Act provides a special mode of proof of entries in bankers' books by dispensing with the production of the books. S 4 of the Act provides that a *certified copy* of any entry in a banker's book is to be received as *prima facie* evidence of the existence of such entry and that it should be admitted as evidence of the matter contained therein to the same extent as the *original* entry

**18 [S 63]** (1) A document which ought to be produced in Court by the plaintiff when the plaint is presented or to be entered in the list to be added or annexed to the plaint, and which is not produced or entered accordingly, shall not, without the leave of the Court, be received in evidence on his behalf at the hearing of the suit

(2) Nothing in this rule applies to documents produced for cross examination of the defendant's witnesses or in answer to any case set up by the defendant or handed to a witness merely to refresh his memory

18 In what cases leave may be granted under this rule—The object of rr 14 and 18 is to provide against false documents being set up after the institution of a suit. In those cases therefore where there is no doubt of the existence of a document at the date of the suit the Court should as a general rule admit the document in evidence though it was not produced with the plaint or entered in the list of documents annexed to the plaint as required by r 14 (g). But the Court may even in such a case refuse to receive it in evidence if it is produced at a very late stage of the proceedings e.g. ten years after the date of the suit and a day before the judgment was delivered as was done in the undermentioned case (r)

## ORDER VIII

### *Written Statement and Set off*

1 [S 110] The defendant may, and, if so required by the Court, shall, at or before the first hearing or within such time as the Court may permit, present a written statement of his defence

Written statement

Written statement—The written statement must contain and contain only a statement in a concise form of the material facts on which the party pleading relies for his defence but not the evidence by which those facts are to be proved (O 6 r 2). A defendant may by his written statement raise as many distinct and separate and therefore inconsistent defences as he may think proper provided the pleading is not embarrassing (s). A written statement is not embarrassing within the meaning of O 6 r 16 merely because it sets up inconsistent defences (t). But where the defendant relies upon several distinct grounds of defence they must be stated separately and distinctly (r 7 below). See notes to O 6 r 2. Alternato and inconsistent allegations.

2 [New R S C, O 19, r 15] The defendant must raise by his pleading all matters which show the suit not to be maintainable, or that the transaction is either void or voidable in point of law, and all such grounds of defence as, if not raised, would be likely to take the opposite party by surprise, or would raise issues of fact not arising out of the plaint, as, for instance, fraud, limitation, release, payment, performance, or facts showing illegality

New facts must be specially pleaded

Fraud—See notes to O 6 r 4. Fraud and coercion

Facts showing illegality—When a plaintiff sues upon a bond and the defence is that there was no consideration, the Court should not entertain the plea that the consideration was unlawful e.g. stifling a criminal prosecution if it is raised for the first time in the argument of counsel at the close of the hearing. The illegality of the consideration must be specifically pleaded (u). See notes to O 6 r 8.

(q) *Devadas v Purjada Begam* (1924) 8 Bom

(r) *G. gadha v Krishnaji* (1900) 44 Bom 65

(s) *Faria v Greenwood* (1885) 2 Fx 303

(t) *Pe Morge Low v Morgan* (1927) 3

(u) *Sur Bahi v Mawa Khan* (1901) 7 La

2 J 262; *C. 643* ( ) 41 34

**Limitation** —In India a suit instituted after the expiry of the period of limitation shall be dismissed although limitation has not been set up as a defence Limitation Act 1908 s 3 In England limitation must be specifically set up as a defence

**Claim against joint contractors for breach** —Where in a suit against joint contractors separate defences are put in a successful defence pleaded and proved by one only enures for the benefit of all (r)

3 [New R S C, O 19, r 17] It shall not be sufficient for a defendant in his written statement to deny generally the grounds alleged by the plaintiff, but the defendant must deal specifically with each allegation of fact of which he does not admit the truth except damages

Denial to be specific

**Deal specifically with each allegation of fact** —The defendant must take each fact which is alleged against him separately and say that he admits it or denies it or does not admit it It is not merely denial which is meant but the rule covers non admission for [the defendant] is to deal specifically with every allegation of fact of which he does not admit the truth (w) Every allegation of fact in the plaint will be taken to be admitted if it is not denied specifically or by necessary implication or stated to be not admitted (r 5)

A defendant ought not to deny by his written statement plain and acknowledged facts which it is neither to his interest nor in his power to disprove (x) nor should he plead to any matter which is not alleged against him (y) See notes to O 6 r 2 Facts not yet material to a case

**Except damages** —It is not necessary for a defendant in a suit for damages to deny specifically the damages it is quite sufficient if he pleads generally to the damages (z) See notes to O 6 r 2 Matters affecting damages

4 [New R S C, O 19 r 21] Where a defendant denies an allegation of fact in the plaint, he must not do so evasively, but answer the point of substance Thus, if it is alleged that he received a certain sum of money, it shall not be sufficient to deny that he received that particular amount, but he must deny that he received that sum or any part thereof or else set out how much he received And if an allegation is made with divers circumstances, it shall not be sufficient to deny it along with those circumstances

Evasive denial

**Evasive denial** —Where the plaintiff sets up an agreement and the defendant denies that the terms of the agreement between himself and the plaintiff were definitely agreed upon as alleged the denial is evasive. He [defendant] is bound to deny that any

(r) *Paris v F. Richardson* (19 7) 1 K. R. 448

(w) *Thorp v Holdsworth* (1876) 3 C. D. 63 640

per Jessel M.R.

(z) *Les Conservancy Board v. Bulton* (18 9) 1

C. D. 333 affirmed (1881) 6 App. Cas. 635

(y) *Pa. sam v. Budge* (1893) 1 Q. R. 51

(1) *Loss & Co v. Scriven* (1916) 43 Cal. 1001 1010, 34 I. C. 35



agreement or any terms of arrangement were ever come to if that is what he means if he does not mean that he should say that there were no terms of arrangement come to except the following terms and then state what the terms were otherwise there is no specific denial at all (a) Similarly where the plaintiff alleges that the defendant offered to the plaintiff's agent a bribe of Rs 500 on 17th July 1908 at the defendant's office it is an evasive traverse for the defendant to plead the defendant did not offer to the plaintiff's agent a bribe of Rs 500 on 17th July 1908 at his office for the defendant might have offered any other sum on another day and in another place Here the point of substance is that a bribe was offered The details as to the amount time and place are only circumstances The defendant should plead that he never offered a bribe of Rs 500 or any other sum (b) Where a denial is evasive leave to amend may be given under O 6 r 17 unless the Court is satisfied that the defendant was acting *malafide* (c)

**5** [New R S C, O 19, r 13] Every allegation of fact in the plaintiff, if not denied specifically or by necessary implication, or stated to be not admitted in the pleading of the defendant, shall be taken to be admitted except as against a person under disability

Provided that the Court may in its discretion require any fact so admitted to be proved otherwise than by such admission

**Admissions of fact in pleadings**—The first paragraph of this rule states what amounts to admissions of fact in a pleading Rule 3 requires that the defendant must deal specifically with each allegation of fact of which he does not admit the truth. The present rule provides that every allegation of fact in the plaintiff if not denied in the written statement shall be taken to be admitted by the defendant (d) In *Rutter v Tregent* (e) the statement of claim stated (paragraphs 1 2 and 3) the original mortgage and the assignment by the mortgagees to the plaintiff in which the mortgagor had joined (paragraphs 4 and 5) the charges created by the mortgagor subsequent to the assignment to the plaintiff of the first mortgage and (paragraph 6) the amount of principal money with interest due to the plaintiff By their statement of defence the defendants stated that they did not admit the correctness of the statements set forth in paragraphs 1 2 3 and 6 of the plaintiff's statement of claim and required proof thereof Defendant the mortgagor admitted that the subsequent charges were made as stated in paragraphs 4 and 5 of the statement of claim Upon a motion for judgment as upon admission of facts in the pleadings it was held that there was no sufficient denial of the facts alleged by the plaintiff and that the plaintiff was entitled to judgment for foreclosure Bacon, V C said The defendants did not admit the correctness of the statements contained in the statement of claim but they ought to state in what respect they disputed them Similarly where a defendant simply puts the plaintiff to proof of the several allegations in the plaintiff he will be deemed to have admitted the facts alleged in the plaintiff (f) Where in a suit for the recovery of money the plaintiff relies in his plaint upon a letter written by the defendant to save the bar of limitation and all that the defendant says in his written statement as to the letter is the suit is not

( ) *Torp v Holdsworth* (18 6) 3 C D 63;

(b) *Tides v Harper* (18 8) 10 C D 403

(c) *Tides v Harper* (18 8) 10 C D 393

(d) *Am Jey v Chulam Nahi* (191 ) Punj H R no 1 p 1 371 C 370

(e) (1879) 1 C D 758

(f) *Harris v Gamble* (18 8) 7 C D 87

saved by the letter put in from the bar of limitation the letter must be taken as admitted and it need not be proved by the plaintiff (g) But where in a suit by the reversioner of a deceased Hindu to recover possession of properties alienated by the widow of the deceased the defendants pleaded that they did not admit that the widow died on the date stated in the plaint and further stated that the suit was barred by limitation and an issue was framed as to the date of the widow's death it was held that there was no admission by the defendants of the date of the widow's death merely because they did not state in their written statement the date on which according to their case the widow died (h)

A plaintiff who claims a decree must prove all the material facts on which he relies in support of his claim. The importance of the present rule lies in this that since facts which have been admitted need not be proved it is not necessary for the plaintiff to prove facts which have been expressly admitted by the defendant or which must be taken to have been admitted by him within the meaning of this rule (see Evidence Act 1872 s 58). The admission itself being a proof no other proof is necessary. In the case however of facts which may be taken to be admitted by the defendant within the meaning of this rule the Court may in its discretion require any facts so admitted to be proved otherwise than by such admission. That is to say the Court may require the plaintiff to adduce such proof of the fact as it would have been necessary for him to adduce if no such admission had been made. This power which has been conferred upon the Court by the proviso to the rule is not new. The matter it will be seen is one of evidence and a similar power is contained in the Indian Evidence Act I of 1872. The proviso to the rule in fact is a reproduction of the proviso to section 58 of the Evidence Act. That section runs as follows —

No fact need be proved in any proceeding which the parties thereto or their agents agree to admit at the hearing or which before the hearing they agree to admit by any writing under their hands or which by any rule of pleading in force at the time they are deemed to have admitted by their pleadings. *Provided that the Court may in its discretion require the facts admitted to be proved otherwise than by such admissions.*

The proviso to section 58 as well as the proviso to the present rule indicates the intention of the Legislature that pleadings in India ought not to be construed with the same strictness as in England. Upon this principle the defendant has been allowed under special circumstances to traverse at the hearing allegations in the plaint which he had omitted to traverse in his written statement (i). The rule of pleadings in England is very stringent. According to that rule a defendant who omits to traverse in his defence any allegation of fact in the statement of claim is not allowed to traverse that fact at the hearing. The fact will be taken to be admitted by him and the Court has no power to require the plaintiff to prove it in any case. Strike out the proviso to the present rule and you have the rule of English law. In fact the first paragraph of this rule is a reproduction of O 19 r 13 of the English Rules made under the Judicature Acts. The proviso has been added to modify the rigour of that rule.

But though pleadings in India are not to be construed as strictly as in England neither party will be allowed to set up at the hearing an entirely new and inconsistent case. The plaintiff must be held to the state of facts alleged in his plaint or consistent therewith (j). Similarly the defendant must be held to the state of facts alleged in his written statement or consistent therewith (k).

- (g) *Laxminarayana v Channarayana* (1917) 41 Bom 293 31 (14)  
(h) *Rajgopalakrishna v Phasikhar* (1911) 47 Mad LJ 500 1 C 584 (24) ALJ 434  
(i) *Madho Prasad v Gajudha* (1885) 11 Cal 111 111 A 146 4 undivided v Shroff (1885) 9 M L A 301 14th

- Singh v Jodha* 5 Gh (1891) 6 All 406  
1st 1st v Phasikhar 5 Gh (1911) 6 All 744  
L J 353, B. I C 617 (24) A L 744  
(j) *Eshen v Under v Nanda* (1886) 11 M L J 17  
(k) *Chow v Isa* (1861) 11 Bom 209 *Munck v Shaw v New Dharmay Co* (1880) 4 Bom 56

Omission to file written statement.—This rule applies only where a pleading has been put in by the defendant Omission to file a written statement does not amount to an admission of the facts stated in the plaint (4)

6 [S 111] (1) Where in a suit for the recovery of money the defendant claims to set off against the plaintiff's demand any ascertained sum of money legally recoverable by him from the plaintiff, not exceeding the pecuniary limits of the jurisdiction of the Court, and both parties fill the same character as they fill in the plaintiff's suit, the defendant may, at the first hearing of the suit, but not afterwards unless permitted by the Court, present a written statement containing the particulars of the debt sought to be set off

Particulars of set-off to be given in written statement

(2) The written statement shall have the same effect as a plaint in a cross suit so as to enable the Court to pronounce a final judgment in respect both of the original claim and of the set off but this shall not affect the lien, upon the amount decreed, of any pleader in respect of the costs payable to him under the decree

Effect of set-off

(3) The rules relating to a written statement by a defendant apply to a written statement in answer to a claim of set off

Illustrations

(a) A bequeaths Rs 2 000 to B and appoints C his executor and residuary legatee B dies and D takes out administration to B's effects C pays Rs 1 000 as surety for D then D sues C for the legacy C cannot set off the debt of Rs 1 000 against the legacy for neither C or D fills the same character with respect to the legacy as they fill with respect to the payment of the Rs 1 000

(b) A dies intestate and in debt to B C takes out administration to A's effects and B buys part of the effects from C In a suit for the purchase money by C against B the latter cannot set off the debt against the price for C fills two different characters one as the vendor to B in which he sues B and the other as representative to A

(c) A sues B on a bill of exchange B alleges that A has wrongfully neglected to insure B's goods and is liable to him in compensation which he claims to set off The amount not being ascertained cannot be set off

(d) A sues B on a bill of exchange for Rs. 500 B holds a judgment against A for Rs 1 000 The two claims being both definite pecuniary demands may be set off

(e) A sues B for compensation on account of trespass. B holds a promissory note for Rs 1 000 from A and claims to set off that amount against any sum that A may recover in the suit. B may do so for as soon as A recovers both sums are definite pecuniary demands

(4) *Ross & Co v Serres* (1916) 43 Cal 1001 1009 1010 34 I C 25 *Varadaraj v A* 29 (1938) 10 Lab. I.J 339 (S.A.L. 69

- (f) *A* and *B* sue *C* for Rs 1 000. *C* cannot set off a debt due to him by *A* alone.  
 (g) *A* sues *B* and *C* for Rs 1 000. *B* cannot set off a debt due to him alone by *C*.  
 (h) *A* owes the partnership firm of *B* and *C* Rs 1 000. *B* dies leaving *C* survivor. *A* sues *C* for a debt of Rs 1 000 due in his separate character. *C* may set off the debt of Rs 1 000.

Changes in the rule—Sub rule (3) is new. See r 9 below.

Conditions of applicability of the rule—A defendant may claim a set off under this rule if the following conditions are satisfied but not otherwise—

- I The suit must be one for the recovery of money.
- II As regards the amount claimed to be set off—
  - (a) it must be an ascertained sum of money [see ills (c) (d) and (e) above]
  - (b) such sum must be legally recoverable
  - (c) it must be recoverable by the defendant or by all the defendants if more than one [see ill (g)]
  - (d) it must be recoverable by the defendant from the plaintiff or all the plaintiffs if more than one [see ill (f)]
  - (e) it must not exceed the pecuniary limits of the jurisdiction of the Court which the suit is brought and
  - (f) both parties must fill in the defendant's claim to set off the same character as they fill in the plaintiff's suit [see ills (a) (b) and (h)]

The suit must be one for the recovery of money—In *Nan Karay v Htoo* (m) their Lordships of the Privy Council observed that it was doubtful whether a suit for an account was a suit for money. In a subsequent Allahabad case it was held that a suit for a dissolution of partnership and for partnership accounts with a prayer that such balance as may be found due to the plaintiff upon taking the partnership accounts may be paid to him was a suit for money and that a plea of set off might therefore be raised by the defendant in such suit (n).

The amount claimed to be set off must be an ascertained sum of money and not unliquidated damages—The expression 'ascertained sum' does not mean a sum admitted by the plaintiff. It is used in contradistinction to unliquidated damages (o). In ills (d) and (e) the claim is for an ascertained sum, not so in ill (c) where the amount claimed to be set off is for unliquidated damages. In the case mentioned in ill (c) the defendant may bring a cross suit against the plaintiff. In ill (f) the amount claimed to be set off by *B* is the amount of a decree and this may be set off against *A*'s claim. It is not necessary that *B* should have taken any steps to enforce the decree (p).

*A* a clerk sues *B* his employer for arrears of wages due to him. *B* alleges that *A* left his employment without notice and that *A* is therefore liable to pay damages which he claims to set off. The amount not being ascertained cannot be set off (q). See ill (3) on the next page.

Equitable set off—There are cases in which the defendant may be allowed to set off even in respect of an unascertained sum which sounds in damages. These are cases where the cross demands arise out of the same transaction or are so connected with their nature and circumstances that they can be looked upon as part of one transaction.

(m) (1861) 13 Cal 14 13 I A 48

(n) *P. M. Khan v. Chand Mal* (1885) 10 All 58

(o) *Edwards v. P. M.* (1909) 14 C. W. N. 10  
 51 C 6. *Ha. P. M. v. P. M. S. P.*  
 (1913) 10 All L J 244 2 I C 340  
 (1) A A 28

(p) *Bha. v. P. M. Khan* (1903) 10 Cal 106  
 See also *G. v. P. M. Khan v. K. J. Khan* (1914) 46 All 74 (1914) A A 341 83 I A 405 a case under the Acta Tenancy Act of 1901.  
 (q) *Victoria Mills C. Ltd. v. P. M. Khan* (1914) 34 All 36 35 I C 93

In such cases Courts of Equity in England have held that it would be inequitable to drive the defendant to a separate cross suit and that he may be allowed to plead a set off though the amount may be *unascertained*. Such a set off is called an *equitable* set off as it is allowed by Courts of *Equity* as distinguished from a *legal* set off which is allowed by Courts of *Common Law* in respect only of an *ascertained* sum. It will thus be seen that the present rule is restricted to a *legal* set off for it requires that the amount to be set off shall be an *ascertained* sum. The question therefore arises whether an *equitable* set off can be pleaded in Indian Courts in other words if the defendant's claim is for an *unascertained* sum but has arisen from the *same transaction* as the plaintiff's claim the defendant can set off such demand against the plaintiff's claim? It has been held that he can do so not under the provisions of the present rule which is limited to a *legal* set off but in the exercise of the general right of a defendant to plead a set off whether it is legal or equitable. The provisions of the Code regulate *procedure* only and they have not the effect of taking away any *right* of set off which a defendant may have independently of its provisions. O 20 r 10 (3) recognizes an equitable set off. The leading case on the subject is *Clark v Ruthnairloo* (r). But this right of set off does not exist when the cross demand relates to a *different transaction* (s).

#### Illustrations

1 A sues B to recover Rs 6000 due under a contract. B admits A's claim but claims to set off several sums of money alleged to be damages sustained by him by reason of A's breach of some of the terms of the *same* contract. B is entitled to claim the set off for the claim arises from the *same transaction*. *Kistnaramy v Municipal Commissioner for Madras* (1868) 4 Mad H C 120. *Prags Lal v Maxwell* (1885) 7 All 284.

2 A agrees to sell and B agrees to purchase 200 bales of wool. B takes delivery of 170 bales and is ready and willing to take delivery of the remaining 30 bales but A fails to deliver them. A sues B for the price of the 170 bales. B claims to set off the damages sustained by him by reason of A's failure to deliver the remaining bales. B is entitled to claim the set off as the claim arises out of the *same transaction*. *Kishor chand v Madhury* (1880) 4 Bom 407. *Nia v Durga* (1893) 15 All 9. *Nand Ram v Ram Prasad* (1905) 27 All 145.

3 A sues B his master for Rs 800 being arrears of salary. B claims to set off Rs 600 being the loss sustained by him by reason of neglect and misconduct on the part of A as his servant. B is entitled to claim the set off as his claim arises out of the *same relation* from which A's claim arose namely that of master and servant. *Chisholm v Gopal Clander* (1889) 16 Cal 711. But see *Victoria Mills Co Ltd v Brij Mohan Lal* (1917) 39 All 362 38 I C 203.

4 A (mortgagee) sues B (mortgagor) to recover the principal and interest due on a usufructuary mortgage. B claims to set off the loss alleged to have been occasioned by A's failure as mortgagee in possession to make repairs to the mortgaged property. B is entitled to claim the set off. *Shiva v Jaru* (1892) 15 Mad 290.

5 A washerman sues his employer for his wages. The employer may set off the value of articles short returned to him against the wages. *Maiden v Bhundu* (1910) 1unj Rec no 77 p 226 7 I C 1006.

6 A sues a limited company to recover the amount of dividends payable to him as a shareholder. The company is not entitled to set off damages claimed by the company against A for breach of a contract to sell and deliver cotton to the company. *Iskaidar v The Hyderabad Spinning and Weaving Co Ltd* (1923) 47 Bom 18 (23) A B 24 17 I C 326.

(r) (1865) 4 Mad H C 296. *Kishor As d v Madhury* (1880) 4 Bom 40. *Bhagbat v Lax d b* (1885) 11 Cal 55. For other ca. see the illustrations.

(s) *Isa deo v Pottharam* (1894) 21 Cal 419. *Dada n v Jic gail Sp* 9 C (1 J) 1. *Lon 1 6 Dhund raj v Gane A* (1924) 18 Bom 1.

The amount claimed to be set off must be legally recoverable — The amount claimed by way of set off under this rule must be legally recoverable. It follows from this that if the defendant's claim is barred by the law of limitation at the date of the suit it cannot be pleaded by way of set off under this rule (t). But this rule relates only to a legal set off. The question arises whether a claim by way of equitable set off can be allowed if it is barred by limitation at the date of the suit. It has been laid down that in cases where the plaintiff's claim and the defendant's claim relate both to the same estate or there is a fiduciary relationship between the parties the defendant's claim to set off though barred by limitation at the date of the suit may be entertained as an equitable set off. It has thus been held that in a suit by an heir against his co-heirs for his one sixth share of the estate of the deceased the latter are entitled to set off one sixth of the Government revenue paid by them in respect of the estate though a separate suit by them to recover from the plaintiff the proportionate part of the revenue payable by him would be barred by limitation (u). Similarly in mortgage suits sums are allowed to be set off in taking accounts of the mortgage even though barred by limitation (v). Upon the same principle it has been held that a trustee in possession of the trust estate is entitled to set up his right to be indemnified out of the trust estate when called upon for an account although his right to sue for the amount claimed by him by way of indemnity is barred by limitation (w). In a recent case (x) the High Court of Madras held that in a suit by a lessor for rent it is not open to the lessee to claim by way of equitable set off an unliquidated claim for damages which was barred at the date of the suit. Subhagiri Ayyar J said: An exception to this rule [namely that a time barred claim cannot be pleaded by way of set off] has been recognized in some cases. Where there is a fiduciary relationship between the parties as in the case of trustee and *cestui que trust* and there is accountability even barred claims may be taken into account in passing the final accounts. This exception has been extended in some of the decided cases in India to mortgages presumably on the ground that there is accountability between the parties. See *Parasurama Pattar v Venkata hallam Pattar* (y), *Chidambara Mudalia v Krishna suami Pillai* (z) and *Ramdhari Singh v Permanund Singh* (a). It is not necessary to say now whether these cases have been rightly decided. I see no reason for extending the exception to suits between a lessor and a lessee.

In a Madras case (b) an agent sued his principal to recover money that might be found due to him on the balance of agency accounts. The defendant pleaded in his written statement that money would be found due to him on taking accounts and he asked for a decree for such sum as might be found due to him. The defendant's claim was not barred at the date of the suit but it was barred at the date of the written statement. It was held that the defendant's claim should be allowed as an equitable set off to the extent of the plaintiff's claim but that the defendant was not entitled to a decree for the balance found due to him as his claim was barred at the date of the written statement. To pass a decree for the balance would be it was said to enable the defendant to evade the law of limitation. The same view has been taken by the High Court of Bombay (c). In an Allahabad case (d) Oldfield J expressed the opinion that the set off is not barred at the date of the suit should be allowed in full and not merely to the extent of the

- (t) *Hier v Clont* (1850) 15 Q B 1046  
see also *J. Beck v Laid v Laid* (1813) 3 All 39 18 1 C 61 (set off barred according to the law of the country to which the plaintiff is subject)  
(y) *Parasurama Pattar v Venkata hallam Pattar* (1913) 19 C W N 1163 11 C 16  
(z) *Chidambara Mudalia v Krishna suami Pillai* (1913) 19 C W N 1163 11 C 16  
(a) *Ramdhari Singh v Permanund Singh* (1913) 19 C W N 1163 11 C 16  
(b) *Chidambara v Krishna suami* (1913) 19 C W N 1163 11 C 16

- (x) *Subhagiri Ayyar v Krishna suami* (1913) 19 C W N 1163 11 C 16  
(y) *Parasurama Pattar v Venkata hallam Pattar* (1913) 19 C W N 1163 11 C 16  
(z) *Chidambara Mudalia v Krishna suami Pillai* (1913) 19 C W N 1163 11 C 16  
(a) *Ramdhari Singh v Permanund Singh* (1913) 19 C W N 1163 11 C 16  
(b) *Chidambara v Krishna suami* (1913) 19 C W N 1163 11 C 16  
(c) *Chidambara v Krishna suami* (1913) 19 C W N 1163 11 C 16  
(d) *Oldfield v Krishna suami* (1913) 19 C W N 1163 11 C 16

plaintiff's claim even it was barred at the date of the written statement See notes to O 20 r 19 Decree in case of set off

Costs awarded to a tenant in a suit brought against him by the benamidar of the landlord cannot be set off by the tenant in a subsequent suit for rent brought against him by the landlord The costs having been awarded against the benamidar they are not legally recoverable from the landlord (e)

A separate debt cannot be set off against a joint and several debt—Thus in ill. (g) B cannot set off the debt due to him alone by A for it is a separate debt while the suit is to recover a joint and several debt It has similarly been held that in a suit by a company against its directors no individual director is entitled to set off the amount due to him alone from the company (f)

The amount claimed to be set off must not exceed the pecuniary limits of the jurisdiction of the Court in which the suit is brought—The valuation of a set off for the purpose of jurisdiction must be taken as relating to the whole amount pleaded as a set off and without reference to any portion of the plaintiff's claim admitted by the defendant A sues B in a Presidency Small Cause Court for Rs 1 000 B claims to set off a sum of Rs 2 700 and claims judgment for Rs 1 00 after giving A credit for Rs 1 000 admitted by B to be due to A The Small Cause Court has no jurisdiction to try the claim as to set off the value of the amount claimed as set off being above Rs 2 000 (g)

A plea of payment is distinct from a plea of set off A sues B to recover Rs 1 500 in a Court of which the pecuniary jurisdiction is limited to Rs 2 000 B alleges that he has paid Rs 1 000 to A on account and admits his liability for the balance of Rs 500 but he claims a set off of Rs 1 700 being the amount due on a promissory note passed to him by A and asks for a decree for Rs 1 200 The amount claimed to be set off is not Rs 1 000 plus Rs 1 700 = Rs 2 700 but Rs 1 700 only and it is therefore within the jurisdiction of the Court (h)

Not only the amount but also the nature of the set off must be within the cognizance of the Court in which the suit is brought Hence a Court cannot entertain a claim to a set off unless such claim if made the subject of a suit would fall within its jurisdiction (i)

Same character—Ills (a) and (b) are cases in which the parties do not fill the same character (j)

A suit is brought by a Hindu son as the heir and representative of his father to recover from B a debt due by B to the father B claims to set off a debt due to him by A's father B may do so for both the parties fill the same character as they fill in the plaintiff's suit (k) Similarly in a suit by A against B for an account for goods supplied by A to B B may claim a set off of the amount due to him from A in respect of wages as A's gumasta (l)

Court fee—A written statement containing a claim of set off must be regarded as a plaint in regard to such set off and must be stamped accordingly (m)

(e) *Til E Chandra v Jasoda K mar* (1906) 11 C W N 215

(f) *New Flemings Co v Kessorey* (1883) 19 Bom 373 403-404 [where a set off was claimed]

(g) *L. Jindra v Budget Budge Jute Mill Co* (1893) 90 Cal 57 *Abraham & Co v Ibrahim* (1914) 41 Rang 46 84 I C 971 (25) A R 6

(h) *Hoe Hoe v Seed* (1914) 41 Rang 349 84 I C 96 (25) A R 2

(i) *Bent Madha v G ra* (1903) 15 All 404

(j) See also *Abul Hasan v Z Ara* (1883) 5 All 109 *Lakshman v Math* (1911) 13 Bom 186 *Madhavrao v Rama* (1913) 33 Bom 131 1 C 30

(k) *Chennappa v Pignathari* (1883) 15 Mad 2

(l) *P. Phar Ira v Polywud* (1917) 41 P. M. 163 33 I C 17

(m) (1883) 15 Mad 99 *supra*

**Set off in winding up proceedings**—Though a director has no right to set off a debt due to him from the company against a claim made against him by the liquidator under s 214 of the Indian Companies Act 189. [Ind Cos Act 1913 s 230] which provides a summary remedy (n) he is entitled to set off the amount due to him if a regular suit is brought against him by the company in respect of that claim (o). In a suit by a liquidator against a debtor of the company the debtor is entitled to set off the amount of a fixed deposit made by him with the company provided the deposit had matured at the date of the suit though it had not matured at the date of the order for winding up the company (p) but he cannot set off a deposit in the name of a firm of which he is a partner (q).

**Set off in insolvency**—See Presidency Towns Insolvency Act 1909 s 47 (r) and Provincial Insolvency Act 1907 s 30 now Act 5 of 1920 s 43.

**Solicitor's lien for costs**—Before the year 1832 the Courts in England had a discretionary power as regards set off and a discretion as to the terms upon which they would allow it (s). This discretion was taken away under the General Rules of 1832 and the General Rules of 1863. Rule 93 of the General Rules of 1832 was in these words: No set off of damages or costs between parties shall be allowed to the prejudice of the attorney's lien for costs in the particular suit against which the set off is sought provided nevertheless that interlocutory costs in the same suit awarded to the adverse party may be deducted. This rule was reproduced in identical terms in 1863. That state of things continued until the Judicature Act 1873 came into force. O 65 r 14 made under that Act was directly contrary to the previous rule. The previous rule allowed no set off. O 65 r 14 says that a set off may be allowed. The result is that in England the Courts under O 65 r 14 exercise now in matters of set off the discretion which was taken away by the General Rules of 1832 (t).

Sec 111 of the Code of 1877 provided that the Court may pronounce a final judgment in the same suit both on the original and on the cross claim but it shall not affect the lien upon the amount decreed of any pleader in respect of the costs payable to him under the decree. This provision was reproduced in sec 111 of the Code of 1882 and it is reproduced in the present rule also. It is clear from the language of this rule that the Courts of this country have no discretion in the matter of a solicitor's lien in cases falling within this rule.

A solicitor has at common law a lien for his costs over property recovered or preserved or the proceeds of any judgments obtained for the client by his exertions (u). The lien attaches to property of every description such as for instance money payable to the client under a judgment including costs ordered to be paid to the client or the proceeds of an execution in the hands of a Sheriff money paid into Court whether as security for costs or by way of defence or otherwise and money received by way of compromise (v). The lien does not extend to general costs for all business done by a solicitor for his client but only to costs of the suit in which the property has been acquired or preserved by his exertions (w). Where there are assets of a partnership in the hands

- (n) *Ex parte Felly* (188) 1 Ch D 49 50;  
507 *Fiducio's case* (188) 1 Ch D 509  
535 *Cruickshank & Pelly Association in v*  
(1884) 7 Ch D 3.  
(o) *Ahmedabad Advance Svy and Wg Co v*  
*Lakshmibankar* (1906) 30 Bom 13  
194.  
(p) *Mehr Chand v American Bank* (1915) Punj  
Rec no 63 p 75 81 C 93.  
(q) *Allan & Co v Wainwright* (19) 8 Lah  
10 1011 C 6 ( ) A L 103.  
(r) See *Muller v Watson & Co* (1909)  
19 Cal 146.  
(s) *Judicature v Leth* (190) (1916) 2 Ch 168  
14.

- (t) *Red v Copper* (1915) K B 14 pp 142  
150.  
(u) *Ex parte Morrison* (1860) L R 4 Q B 153  
156 *Brown v Lolla* (1830) 4 My & C 1  
4 *Red v Sudgen* (1886) 34 Ch D  
155.  
(v) *Tyabji Dayalji & Co v Jetha Deyji & Co*  
(1917) 51 Bom 5 105 F C 33 ( )  
A B 54 *Hibury vol 6 s 1343 p*  
51.  
(w) *Sadanand v Parashram* (192) 15 Bom 26  
108 I C 6 ( ) A B 108 *Narayana*  
*swami v Chelapalai* (1910) 33 Mad 33  
4 I C 38.





By a decree passed in a suit for redemption of a mortgage brought by *A* against *B* *A* is directed to pay the mortgage debt to *B* but *B* is directed to pay to *A* the costs of the suit. The High Court of Calcutta held that the suit being one for redemption *B*'s attorney is not entitled to a lien for his costs on the whole of the mortgage money but to the mortgage money less the costs payable by *B* to *A* which costs *A* is entitled to set off against the mortgage money (*g*). See O 20 r 19 and O 21 r 19.

It has been held by the High Court of Calcutta that where *A* obtains a decree against *B* for Rs. 1451 and *L* subsequently obtains a decree against *A* for Rs. 1000 *A* is entitled to have satisfaction of *B*'s decree entered notwithstanding the lien of *B*'s attorney for his costs. The chance was placed in the judgment on the fact that *B*'s attorney had not stated that there was no chance of recovering his costs from his client [*B*] and that the decree which *B* had against *A* was the only property out of which his claim could be satisfied (*h*). There is no reference in the judgment to the provisions of O 8 r 6 (2).

**Appeal**—Unless the whole suit is disposed of, an appeal does not lie from an order disposing of a defendant's claim to set off made under this rule even though the question as to that claim may have been tried as a preliminary issue. Such an order is not a preliminary decree. See O 20 r 19 which shows that there should be only one decree drawn up in a suit in which a set off is claimed. (1)

**Res judicata** — A defendant is under no obligation to claim a set off. His omission therefore to do so does not preclude him from bringing a separate suit in respect thereof (3)

**Counterclaim**—Though the Code does not provide for counterclaim there is nothing to prevent a Court from treating the counterclaim as a plaint in a cross suit and hearing the two suits together provided that the requisite court fee on the counterclaim has been paid (1)

7 [New R S C, O 20 r 7] Where the defendant relies upon several distinct grounds of defence or set off founded upon separate and distinct facts, they shall be stated as far as may be, separately and distinctly

See note 4 to rule 1 above. Compare O. 2. r. 9.

8 [Aen] Any ground of defence which has arisen after the institution of the suit or the presentation of a written statement claiming a set off may be raised by the defendant or plaintiff, as the case may be, in his written statement

See r 9 below

9 [S 112] No pleading subsequent to the written statement of a defendant other than by way of defence to a set off shall be presented except by the leave of the Court and upon such

(g) *Iry ih v J per ih* (18 0) 4 Cal 4  
(h) *IA pendra N ih v Sa nom d Co* (1916) 45  
Cal 93 341 C 30  
(i) *Sbro Jarasah Embay-Malaya United Mill*  
*Ltd* (191) Pun lee no 6 p 0 33  
1 C 508

(1) *American Nat m l Hanking C Ld v Fals*  
 II A (1919) 121 1 100 no 4 p 1 1 5  
 1 1 1 1 5

(2) *Says Iou v Wagon Kyng A n (1914) "*  
 Fang 6 1 1 C 1 (1914) 1 1 1 1 5

terms as the Court thinks fit, but the Court may at any time require a written statement or additional written statement from any of the parties and fix a time for presenting the same

**Additional written statement**—The additional written statement should not set up a totally new case or state facts at direct variance with the original written statement so as completely to change the issue in the case (l) See O 6 r 7 and notes

**10 [S 113]** Where any party from whom a written statement is so required fails to present the same within the time fixed by the Court, the Court may pronounce judgment against him or make such order in relation to the suit as it thinks fit

Procedure when party fails to present written statement called for by Court

**Decree against defendant where no written statement filed**—This rule enables the Court to pronounce judgment against the defendant on failure to file a written statement such as is required by r 9 Failure to file a written statement in other cases does not come within this rule (m) and the Court cannot in those cases pass a decree against the defendant unless the plaintiff proves his case (n) In a Bombay case the defendant was served with a summons which required him to file his written statement within four weeks from the date of service The date fixed for the hearing was 21st November 1907 The defendant failed to file his written statement within four weeks. It was held that the plaintiff was not entitled to apply for and obtain an ex parte decree before the returnable date of the summons namely 27th November 1907 (o)

**Appeal**—An appeal lies from an order under this rule pronouncing judgment against a party (O 43 r 1 cl. (b))

## ORDER IX

### *Appearance of Parties and Consequence of Non appearance*

**1 [S 96]** On the day fixed in the summons for the defendant to appear and answer, the parties shall be in attendance at the Court house in person or by their respective pleaders, and the suit shall then be heard unless the hearing is adjourned to a future day fixed by the Court

Parties to appear on day fixed in summons for defendant to appear and answer

**2 [S 97]** Where on the day so fixed it is found that the summons has not been served upon the defendant in consequence of the failure of the plaintiff to pay the Court-fee or postal charges (if any) chargeable for such service, the Court may make an order that the suit be dismissed

Dismissal of suit where summons not served in consequence of plaintiff's failure to pay costs

(l) *Douglas v Collector of Benares* (1851) 5 M 1 A 1 290

(m) *Moopan v Karupanan* (1923) 6 Rang. 466 11 I C. 438 (-3) A R 761

(n) *Doss & Co v Serren* (1916) 43 Cal 1001

1009 1010 34 I C 235 Var d 4 ngd v A 2(19 8)10 Lab L J 339 (-3) A L 69

(o) *Dhrajlal v H masur* (1902) 3 B m 534 See also *J ya tu i v Naguath* (1913) 15 Bom L R. 1 6 19 I C. 9

Provided that no such order shall be made although the summons has not been served upon the defendant, if on the day fixed for him to appear and answer he attends in person or by agent when he is allowed to appear by agent

Defendant—The expression defendant in this rule does not include the guardian ad litem of a minor defendant (p)

**Appeal** -The order or dismissal under this rule is a form of dismissal for default. It is not a decree [s. 2 (2)] and no appeal lies from it. The plaintiff's remedy is under r. 4 of this Order (a).

**Revision**—The Court has no power under this rule to dismiss the suit in a case where the plaintiff has paid the requisite Court fee for the service of the summons but the office does not issue the summons in time. If the Court dismisses the suit in such a case the High Court has power to set aside the order in revision (r).

3 [S 98] Where neither party appears when the suit is called on for hearing, the Court may make an order that the suit be dismissed

Where neither party appears — I sues B and C. A and C do not appear when the suit is called on for hearing but B appears. The Court makes an order dismissing the suit. As between A and B the order is one under r 8 so as to attract the applicability of r 9. But as between A and C the order is one under the present rule so that r 4 applies and not r 9 (e).

If the plaintiff appears on the date fixed for the hearing but the defendant does not appear and the suit is dismissed owing to failure on the part of the plaintiff to adduce evidence in support of his claim the dismissal is on the merits and not under this rule (2)

This rule does not apply after a preliminary decree has been passed and a suit cannot be dismissed for default of appearance on an application for a final mortgage decree (u)

May make an order that the suit be dismissed.—These words have been substituted for the words the suit shall be dismissed [Code of 1882 s 98] to make it clear that the dismissal under this rule is not a decree but an order. Secs 2 (2)

4 [S 99] Where a suit is dismissed under rule 2 or rule 3, the plaintiff may (subject to the law of limitation) bring a fresh suit, or he may apply for an order to set the dismissal aside, and if he satisfies the Court that there was sufficient cause for his not paying the Court-fee and postal charges (if any) required within the time fixed before the issue of the summons, or for his non appearance, as the case may be the Court shall make an order setting aside the dismissal and shall appoint a day for proceeding with the suit

(p) Gobind Ram v. V. Arum d (191) Punjab  
Rec. no. 35 p. 115, 116, C. 31

(q) *La Amí Nardón v. Durruti Ltd* (1916) 38 All 873 31 L C 37 *Locky Churn v. Budur* 111 Ind 111 (1916) 9 Cal 67

(1) *Kalla Lam v J J* (19<sup>th</sup>) 4 Lab L.J. 16  
1 C 945 (19<sup>th</sup>) 4 L. 63

(s) *Dum v Valysa* (17 0) 44 Dom "d 61 C  
455

(1) H su S upā v Jhuta Sipa (1918) 40 All  
520 46 I C 320

(u) *Charadrius v. Am.* (19<sup>th</sup>) 49 All 2<sup>o</sup> 101 I C  
8 G. ( ) A 4 479 Cf *Lachm. Vasa* v  
*Estimulatus* (19 4) 51 I 4 3-1 4 Pat. 61  
81 I C 74 (194) A Pl. 198.

Sufficient excuse for plaintiff's non appearance—A *bona fide* mistake which is not unreasonable is a sufficient excuse within the meaning of this rule (c)

Whether this rule applies to proceedings in execution—See notes to r 9 below under the same head

5 [S 99A] (1) Where, after a summons has been issued to the defendant, or to one of several defendants, and returned unserved, the plaintiff fails, for a period of three months from the date of the return made to the Court by the officer ordinarily certifying to the Court returns made by the serving officers, to apply for the issue of a fresh summons the Court shall make an order that the suit be dismissed as against such defendant unless the plaintiff has within the said period satisfied the Court that—

Dismissal of suit where plaintiff after summons returned unserved fails for three months to apply for fresh summons

- (a) he has failed after using his best endeavours to discover the residence of the defendant who has not been served or
- (b) such defendant is avoiding service of process, or
- (c) there is any other sufficient cause for extending the time

in which case the Court may extend the time for making such application for such period as it thinks fit

(2) In such case the plaintiff may (subject to the law of limitation) bring a fresh suit

Amendment of sub rule (1)—Sub rule (1) was substituted for the original sub rule by Act 24 of 1920 the material changes being the substitution of three months for one year shall make an order for may make an order and the addition of cl (c)

Period of three months from date of return—The period of three months is to be calculated from the date of the return made to the Court by the officer ordinarily certifying to the Court returns made by the serving officer. The words italicized were first added by the Code of 1908. In the absence of these words in the corresponding section of the Code of 1892 the question arose whether the period was to be calculated from the date of the return made by the serving officer or from the date of return made by the officer whose duty it is to certify to the Court returns made by the serving officer. It was held that the period was to be calculated from the date of return made by the latter officer and not that made by the serving officer (w). The words italicized above were added to give effect to that decision. The procedure is thus after the writ of summons is issued it is delivered to an officer of the Court for service on the defendant. The officer then delivers the summons to the serving officer whose duty it is to serve summonses. After effecting service the serving officer has to endorse on the original summons a return stating

(1) If it is *Victoria Finance and Bull. n. 1* (w) *Perrot m. v. Vidal* (1899) 13 Bom 500  
*Assam v. M. (186) 3 B. H. C. O. 60*

the manner in which the summons was served. If for any reason the summons cannot be served upon the defendant the serving officer has to make a return to that effect. This return is countersigned by the officer to whom the summons was delivered by the Court and the summons is then returned by him to the Court. It is from the date of the countersignature that the period of three months is to be calculated and not from the date of the return made by the serving officer.

Make an order that the suit be dismissed.—These words were substituted in the Code of 1908 for the words may dismiss the suit which occurred in s 99 A of the Code of 1852 in order to make it clear that a dismissal under this rule is not a decree but an order. See s 2 (2).

Appeals.—This rule does not apply to appeals (r).

## 6 [S 100]

Pro Jure when only  
plaintiff appears

(1) Where the plaintiff appears and defendant does not appear when the suit is called on for hearing, then—

When summons duly  
served

(a) If it is proved that the summons was duly served the Court may proceed ex parte,

When summons not duly  
served

(b) if it is not proved that the summons was duly served the Court shall direct a second summons to be issued and served on the defendant,

When summons served  
but not in due time

(c) if it is proved that the summons was served on the defendant, but not in sufficient time to enable him to appear and answer on the day fixed in the summons, the Court shall

postpone the hearing of the suit to a future day to be fixed by the Court, and shall direct notice of such day to be given to the defendant.

(2) Where it is owing to the plaintiff's default that the summons was not duly served or was not served in sufficient time, the Court shall order the plaintiff to pay the costs occasioned by the postponement.

Ex parte decree.—If the defendant does not appear and it is proved that the summons was duly served upon him the Court may proceed ex parte. If the plaintiff makes out a prima facie case the Court may pass a decree for the plaintiff. If the plaintiff fails to make out a prima facie case the Court may dismiss the plaintiff's suit. Every Judge in dealing with an ex parte case should take good care to see that the plaintiff's case is at least prima facie proved. The mere absence of the defendant does not of itself justify the presumption that the plaintiff's case is true (y). The Court has no jurisdiction to pass an ex parte decree without any evidence being given by or on behalf of the plaintiff (z) and the provisions of O 8 r 10 only apply when the

(x) *Jadhanna v J. para* (19 6) 50 Bom 615 100  
1 C 14 (10) A B 68  
(y) *Amur v Dh v J. para* (18 1) 15 W R  
503 *div mura v Nath v V. endra* (19 1)  
39 Cal L J 9, 21 C 66 (1) A C

506 *V. maha v Josada Lal* (19-3) 23  
Cal W N 300 1 C 311 (1) A C  
64  
(z) *Jug & C v Seta en* (1916) 43 Cal 100 1 34  
1 C 3

Sufficient excuse for plaintiff's non appearance — A *bona fide* mistake which is not unreasonable is a sufficient excuse within the meaning of this rule (1)

Whether this rule applies to proceedings in execution — See notes to r 9 below under the same head

**5 [S 99A] (1)** Where, after a summons has been issued to the defendant, or to one of several defendants, and returned unserved, the plaintiff fails, for a period of three months from the date of the return made to the Court by the officer ordinarily

Dismissal of suit where plaintiff after summons returned unserved fails for three months to apply for fresh summons

certifying to the Court returns made by the serving officers, to apply for the issue of a fresh summons the Court shall make an order that the suit be dismissed as against such defendant unless the plaintiff has within the said period satisfied the Court that—

- (a) he has failed after using his best endeavours to discover the residence of the defendant who has not been served, or
- (b) such defendant is avoiding service of process or
- (c) there is any other sufficient cause for extending the time,

in which case the Court may extend the time for making such application for such period as it thinks fit

(2) In such case the plaintiff may (subject to the law of limitation) bring a fresh suit

Amendment of sub rule (1) — Sub rule (1) was substituted for the original sub rule by Act 24 of 1920 the material changes being the substitution of three months for one year shall make an order for may make an order and the addition of cl. (c)

Period of three months from date of return — The period of three months is to be calculated from the date of the return made to the Court by the officer ordinarily certifying to the Court returns made by the serving officers. The words italicized were first added by the Code of 1908. In the absence of the words in the corresponding section of the Code of 1882 the question arose whether the period was to be calculated from the date of the return made by the serving officer or from the date of return made by the officer whose duty it is to certify to the Court returns made by the serving officer. It was held that the period was to be calculated from the date of return made by the latter officer and not that made by the serving officer (1c). The words italicized above were added to give effect to that decision. The procedure is thus after the writ of summons is issued it is delivered to an officer of the Court for service on the defendant. The officer then delivers the summons to the serving officer who is duty bound to serve summonses. After effecting service the serving officer has to enter on the original summons a return stating

(1) *Hanilton v Victoria Furnace and Bldg. Assocn* (1860) 1 B & C 60

(1c) *Peterson v Ald* (1849) 13 Rom 500

the manner in which the summons was served. If for any reason the summons cannot be served upon the defendant the serving officer has to make a return to that effect. This return is countersigned by the officer to whom the summons was delivered by the Court and the summons is then returned by him to the Court. It is from the date of the countersignature that the period of three months is to be calculated and not from the date of the return made by the serving officer.

**Make an order that the suit be dismissed**—These words were substituted in the Code of 1908 for the words *may dismiss the suit* which occurred in s 99 A of the Code of 1892 in order to make it clear that a dismissal under this rule is not a decree but an order. See s 2 (2).

**Appeals**—This rule does not apply to appeals (x).

**6 [S 100]** (1) Where the plaintiff appears and defendant does not appear when the suit is called on for hearing, then—

Procedure when only plaintiff appears

When summons duly served

(a) If it is proved that the summons was duly served, the Court may proceed *ex parte*

When summons not duly served

(b) if it is not proved that the summons was duly served the Court shall direct a second summons to be issued and served on the defendant,

When summons served but not in due time

(c) if it is proved that the summons was served on the defendant, but not in sufficient time to enable him to appear and answer on the day fixed in the summons, the Court shall postpone the hearing of the suit to a future day to be fixed by the Court, and shall direct notice of such day to be given to the defendant.

(2) Where it is owing to the plaintiff's default that the summons was not duly served or was not served in sufficient time the Court shall order the plaintiff to pay the costs occasioned by the postponement.

**Ex parte decree**—If the defendant does not appear and it is proved that the summons was duly served upon him the Court may proceed *ex parte*. If the plaintiff makes out a *prima facie* case the Court may pass a decree for the plaintiff. If the plaintiff fails to make out a *prima facie* case the Court may dismiss the plaintiff's suit. Every Judge in dealing with an *ex parte* case should take good care to see that the plaintiff's case is at least *prima facie* proved. The mere absence of the defendant does not of itself justify the presumption that the plaintiff's case is true (y). The Court has no jurisdiction to pass an *ex parte* decree without any evidence being given by or on behalf of the plaintiff (z) and the provisions of O 8 r 10 only apply when the

(x) *Bhanna v Parara* (1906) 50 B M 515 100  
 1 C 14 (no) 4 B 68  
 (y) *Imriti v Dhillon* (1915) 15 W L 513  
 513 *Alvendra v Dhillon* (1915) 15 W L 513  
 39 Cal L J 2, 81 L C 267 (4) A C  
 (z) *M. Mehta v Jooda Lal* (1923) 23 Cal W 300 71 C 511 (4) A C 647  
 (1) *Fussell v Co. v. Srinani* (1916) 43 Cal 1001 34



Court has under O 9 r 9 required the defendant to file a written statement (a) The Court has no power to pass an ex parte decree before the returnable date mentioned in the summons (b)

Ex parte decree for amount in excess of sum actually due—If the plaintiff obtains an ex parte decree for a sum in excess of that which is due to him the defendant is entitled ex d bito justitiae to have such decree set aside (c) except where the error was due to an accidental slip within the meaning of s 152 in which case the Court may on the plaintiff's application allow the decree to be amended by reducing it to the proper amount (d)

Subsequent appearance of defendant pending suit—When a defendant files a written statement but does not appear on the day fixed for the hearing and it is in consequence declared ex parte he should not be precluded from appearing at a later stage of the suit while it is still pending he should be allowed to come in at the stage at which the suit is (e)

Appears—As to the meaning of the word appears see note to r 9 below  
Appearance

Remedies open to a defendant in the case of an ex parte decree—See note to r 13 below Remedies in case of ex parte decree

7 [S 101] Where the Court has adjourned the hearing of the suit ex parte, and the defendant, at or before such hearing, appears and assigns good cause for his previous non appearance, he may, upon such terms as the Court directs as to costs or otherwise, be heard in answer to the suit as if he had appeared on the day fixed for his appearance

Procedure where defendant appears on day of adjourned hearing and assigns good cause for previous non appearance

This rule was applied in the undermentioned case (f)

8 [S 102] Where the defendant appears and the plaintiff does not appear when the suit is called on for hearing the Court shall make an order that the suit be dismissed unless the defendant admits the claim, or part thereof, in which case the Court shall pass a decree against the defendant upon such admission, and, where part only of the claim has been admitted, shall dismiss the suit so far as it relates to the remainder

Procedure where defendant only appears

Where defendant only appears—If neither party appears on the day fixed for the hearing of the suit the procedure laid down in r 3 is to be followed. If the plaintiff appears and the defendant does not appear the procedure laid down in r 6 is to be followed. If the defendant appears and the plaintiff does not appear the procedure laid down in the present rule is to be followed. All that a defendant is entitled to under this rule is to have the plaintiff's suit dismissed. He is not entitled to call any evidence

(c) *Mloopa Karupa a* (1928) 6 Rang 466  
11 I C 434 (2S) A K 61  
(d) *Dh Jal v Hm* (1908) 30 B m 31  
(e) *H Ja Just* (1891) 1 Q 1 66 M w  
Jent (1913) K B 31  
(f) *Armit v Je son* (1904) 3 K B 410

[where the excess was Rs]  
(e) *Jatt Rama v A I* (1925) 51 Jia 69  
(7) A M 119  
(f) *Venkat Subrah v Lak Am a arumham* (1931)  
69 Jia 1 L J 3 91 I C 515 (25) A M  
1 4

even though it be to disprove charges of fraud or the like that may have been made against him in the plaint (g)

If the plaintiff does not appear—See notes to r 9 below. Appear-  
ance. This rule does not apply to the case of non appearance by reason of death. Where a sole plaintiff dies before the hearing of a suit and the suit is dismissed for non appearance under this rule the fact of his death not being known to the Court there is inherent jurisdiction in the Court under s 151 to set aside the dismissal and thus rectify the mistake which has been inadvertently made. It is then for the legal representative of the plaintiff to apply to be brought on the record under O 22 r 3 (h). Similarly the rule does not apply if the plaintiff has been adjudged insolvent before the hearing for there is no person on the record who has any right or duty to appear and the Court should not dismiss the suit but should under O 22 r 8 fix a time within which the Official Assignee may decide to continue the suit (i). Where on the day fixed for hearing the plaintiff does not appear and the defendant appears but applies for time and the Court dismisses the suit for default the order falls under this rule and not under r 4 above (j).

More plaintiffs than one—This rule provides for the case where a single plaintiff or all the plaintiffs if there are more than one do not appear. Rule 10 provides for a case where there are more plaintiffs than one and one or more of them appear and others do not appear (k).

More defendants than one—If there are several defendants of whom one appears the suit will be dismissed against the defendant who appears under O 9 r 8 and the plaintiff will under O 9 r 9 be precluded from bringing a fresh suit against him. But as against the defendants who have not appeared the dismissal will be under O 9 r 3 and the plaintiff will under O 9 r 4 be at liberty to bring a fresh suit against them (l).

Remedies in case of dismissal under this rule—See notes to r 9 below.

Remedies in case of dismissal under rule 8

The Court shall make an order that the suit be dismissed.—These words have been substituted for the words the Court shall dismiss the suit [Code of 1852 s. 102]. An order of dismissal under this rule for default of plaintiff's appearance is not a decree and is not therefore appealable. See s 2 (2) (b) and notes. Order of dismissal for default on p 11 above.

9 [s 103] (1) Where a suit is wholly or partly dismissed under rule 8, the plaintiff shall be precluded from bringing a fresh suit in respect of the same cause of action.

Decree against plaintiff by default bars fresh suit.

But he may apply for an order to set the dismissal aside, and if he satisfies the Court that there was sufficient cause for his non appearance when the suit was called on for hearing, the Court shall make an order setting aside the dismissal upon such terms as to costs or otherwise as it thinks fit, and shall appoint a day for proceeding with the suit.

(g) *Kesri Chand v National Jade Mills Co* (1913) 40 Cal 119 173 C 8.  
(A) *Debi Bhabha v H Bhabha* (1913) 35 All 331 401 A 151 191 C 8.  
(i) *Kusum v Nand Lal* (1917) 53 Cal 844 141 C 781 (1917) A C 76.

(j) *hjt Lal v Maharajall ref* (1905) 12 P 333 1091 C 64 (20) A P 111.  
(k) *Kulendra v Lal Kishore* (1911) 42 Cal 76 1 C 21 (1) A C 16.  
(l) *Mahomed v Jirah* (1922) 49 All 97 61 C 2, (1922) A A 102.

(2) No order shall be made under this rule unless notice of the application has been served on the opposite party

**Remedies in case of dismissal under rule 8**—A plaintiff whose suit is dismissed under r 8 for default of appearance on the day fixed for the hearing cannot appeal from the order of dismissal as such an order is not a decree [s 2 cL (2) sub cl (b)] but he may—

(1) apply for a review of the order under O 47 r 1 (m) though the High Court of Bombay (n) has held that since the decision of the Privy Council in *Chayya Ram v Nals* (o) a plaintiff whose suit has been dismissed under r 8 has no remedy by way of review. Or he may

(2) apply under this rule for an order to set aside the order of dismissal

He is entitled to apply for a review without a previous application to set aside the dismissal under this rule (p). The period of limitation for an application for a review of the order is 10 days from the date of the order in the case of an order made by the Provincial Court of Small Causes, 30 days from the date of the order in the case of an order made by any of the chartered High Courts in the exercise of its original jurisdiction and 90 days from the date of the order in other cases (q). The period of limitation for an application under this section is 30 days from the date of the dismissal of the suit (r).

The first remedy is open to any plaintiff whose suit has been dismissed *whether the ground of dismissal may be whether it is dismissed for default of appearance at the hearing or on the merits after a hearing*. But the second remedy that is the remedy provided by this rule can only be availed of by a plaintiff who *does not appear* at the hearing and the suit is dismissed for default of appearance under r 8 above. The remedy given by this rule is not open to a plaintiff whose suit is dismissed *on any ground other than default of appearance*. Hence if a plaintiff's suit is dismissed on his failure to establish his case by reason of *non attendance of his witnesses* (s) or for *want of evidence* (t) the dismissal is not one under r 8 and he cannot therefore avail himself of the remedy provided by this rule.

There is a conflict of decisions whether if a plaintiff does not apply under this rule within the 10 days allowed by law he is entitled to apply for a review under O 47 r 1 after the expiration of that period. The Patna High Court has held (u) following an earlier decision of the Calcutta High Court (v) that he is not; on the other hand the Calcutta High Court has held in a latter case that he is (w). The ground of the Patna decision is that to allow a review in such a case would be an evasion of the rule of limitation. See note below limitation.

**Appearance**—A plaintiff or a defendant will be deemed to have appeared on the day fixed for the hearing of the suit if he appears—

(1) in person or

(2) by a pleader either himself duly instructed and able to answer all material questions relating to the suit or accompanied by some person able to answer such questions [O 47 r 1 sub r (a)]

(m) *J. V. S. S. N. (1899) 6 Cal 593*  
 (n) *J. I. S. V. Lakshmi v. Venkatesh (1900) 49 Bom 139* 90 I C 610 (5) A B 1  
 (o) (1901) 42 I.A. 144 d Lah 17 79 I C 945  
 (p) (1901) 42 I.A. 730  
 (q) (1901) 6 I C 1504  
 (r) Limitation Act 1908 Sch I arts 161 16 and 17  
 (s) *Il Datt v. A. T. (1904) 31 I art 163*  
 (t) *Il Datt v. A. T. (1904) 31 Cal 10*

(u) *M. A. M. d. v. H. B. T. A. (1973) 5 All H C 74*  
 (v) *Kart v. S. S. S. (1861) 1 Cal 563*  
 (w) *Il Datt v. A. T. (1904) 31 I C 1504*  
 (x) *K. S. v. S. S. S. (1891) 1 Cal W N 315*  
 (y) *L. S. v. S. S. S. (1911) 16 Cal W N 613 15 I C 551 11 I C 143*  
 (z) *Il Datt v. A. T. (1904) 31 Cal 10*

*First as regards Appearance of a party in person*—The mere presence of a party in Court at the hearing is sufficient to constitute appearance within the meaning of this Order. It does not matter for what purpose he appears or what action he takes on the appearance. A plaintiff appearing and applying for an adjournment on the ground that his witnesses are not present will be deemed to have appeared. If the application is refused and the suit is dismissed owing to his inability to establish his case in the absence of witnesses the dismissal is not one under r 8 for the plaintiff *did appear* and he cannot therefore avail himself of the provisions of this rule (x). Similarly a defendant appearing and applying for an adjournment on the ground that he had no time to prepare his case will be deemed to have appeared. If the application is refused and a decree is passed against him owing to his unpreparedness to defend the suit the decree is not *ex parte* under r 6 for he *did appear* and he cannot therefore avail himself of the provisions of r 13 below (y).

*Next as regards Appearance of a party by a pleader*—Different considerations arise when a party is represented by a pleader. Appearance by a pleader within the meaning of this Order does not like appearance by a party in person mean mere presence in Court. It means appearance by a pleader duly instructed and able to answer all material questions relating to the suit or by a pleader accompanied by some person able to answer all such questions. [O 5 r 1]. Hence a party cannot be said to appear by a pleader if the pleader appears at the hearing and states that though he has filed his vakalatnama he has not received any instructions from his client with regard to the case and that he is therefore unable to go on with the suit (z). Similarly a party cannot be said to appear by a pleader if the pleader has no instructions other than to apply for an adjournment and on the adjournment being refused withdraws from the suit stating that he has no further instructions to go on with the suit (a). In neither case can it be said that the party appeared by a pleader *duly instructed and able to answer all material questions relating to the suit*. But what if the party himself is also present in person in Court at the time? According to the Madras (b) and Patna (c) High Courts it makes no difference that the party himself is present in Court for mere physical appearance does not constitute appearance. According to the Bombay High Court he must be deemed to have appeared the reason given being that if the pleader is not duly instructed to answer material questions the Court may under O 10 r 1 ask questions relating to the suit to the party himself and may examine his witnesses (d).

A pleader appears at the hearing on behalf of a plaintiff and applies for an adjournment on the ground that he had no time to prepare himself with the case or on the ground that the papers being left with his senior he could not proceed with the case. The application is refused and the pleader being unable to go on with the case the suit is dismissed. Can it be said under these circumstances that the plaintiff *appeared*

- (i) *S. oneri v. G. rpr and* (1899) 3 Bo 414  
(v) *W. onendra v. V. bor* (1909) 17 W R 30  
(r) *Sh. ikar v. I. dha* (1898) 0 All 19  
*Aruna hula v. I. dha* (19 3) 47 Mad L J 513  
8 I C 107 ( ) 4 W 81  
*Juliam v. Tara h* (19 ) 0 All LJ 13 65 IC  
7 ( ) 2) A 4 69  
*Ia dha v. I. ph* (19 3) 4 All 618 75 IC 387  
( ) A A 551  
*Motlal v. A. dham* (19 3) 11 1 8 IC 14 ( )  
A B 139  
(a) *Soondel v. Corp of* (1909) 3 Bom 414  
*Lalia v. N. nd A. h* (1909) All 66  
*Arish a. B. v. I. am G. r* (19 3) 1 All  
1 J 100 74 IC 815 ( ) A A 549  
*C. v. I. dha* (1901) 8 IC 100  
B 1  
*A. I. dha v. A. dha* (1907) 34 Cal 341  
*Cepala I. dha v. M. r*  
*ay* (1907) 30 Mad 74  
*I. men ja v.*

- Pu. ga ram* (1908) 13 M d I J 51  
*Man I. m. C. Mahudum* (19 4) 47 M I 819  
8 IC 10 ( ) A M 1 [F B] I  
*I. am K. v. A. v. J. dha* (1918) 3 Pat L J  
491 48 IC 488  
*M. v. P. r* (19 7) 4 Ran 404 90 IC 717 ( )  
A R 46  
*M. v. A. o* (19 3) 6 Ran  
33 ( ) 4 R 191  
(f) *G. pala v. M. r* (1907) 30 Mad 74  
*Kalappa v. F. m. r* (19 8) 51 Mad  
L J 10 97 IC 517 (26) A M 91  
(c) *Lalji A. v. L. dha* (1918) 3 Pat  
L J 355 47 IC  
*Sh. ikh. M. hammad v. C. h. dha* (1919) 4 Pat L J 71  
5 IC 30  
*M. v. A. dha* (19 ) 1 Pat 153 69 IC 837  
( ) A I 44  
(d) *Z. m. d. v. H. aj Ja* (1909) 33 Bom.  
4 31 IC 90

by a pleader? It has been held in the undermentioned cases that the plaintiff must be held to have appeared by a pleader and that the order of dismissal could not therefore be said to be one made under r 8 so as to entitle the plaintiff to apply under this rule (c)

**Suit.**—An application under s 148 of the Bengal Tenancy Act 1880 is not a suit within the meaning of r 8 or this rule (f)

**Fresh suit in respect of the same cause of action.**—If the plaintiff fails to appear and the suit is in consequence dismissed under r 8 the dismissal does not operate as *res judicata* (g). In such a case however the plaintiff is precluded by this rule from bringing a fresh suit in respect of the same cause of action. Thus if A sues B for damages for breach of a contract and the suit is dismissed for default of A's appearance A cannot bring a fresh suit to recover damages for breach of the same contract. A's only remedy in such a case is to apply for a review or to apply under this rule for an order to set aside the dismissal. But if the cause of action in the subsequent suit is different from that in the first suit the subsequent suit will not be barred under this rule. Thus the dismissal for default of a suit by a reversioner against a Hindu widow for an injunction to restrain her from making a gift of immovable property inherited by her from her husband is no bar to a subsequent suit by the same plaintiff against the widow for a declaration that a gift of the property made by the widow after the first suit is inoperative (h). Similarly if A sues B for the rent of certain lands and the suit is dismissed for default of A's appearance under r 8 the dismissal does not operate as a bar to a suit by A against B for enhanced rent (i) or for possession of the lands (j). For other cases in which it was held that the cause of action in the subsequent suit was not the same as in the first suit see cases cited in foot note (l)

If the right of redemption has not been extinguished the rule will not apply to a suit for redemption (l). The Privy Council case of *Shankar Bahadur v Daya Shankar* (1) seems to have been decided on the English rule that the dismissal of an action for redemption operates as a foreclosure.

This rule does not apply to a suit for partition. The reason is that the right to enforce partition is a legal incident of a joint tenancy and as long as such tenancy subsists so long may any of the joint tenants sue for partition of the joint property (n).

The dismissal under r 9 of a suit filed by the Voluntary Liquidator against a shareholder for the recovery of money alleged to be due to the company is a bar to a subsequent application by the Official Liquidator to have the name of the defendant placed in the list of contributories in respect of the same claim (o).

This rule does not apply when an application for probate is dismissed for default (p) nor when an adjudication order is annulled under sec 43 (1) of the Provincial Insolvency Act 1920 for default of appearance of the insolvent on the day fixed for hearing his application for discharge (q).

- (c) *Ismahil v M. Hax* (189) 16 Bom 3  
*Cl. J. v. J. v. J. v. J.* (1894) 0 All 91  
*Ismahil v. J. v. J.* (1903) 6 All 67  
 See these cases in *Cl. J. v. J.*  
*Cl. J. v. J.* (1907) 34 Cal 401 411 414  
 (f) *J. H. Fay v. Faja H. Is. d.* (193) 2 Pat 10  
*J. H. Fay v. J. H. Fay* (193) 2 Pat 10  
 (g) *I. H. Fay v. J. H. Fay* (193) 2 Pat 10  
 (h) *Ch. d. H. v. J. H. Fay* (193) 2 Pat 10  
 (i) *Gopal Lal v. T. J. M. Hax* (19) 1 Pat 10  
 (j) *Gopal Lal v. T. J. M. Hax* (19) 1 Pat 10  
 (k) *Gopal Lal v. T. J. M. Hax* (19) 1 Pat 10  
 (l) *Gopal Lal v. T. J. M. Hax* (19) 1 Pat 10  
 (m) *Gopal Lal v. T. J. M. Hax* (19) 1 Pat 10  
 (n) *Gopal Lal v. T. J. M. Hax* (19) 1 Pat 10  
 (o) *Gopal Lal v. T. J. M. Hax* (19) 1 Pat 10  
 (p) *Gopal Lal v. T. J. M. Hax* (19) 1 Pat 10  
 (q) *Gopal Lal v. T. J. M. Hax* (19) 1 Pat 10

- (k) *Ismahil v. M. Hax* (189) 16 Bom 3  
*Cl. J. v. J. v. J.* (1894) 0 All 91  
*Ismahil v. J. v. J.* (1903) 6 All 67  
 See these cases in *Cl. J. v. J.*  
*Cl. J. v. J.* (1907) 34 Cal 401 411 414  
 (l) *J. H. Fay v. Faja H. Is. d.* (193) 2 Pat 10  
*J. H. Fay v. J. H. Fay* (193) 2 Pat 10  
 (m) *I. H. Fay v. J. H. Fay* (193) 2 Pat 10  
 (n) *Ch. d. H. v. J. H. Fay* (193) 2 Pat 10  
 (o) *Gopal Lal v. T. J. M. Hax* (19) 1 Pat 10  
 (p) *Gopal Lal v. T. J. M. Hax* (19) 1 Pat 10  
 (q) *Gopal Lal v. T. J. M. Hax* (19) 1 Pat 10  
 (r) *Gopal Lal v. T. J. M. Hax* (19) 1 Pat 10  
 (s) *Gopal Lal v. T. J. M. Hax* (19) 1 Pat 10  
 (t) *Gopal Lal v. T. J. M. Hax* (19) 1 Pat 10  
 (u) *Gopal Lal v. T. J. M. Hax* (19) 1 Pat 10  
 (v) *Gopal Lal v. T. J. M. Hax* (19) 1 Pat 10  
 (w) *Gopal Lal v. T. J. M. Hax* (19) 1 Pat 10  
 (x) *Gopal Lal v. T. J. M. Hax* (19) 1 Pat 10  
 (y) *Gopal Lal v. T. J. M. Hax* (19) 1 Pat 10  
 (z) *Gopal Lal v. T. J. M. Hax* (19) 1 Pat 10



(r) *Lalla Shea* v *F* *I* (195) Cal 8  
C n i s v *Lakera* (191) 19 Rom  
571 5 *H* ma i v *J* vula (1900)  
41 n 54 55  
(s) *Id* i 4r v *The Pu* j h v *tion* i Ba k  
*Id* (1909) 10 Lab 5 0 114 1 c 6  
( ) A L 16  
t) *Lalla* *Pran* d v *Iam Kara* (191) 34 All

by a pleader? It has been held in the undermentioned cases that the plaintiff must be held to have appeared by a pleader and that the order of dismissal could not therefore be said to be one made under r 8 so as to entitle the plaintiff to apply under this rule (c)

**Suit.**—An application under s 108 of the Bengal Tenancy Act 1886 is not a suit within the meaning of r 8 or this rule (f)

**Fresh suit in respect of the same cause of action.**—If the plaintiff fails to appear and the suit is in consequence dismissed under r 8 the dismissal does not operate as *res judicata* (g). In such a case however the plaintiff is precluded by this rule from bringing a fresh suit in respect of the same cause of action. Thus if A sues B for damages for breach of a contract and the suit is dismissed for default of A's appearance, A cannot bring a fresh suit to recover damages for breach of the same contract. A's only remedy in such a case is to apply for a review or to apply under this rule for an order to set aside the dismissal. But if the cause of action in the subsequent suit is *different* from that in the first suit the subsequent suit will not be barred under this rule. Thus the dismissal for default of a suit by a reversioner against a Hindu widow for an injunction to restrain her from making a gift of immovable property inherited by her from her husband is no bar to a subsequent suit by the same plaintiff against the widow for a declaration that a gift of the property made by the widow after the first suit is inoperative (h). Similarly if A sues B for the rent of certain lands and the suit is dismissed for default of A's appearance under r 8 the dismissal does not operate as a bar to a suit by A against B for enhanced rent (i) or for possession of the lands (j). For other cases in which it was held that the cause of action in the subsequent suit was not the same as in the first suit see cases cited in foot note (l).

If the right of redemption has not been extinguished the rule will not apply to a suit for redemption (l). The Privy Council case of *Shankar Balsh v Dayn Shanker* (m) seems to have been decided on the English rule that the dismissal of an action for redemption operates as a foreclosure.

This rule does not apply to a suit for partition. The reason is that the right to enforce partition is a legal incident of a joint tenancy and as long as such tenancy subsists so long may any of the joint tenants sue for partition of the joint property (n).

The dismissal under r 8 of a suit filed by the Voluntary Liquidator against a shareholder for the recovery of money alleged to be due to the company is a bar to a subsequent application by the Official Liquidator to have the name of the defendant placed in the list of contributors in respect of the same claim (o).

This rule does not apply when an application for probate is dismissed for default (p) nor when an adjudication order is annulled under sec 43 (1) of the Provincial Insolvency Act 1920 for default of appearance of the insolvent on the day fixed for hearing his application for discharge (q).

- (c) *I am ha d v Ma haat* (189) 16 Bom 23  
*Chit f v P lla* (1834) 0 All 91  
*I l n h r v l l l* (1903) 6 Mad 67  
 See these cases discussed in *Satish Chandra v Chandra Prasad* (1907) 34 Cal 401 411 414  
 (f) *Ju H Lay v F ja f l* (191) P t 19 41 C 464 (1) 1 341  
 (g) *P dha l rshad v Lal Sukh* (1830) 1 I 4 1 0 13 All 53  
 (h) *Cha d haw v Jartat S gh* (1884) 15 I 4 150 16 C 109  
 (i) *G pal Lal v T J M h m m ad* (19) 7 Lat 1011 C 615 (1) A 1 3  
 (j) *G d f f u l* (1843) 9 Cal 4 6 f f rish  
*J gh l r* (191) 45 All 81 74 I C 991  
 (193) A A 409 [1 suit to eject defendant tenant—suit is to eject him—see]

- (k) *I ya C l l Taj Mahomed* (19) 7 Pat 101 I C 815 (7) A 1 8 5 Ma 7  
*I 2 v Ma Th t S* (10) 1 5 R 2  
 108 I C 809 (1) A R 3 l l b  
*Bh d l l t l r h l shaw* of inheritance  
 (l) *Arudha v G* (102) 5 Bom 111 105 I C (1) A B 67  
 (m) (1843) 15 Cal 40 15 I 4 66  
 (n) *Jish h Das v Jam Prasad* (1906) 4 All 6 Madon Mahon B k n d v r t  
 (1906) 10 Cal W 833 Madon v  
 A H d h (10 6) 43 All 933 9 I C 6 (1) A M 1014  
 (o) *F p Jam v Fazal Din* (1910) 1 Lah 571 C 3  
 (p) *S ryua v Jayn ya* (1914) 53 C 1 5 4 941 C 3 (6) A C 1047  
 (q) *Te J p u l s h r u v Ch l n Lal* (1916) 47 Mad 91, 9 I C 706 (1) A M 91—

**Minor plaintiff**—A fresh suit notwithstanding the provisions of this rule may be instituted in respect of the same cause of action where the first suit was brought by a next friend on behalf of a minor and was dismissed under r 8 for default of the next friend's appearance *owing to gross want of care and diligence on his part (r)* See notes to r 13 below *Ex parte* decree against minor defendant

**Sufficient cause**—What is sufficient cause is in each case a question of fact—

(1) A plaintiff left the Court house believing that a part heard case which preceded his case would occupy some time he returned in about half an hour and found that his suit had been called on and dismissed owing to his absence He then applied to set aside the order of dismissal *Hell* refusing the application that the above circumstances did not amount to sufficient cause for non appearance *Manilal v Gulim Husain* (1883) 13 Bom 12

(2) Where it was the duty of an attorney's clerk to examine every evening the board for the next day and to inform his master what cases in which he was engaged as attorney were on the board for hearing and the clerk neglecting his duty did not inform the master and no one appearing for the plaintiff the suit was dismissed it was held that the absence was caused by a bona fide mistake and the suit was restored on payment by the attorney of the costs of the hearing *The Oriental Corporation v The Mercantile Corporation Ltd* (1866) 2 B H C 267

(3) In two cases the High Court of Bombay said that the rule of practice to be observed in the subordinate Courts in the Bombay Presidency is that when a party arrives late before the Judge and finds that his suit has been dismissed before his arrival he is entitled to have his suit restored though there may be no sufficient cause for his late arrival on payment of such costs as may have been incurred by reason of his default by the defendant *Chhotalal v Ambalal* (1923) 27 Bom L R 68 89 IC 25 (23) A B 423 *Sorabji v Ramji* (1924) 26 Bom L R 321 90 IC 337 (24) A B 39 In a later case it was held that there was no such hard and fast rule and that the Court had a discretion in each case to deal with the matter *Currimbhoy v Moos* (1929) 31 Bom L R 468 117 IC 593 (23) A B 500

(4) A litigant should not be deprived of a hearing unless there has been something equivalent to misconduct or gross negligence on his part *Arunachala v Subbaramiah* (1923) 46 Mad. 60 63 68 IC 971 (23) A M 63 [delay caused by inevitable accident] As to negligence of pleader see the undermentioned case (s)

**Inherent power to restore suit dismissed for default**—It has been held by the High Courts of Allahabad (t) Bombay (u) and Rangoon (v) that this rule does not take away the inherent power of a Court to restore a suit dismissed for default if there be a just and reasonable cause for restoring it even if no sufficient cause is shown within the meaning of this rule for the plaintiff's non appearance Thus where a case was called on at 12 o'clock and the plaintiff's pleader being under the impression that the case would be taken up at 2 o'clock was engaged in other cases in other Courts and the plaintiff himself was waiting in his pleader's room and the suit was dismissed for default of appearance it was held that though there was no sufficient cause for non appearance within the meaning of this rule the case was one in which the Court should in the exercise of its inherent powers restore the suit to the file (w) Similarly where a plaintiff believing that his case which was fourteenth on the list would not be reached immediately did not attend the Court but went to bring his principal

(r) *Lalla v Lal* 117 IC 8 (189) 19 Cal 8  
C a las v Lal (181) 19 Bom  
571 5 7 Il ma t pa v Ji lu (1900)  
4 Bom 54 55  
(s) *Abul Kalam v The Prince of Wales* 2  
117 IC 11 10 Lab 50 114 IC 6  
(1) A L 26  
(t) *Lalla v Lal* 117 IC 8 (191) 34 All

4 6 14 IC 1  
( ) *Balas v C. Andas* (1919) 1 Bom L R  
95 531 C 20  
( ) *Mawji v V. F. W. E. W.* (1906) 4 Ran  
19 95 IC 51 (6) 4 R 109  
(w) (191) 34 All 4 6 14 IC 15 *supra* But  
see *Shankar Hall v V. V. V. V. V.* (1911) 19  
All L J 90 641 C 52 (22) A 4 441



9 witness and the suit being called on in the meantime his counsel applied for an adjournment on the ground that his client was not in Court but the application was refused and the suit dismissed, it was held that even if there was no sufficient cause within the meaning of this section the Court had inherent power to restore the suit having regard to the special facts of the case (x). On the other hand it has been held by a Full Bench of the Madras High Court that a Court has no power apart from the provisions of this rule to restore a suit or apart from the provisions of r 13 to set aside an ex parte decree (y). The Patna High Court has followed the Madras ruling (z).

**Appeal**—An appeal lies under O 43 r 1 (c) from an order rejecting an application (in a case open to appeal) made under this rule but no appeal lies from an order granting the application (a). As regards an order rejecting an application to set aside the dismissal of a suit made by a single Judge sitting on the original side of the High Court it has been held by the High Court of Calcutta that it is appealable not only under O 43 r 1 (c) but also as a judgment within the meaning of cl 15 of the Letters Patent (b) but that an order granting the application is not appealable either under O 43 r 1 (c) or as a judgment under cl 15 of the Letters Patent (c).

Where an application is made by a plaintiff under this rule but the application is dismissed for default no appeal lies from the order of dismissal (d).

**Revision**—If there is no sufficient cause for setting aside the dismissal the Court cannot do so as a matter of grace because it involves a heavy claim and if it does so the High Court will set aside the order in revision even though the suit has been tried and decreed (e).

**Whether this rule applies to proceedings in execution**—As has already been stated in the notes on sec 141 the provisions of O 9 do not apply to proceedings in execution. Therefore if an application for execution is dismissed for default it cannot be restored under this rule (f). It is competent however to the applicant to present a fresh application for execution (g). The High Court of Lahore has held that if an application for execution is dismissed for default the Court may restore it in the exercise of its inherent power under sec 151 of the Code (h). A different view has been taken by the High Courts of Patna and Madras (i).

An application to set aside a sale on the ground of irregularity under O 1 r 90 is also a proceeding in execution and the provisions of this Order do not apply to it (j). A judgment debtor who is properly sold in execution of a decree applies under O 1 r 90 to set aside the sale on the ground of material irregularity in conducting the sale. Notice of the hearing of the application is given to B the decree holder and to C the auction purchaser. Three cases might occur. First where none of the parties appears at the hearing of the application and the application is dismissed for non appearance. Secondly where B and C appear at the hearing but A does not and the application is dismissed for A's non appearance. Thirdly where A alone appears at the

(x) (1910) 21 Bom L R 9 53 I C 25

(y) *Prasanna v Narayana* (1901) 43 Mad 94  
53 I C 21 approving *Venkataswami v  
Narasimha* (1913) 4 Mad L J 3 14 I C  
366 and *error in law* v *Sudhama*  
(1903) 26 Mad 573

(z) *Prasanna v Muhammad Ali Khan* (1901) 1  
Pat 63 I C 511 (22) P 4 J

(a) *Hindun v Jyothoor* (1890) Cal 11  
J 14 *Hindun* (1916) Pat J 1 n 40  
p 11 31 I C 914

(b) *Maharaj v Hira Chandra* (1916) 43 Cal  
83 31 I C 634

(c) *Maharaj v Hira Chandra* (1901) 43 Cal 616  
61 I C 1 (1) 4 I C 40

(d) *Jyothoor v Hindun* (1917) Pat L J 400  
47 I C 54, *Hindun v Maharaj* (1901)  
30 Cal L J 1 62 I C 1093 (22) A C

(e) *Maharaj v Hira Chandra* (1901) 43 Mad 94  
53 I C 21

(f) *Hira Chandra v Maharaj* (1901) 43 Mad 94  
53 I C 21

(g) *Hira Chandra v Maharaj* (1901) 43 Mad 94  
53 I C 21

(h) *Hira Chandra v Maharaj* (1901) 43 Mad 94  
53 I C 21

(i) *Hira Chandra v Maharaj* (1901) 43 Mad 94  
53 I C 21

(j) *Hira Chandra v Maharaj* (1901) 43 Mad 94  
53 I C 21

hearing and an ex parte order is made granting *A*'s application and setting aside the sale. Since O 9 does not apply the dismissal of the application in the first case cannot be treated as a dismissal under O 9 r 3 and the provisions of O 9 r 4 do not apply (j). Similarly the dismissal in the second case cannot be treated as a dismissal under O 9 r 8 and the provisions of O 9 r 9 do not apply (k). For the same reason the ex parte order made in the last case cannot be treated as one under O 9 r 6 and the provisions of O 9 r 13 do not apply.

The provisions of O 9 do not apply to proceedings under O 21 rr 9, 10 (l).

**Dismissal for default of application to restore suit**—This rule provides for the revival of a suit dismissed for default. Does it apply where an application to set aside the dismissal of a suit is itself dismissed for default? A suit by *A* against *B* is dismissed for *A*'s default. *A* applies under this rule to set aside the dismissal. *A* does not appear at the hearing of the application and the application also is dismissed for default. Can the application be restored under this rule? No according to the Patna High Court the reason given being that such an application is a proceeding in execution and that O 9 cannot therefore apply to such an application (m). On the other hand the other High Courts (n) have held that such an application may itself be treated as an application to restore the suit provided it is made within the period prescribed for the original application. In later cases in Allahabad (o) and Calcutta (p) it was said that the second application may be entertained under s 151. The same rules apply to applications to restore an application to set aside an ex parte decree which has been dismissed for default.

**Limitation**—Where no application to set aside a dismissal is made within the period of limitation the Court has no inherent power under s 141 to set aside the dismissal after the expiry of the period (q). See notes above. Remedies in case of dismissal under r 8. The High Court of Bombay has made a rule under sec 147 applying sec 5 of the Indian Limitation Act 1908 to applications under this rule. The rule so made has been held to be intra vires (r).

**10 [S 105]** Where there are more plaintiffs than one, and one or more of them appear, and the others do not appear, the Court may, at the instance of the plaintiff or plaintiffs appearing, permit the suit to proceed in the same way as if all the plaintiffs had appeared, or make such order as it thinks fit.

More plaintiffs than one—See notes to r 8 above under the same head.

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>(j) <i>Dona et alia v. Pany Han</i> (1906) 3 Cal 69 681 C 0 (28) AC 3. <i>Na end a v. Khat</i> (1914) 41 C 1 L.J. 36 91 C 31 (1) AC 510.</p> <p>(k) <i>Iti et al. v. Trigudhar</i> (1910) 4 P.T. L.J. 13 49 IC 61. <i>Italy et al. v. Soor</i> (1914) 4 M.L.J. 200 61 IC 841 (5) AM 16. <i>J. Ash v. J. Ash</i> (1910) 31 B.M. 1 R. 400 119 IC 700 (9) A.B. 17. <i>Chandra et al. v. Chandra</i> (1915) 19 L.W.N. 1 IC 40. <i>Chandra et al. v. Chandra</i> (1915) 19 L.W.N. 1 IC 40.</p> <p>(l) <i>Iti et al. v. Jha</i> (1913) 41 Cal 1 19 IC 683. <i>Iti et al. v. Jha</i> (1913) 41 Cal 1 19 IC 683. <i>Iti et al. v. Jha</i> (1913) 41 Cal 1 19 IC 683.</p> <p>(m) <i>P. N. G. Lim v. S. G. Dronarai</i> (1910) 4 Pat. L.J. 47 51 C 15.</p> <p>(n) <i>P. N. G. Lim v. S. G. Dronarai</i> (1910) 4 Pat. L.J. 47 51 C 15.</p> <p>(o) <i>P. N. G. Lim v. S. G. Dronarai</i> (1910) 4 Pat. L.J. 47 51 C 15.</p> <p>(p) <i>P. N. G. Lim v. S. G. Dronarai</i> (1910) 4 Pat. L.J. 47 51 C 15.</p> | <p>4 A 503. <i>Suit Beg v. Kotayya</i> (1906) 94 I.C. 231 (6) A.M. 64. <i>Thapara v. D. H. Prasad</i> (1906) 50 B.M. 45 95 IC 411 (6) A.M. 37. <i>Iti et al. v. Jha</i> (1910) 31 B.M. 1 R. 400 119 IC 700 (9) A.B. 17. <i>Chandra et al. v. Chandra</i> (1915) 19 L.W.N. 1 IC 40. <i>Chandra et al. v. Chandra</i> (1915) 19 L.W.N. 1 IC 40.</p> <p>(q) <i>Chandra et al. v. Chandra</i> (1915) 19 L.W.N. 1 IC 40. <i>Chandra et al. v. Chandra</i> (1915) 19 L.W.N. 1 IC 40.</p> <p>(r) <i>Chandra et al. v. Chandra</i> (1915) 19 L.W.N. 1 IC 40. <i>Chandra et al. v. Chandra</i> (1915) 19 L.W.N. 1 IC 40.</p> |
|---|---|

**11 [S 106]** Where there are more defendants than one, and one or more of them appear and the others do not appear, the suit shall proceed and the Court shall, at the time of pronouncing judgment, make such order as it thinks fit with respect to the defendants who do not appear

Procedure in case of non  
attendance of one or more of  
several defendants

**12 [S 107]** Where a plaintiff or defendant, who has been ordered to appear in person, does not appear in person, or show sufficient cause to the satisfaction of the Court for failing so to appear, he shall be subject to all the provisions of the foregoing rules applicable to plaintiffs and defendants respectively, who do not appear

Consequence of non  
appearance without suffi-  
cient cause shown by party  
ordered to appear in  
person

Where party directed to appear in person—This rule applies to all cases where a party has been ordered to appear in person and fails to do so. This is clear from the fact that the words "under the provisions of section 60 or section 43b (now Order 3 and Order 23 r 3 respectively)" which occurred in the corresponding s. 107 of the Code of 1882 have been omitted from the present rule (s)

### *Setting aside Decrees ex parte*

**13 [S 103]** In any case in which a decree is passed ex parte against a defendant, he may apply to the Court by which the decree was passed for an order to set it aside, and if he satisfies the Court that the summons was not duly served, or that he was prevented by any sufficient cause from appearing when the suit was called on for hearing, the Court shall make an order setting aside the decree as against him upon such terms as to costs, payment into Court or otherwise as it thinks fit, and shall appoint a day for proceeding with the suit

Setting aside decree ex  
parte against defendant

Provided that where the decree is of such a nature that it cannot be set aside as against such defendant only it may be set aside as against all or any of the other defendants also

Old section—This rule corresponds with s. 103 of the Code of 1882. The words "as against him" have been added after the words "shall make an order setting aside the decree." The proviso to the rule is also new. See as to the effect of these changes note. Proviso to the Rule

Remedies in case of ex parte decree—A defendant against whom an ex parte decree has been passed under r. 6 for default of appearance at the hearing has the following courses open to him (f) —

(1) he may appeal from the ex parte decree under s. 96

(a) *Tanveer thammal v. Vallamma* (1914) 41 Mad 226 (A.C. 19) | (b) *Jethalal v. J. Rajulal* (1914) 46 Bom 141 15  
632 C 44 ( ) A.H. 6

(-) he may apply for a review of judgment under O 47 r 1 (u)

(3) he may apply under this rule for an order to set aside the ex parte decree provided the application is made in cases to which the Limitation Act 1908 applies within 30 days from the *date of the decree* or where the summons was not duly served when he has *knowledge of the decree* (i) and in cases to which the Limitation Act 1877 applies within 30 days from the *date of executing any process* for enforcing the judgment (u) As to knowledge of the decree it has been held that it must be knowledge of a particular decree passed against the defendant in a particular Court in favour of a particular person and for a particular sum and not merely the knowledge that a decree has been passed by some Court against him (x)

Where the right to make the application is barred under the Act of 1877 and the bar arose before the Limitation Act of 1908 came into force the provisions of that Act could not revive the right (y) But where the right is not barred the law of limitation to be applied to applications under the present rule made after January 1 1909 is art 164 of the Limitation Act of 1908 and not art 164 of the Limitation Act of 1877 though the ex parte decree was passed when the Limitation Act of 1877 was in force ( )

The first two remedies that is the remedies by way of appeal and review are open to any person against whom a decree is passed whether the decree is ex parte or not But the third remedy the one provided by this rule can only be resorted to if the decree is passed ex parte that is to say passed against the defendant for *default of appearance* under r 6 The remedy given by this rule is not open to a defendant if the decree is passed on *grounds other than his non appearance*

**Whether remedies concurrent**—A defendant against whom an ex parte decree is passed is at liberty as stated above to apply to set aside the decree under this rule or to appeal from the decree or to apply for a review of the judgment He is entitled to apply under this rule to set aside the decree and at the same time to appeal from the decree Further he is entitled to appeal from the decree without a previous application to set aside the decree under this rule (a) Similarly he is entitled to apply for a review without previously applying under this rule (b) If he applies under this rule and his application is rejected he is entitled under O 43 r 1 (d) to appeal from the order rejecting the application But he is not bound to appeal from the order he may appeal under s 96 from the ex parte decree itself

If a defendant against whom an ex parte decree is passed does not apply under this rule to set aside the decree but appeals from the decree two questions arise namely—

- (1) Whether the appellate Court can consider the reason for the defendant's non appearance at the hearing and determine whether the lower Court was right in proceeding ex parte or whether the only question which it could consider is whether the evidence on the record is sufficient to support the ex parte decree in other words whether the decree can be sustained on the merits and
- (2) whether if the appellate Court comes to the conclusion that the suit ought not to have been heard ex parte it has the power to remand the case for re-hearing to the lower Court

Upon the points there is a conflict of decisions In a case under the Code of 1884 the Calcutta High Court held that the only question which the appellate Court could

( ) *It is not an application* (1884) 6 All 65  
(r) *Limitation Act 1908 s 1 art 164*  
(u) *Limitation Act 1877 s 1 art 164*  
( ) *It is not an application* (1933) 4 Bom 453  
( ) *It is not an application* (1913) 29 Cal 508  
(y) *It is not an application* (1913) 29 Cal 508

( ) *It is not an application* (1910) 1 Bom 100  
( ) *It is not an application* (1913) 3 All 59  
( ) *It is not an application* (1913) 3 All 59  
( ) *It is not an application* (1913) 3 All 59  
( ) *It is not an application* (1913) 3 All 59  
( ) *It is not an application* (1913) 3 All 59





3 on the ground of fraud in respect of the service of summons upon him. The Court after going into the question of fraud rejects the application and then institutes a regular suit to set aside the ex parte decree, basing his suit on the very fraud that was alleged by him in the application. The suit is barred as *res judicata* (x). In a recent Calcutta case I sued B in a Munsif's Court on a hand note and obtained an ex parte decree for Rs. 50. B applied to set aside the decree but the application was refused. B then sued A in the Munsif's Court to set aside the decree on the grounds (1) that the summons was not duly served and (2) that the decree was obtained by perjured evidence. It was held that the issue as to service of summons was not *res judicata*, the reason given being that the suit included matters which could not have been raised on the application to set aside the decree (y). This decision it is submitted is not good law.

**Application by legal representative of deceased defendant.**—Under the Code of 1859 it was not settled whether his legal representative could apply for an order to set aside the ex parte decree against a deceased defendant. The High Court of Calcutta held that he could (z). The High Courts of Madras (a) and Allahabad (b) held that he could not. But the Allahabad Court conceded that if the application was made by the defendant and he died during the pendency of the application the proceedings could be continued by his legal representative (c). Under this Code (s. 14f) such an application may be made by the legal representative of the deceased defendant (d).

**Grounds on which ex parte decree may be set aside.**—The grounds are stated in the second paragraph of the rule, the one being that the summons was not duly served upon the defendant (e) and the other that though the summons was duly served the defendant was prevented by sufficient cause from appearing when the suit was called on for hearing (f). A summons cannot be said to be duly served if it is a misleading document having no relevance to the real proceedings which are contemplated and having no reference to the order ultimately passed (g). When a summons was served upon a *purdashin* lady to whom the serving officer was not able to obtain access by affixing a copy of the summons on the outer door of her dwelling house under Order 1 and it appeared that the lady had no knowledge of the suit against her the Court set aside the ex parte decree passed against her on the ground that she was prevented by sufficient cause from appearing at the hearing of the suit (h). But duly does not mean personally and a summons may be duly served by substituted service (j).

**Sufficient cause.**—Where an ex parte decree has been passed against a defendant who has failed to appear at the hearing he is not entitled to have the decree set aside as a matter of course even if he applies on the same day for the purpose. It is a matter for the discretion of the Court (j). The fact that a defendant was contemplating an appeal from a preliminary decree in a suit for partition is no ground for his failure to attend proceedings in connection with the division of property and for setting aside the final decree for partition (l). In a Rangoon case under the Land Acquisition Act 1901 the Collector failed to appear as he was on tour at that time and there was

- (x) *Purnan Chandra v. Shoolat Rai* (1907) 29 All 1. *Narain Mal v. Isak H. S. N.* (1907) 2 All 104. *Mahabir v. Mahabir* Pat 233. *Jangal v. Lalji* (1907) 6 Pat 1 J 1 601 1 1 1.
- (y) *N. A. H. v. H. S. N.* (1907) 9 Cal W N 30. 891 C. 9 (3) A C 603.
- (z) *Co. of S. S. v. S. S. N.* (1907) 23 Cal 33.
- (a) *Amala v. Terra* (1907) 33 M d 61.
- (b) *J. H. v. S. S. N.* (1907) 1 All 104.
- (c) *Lat. J. v. N. S. S. N.* (1907) 29 All 54.
- (d) *See Venkataswamy v. Arunnamurthy* (1911) 34 M d 44. 111 C 354.
- (e) *F. H. v. D. N. v. H. S. N.* (1901) 23

- All 99. *H. S. N. v. H. S. N.* (1907) 1 All 33.
- (f) *Somayaj v. S. S. N.* (1907) 63 Cal 592.
- (g) *Jalpa v. S. S. N.* (1907) 1 All 1. *J. H. v. S. S. N.* (1907) 1 All 1. *J. H. v. S. S. N.* (1907) 1 All 1.
- (h) *J. H. v. S. S. N.* (1907) 1 All 1.
- (i) *J. H. v. S. S. N.* (1907) 1 All 1.
- (j) *J. H. v. S. S. N.* (1907) 1 All 1.
- (k) *J. H. v. S. S. N.* (1907) 1 All 1.
- (l) *J. H. v. S. S. N.* (1907) 1 All 1.

considerable pressure of work. One of the Judges of a Division Bench held that this was a sufficient cause for his non appearance while the other Judge held that it was not (l). For other cases see note to O 9 r 9 Appearance.

Upon such terms as to payment into Court.—In restoring a case under this rule the Court may make it a condition that costs (m) or the decretal amount or some portion thereof be paid into Court (n). If a decree is set aside on failure to comply with a condition imposed by a Court an appeal will lie under O 43 r 1 (d) and the appellate Court will consider whether the condition was a reasonable one (o).

High Court of Calcutta Original Side.—The High Court of Calcutta has held that this rule does not apply in terms on the Original Side of the High Court. The principle however of this rule is applied on that side and Pankin C.J. said that the High Court on its Original Side has a discretion which it may exercise independently of the rule and that it may set aside an ex parte decree even in a case in which there has been an element of negligence (p). The same High Court has also held that an application to set aside an ex parte decree not being one under this rule is not governed by art. 164 of the Limitation Act (q).

Inherent power to set aside ex parte decree.—See notes to r 9. Inherent power to restore suit dismissed for default.

Ex parte decree against minor defendant.—It is no ground for setting aside an ex parte decree passed against a minor defendant that the Nazir who was appointed guardian ad litem of the minor did not appear and defend the suit if the failure to defend was owing to the fact that the Nazir did not receive instructions from any person to defend the suit. It would be otherwise if fraud, collusion or gross negligence on the part of the guardian ad litem were proved (r). See notes to r 9. Minor plaintiff.

Proviso to the rule.—Cases under this proviso fall into two classes:

I Where the decree is ex parte against *all* the defendants but the application to set aside the decree is made *only* by *some* of *them*.

II Where against *some* of the defendants the decree is passed ex parte but against others who have appeared and defended the suit it is passed on the merits and the application to set aside the decree is made by one or more of the defendants against whom the decree was passed ex parte.

In cases under both classes the question is whether if the decree is set aside as against the applicant the Court can set aside the decree as against the other defendants also so as to reopen the whole suit and if so in what cases? No provision was made in the old section as to these cases. The present rule expressly provides for the two cases. The first para. of r 13 says that where a defendant against whom a decree is passed ex parte applies for an order to set it aside and satisfies the Court that the summons was not duly served upon him etc. the Court shall make an order setting aside the decree *as against him* [that is the applicant] (s). The proviso to r 13 says that *where the decree is of such a nature that it cannot be set aside as against such defendant only it may be set aside as against all or any of the other defendants*. The object is to provide for case where it may be necessary in the ends of justice to set aside the decree not

(l) *Mahad v. C. H. Dor f. Pon goo* (1905) 5 Kan 80 10<sup>th</sup> 1<sup>st</sup> 39 (2) A.R. 10.  
(m) *Am. v. H. rdal* (1906) 48 All 199 90 I.C. 43 (6) A.A. 14 (1).  
(n) *Shy m. Lal v. J. m. Varna m. Lal* (1900) 5 Pat. 1 J. 40 57 I.C. 300.  
(o) *Na. yan v. J. K. t.* (1905) 51 Bom. 7 93 I.C. 331 (1) A.B. 1 overruling *J. K. rouda v. J. m. d. m.* (1906) 56 Bom. 36 96 I.C. 31 (1) A.B. 303.

(p) *Be. ry v. S. bruce Jy* (1906) 4 Cal 43 106 I.C. 91 (1) A.C. —  
(q) *H. J. m. v. H. f. r.* (1906) 30 C.W.N. 411 (1) A.C. 864.  
(r) *Furn v. Duf.* (1901) 9 Dom. L.R. 1099.  
(s) See as to the insertion of the words "as against him" the judgment of Sanley J. in *K. m. V. m. H. d. m. D. m.* (1907) 4 All 353, at p. 357.



3 only against the applicant but also against the other defendants (f) This would be a general rule be so

(1) where the decree is one and indivisible (u)

(-) where the suit would result in inconsistent decrees if the decree were not set aside as against the other defendants also (v)

(3) where the relief to which the applicant is entitled in the suit could not effectively be given otherwise than by setting aside the decree as against the other defendants also (w)

(4) where the decree proceeds on a ground common to all the defendants (x)

These four cases may be considered under the two classes referred to above

*Class I*—Where the decree is *ex parte* passed against all the defendants but the application to set aside the decree is made by some of them only

#### Illustrations

(a) *B C and D* who constitute a joint Hindu family execute a mortgage of the joint property in favour of *A*. *A* sues *B C and D* to enforce the mortgage. *D* is served with the summons but not *B and C*. None of the defendants appears at the hearing and an *ex parte* decree is passed against all the defendants for a sale of the mortgaged property. *B and C* apply for an order to set aside the decree on the ground that the summons was not served upon them. Here the decree being one and indivisible the Court may set aside the decree not only as against *B and C* but also as against *D* though *D* was served with the summons and there was no sufficient cause for his non appearance. *Ajodhya Pershad v Sh o Pershad* (1900) 5 C W N 38. *Ashfaq Husain v Gauri Sahai* (1911) 33 All 261 33 I A 379 I C 955

(b) *A* sues *B* and his minor sons *C and D* members of a joint Hindu family to recover Rs. 1000 alleged to have been advanced to *B* as manager of the family. None of the defendants appears at the hearing and an *ex parte* decree is passed against all the three. All the three defendants apply to have the decree set aside. As to *C and D* it is proved that no summons was served upon them. As to *B* it is proved that the summons was duly served upon him. Here the decree being one and indivisible (y) the Court may set aside the decree not only as against *C and D* but also as against *B* though the summons was served upon him and there was no sufficient cause for his non appearance. Moreover this is a case where the relief to which the minors *C and D* are entitled could not effectively be granted unless the decree was set aside as against *B* also. For if the decree were allowed to stand as against *B* *B*'s share in the joint family property could be attached and sold though the sons might succeed in showing at the re trial of the suit that the debt never was incurred or that it had been discharged or that from its nature the joint family property was not liable. The sale of the father's share in the joint family property would be a manifest injury to the son and this could only be avoided by setting aside the decree against the father also and reopening the whole suit. *Phura Mal v Har Krishan Das* (1902) 24 All 343 at pp 460 and 461

(c) *A* alleging that *A and B* are in joint possession of certain immovable property sues *A and B* and asks for a declaration that he is in joint possession with them. *A*

(1) *Doolhee Khan v P Jeeu v P* (1871) 15 W R 371 per Norman C J and Lord J. *Sh Homed Hamid L v Tah ren ussa Bibi* (1924) 25 Cal 155 15 159. *Phura Mal v Har Krishan Das* (1902) 24 All 343 (46)

(2) *Sh Homed Hamid L v Tah ren ussa Bibi* (1924) 25 Cal 155 160. *Memom Anil v Vera Narayan Loy* (1929) 4 C W N 456, 458

(3) *Phura Mal v Har Krishan Das* (1902) 24 All 343 at pp 400

(u) *Phura Mal v Har Krishan D* (1902) 24 All 343 400 401. *Sh Homed Hamid L v Tah ren ussa Bibi* (1924) 25 Cal 155 159

(v) *Doolhee Khan v Pajuresse Fance* (1871) 15 W R 371 per Norman C J and Lord J. See also *L. pala Chetti v S Mur* (1907) 26 Mad 601

(y) See *Sh Homed Hamid L v Tah ren ussa Bibi* (1924) 25 Cal 155 160 where it is said of a similar decree that it was one and indivisible

is served with the summons but *B* is not. Neither defendant appears at the hearing and a decree ex parte is passed against both the defendants. *B* applies to have the decree set aside and it is set aside as against him but not as against *A*. At the hearing *B* establishes that *A* has no title whatever to the property. There would in such a case be two absolutely inconsistent decrees namely the ex parte decree held by *A* against *A* declaring *A* to be jointly in possession with *A* and *B* and the decree against *A* passed at the hearing that *A* was not in joint possession with *A* and *B*. This is therefore a case in which the decree must be set aside not only as against *B* but as against *A* also see *Bhura Mal v Har Kishan Das* (1902) 24 All 383 at p 388.

(d) *A* sues *A* and *B* on a promissory note executed by *A*. *B* is *A*'s nephew and he is joined as a defendant on the ground that *A* and *B* are members of a joint Hindu family and that the note was for a debt binding on the family. Neither defendant appears at the hearing and an ex parte decree is passed against both the defendants. The decree against *A* proceeds on the ground that the note was passed by him and against *B* on the ground that the debt was incurred for a family purpose. *B* applies for an order to set aside the decree alleging that the summons was not served upon him and that the debt in respect of which the note was passed by *A* was not incurred for a family purpose. It is not disputed that the amount was actually advanced to *A*. Such being the case the decree may be set aside as against *B* but it must not be set aside as against *A*. Justice does not require it for the contention of *B* that the debt was one not binding on him is a defence peculiar to him alone and not one common to him and *A*. *Gopala Chelli v Subbar* (1913) 26 Mad 604.

(e) *A* sues *B*, *C* and *D* personally and as managers of a devasam to recover Rs. 270 being revenue paid by him on behalf of the defendants. None of the defendants appears at the hearing and an ex parte decree is passed against them personally and against the devasam property. If *B* alone applies under this rule and shows sufficient cause for his non appearance at the hearing the decree may be set aside so far as it ordered payment by *B* personally and from the devasam property but it cannot be set aside so far as it directs *C* and *D* to pay the amount personally. *Lalia Koni v Marutha eera* (1909) 31 Mad 454.

*Class II*—Where against some of the defendants the decree is passed ex parte but against others who have appeared and defended the suit it is passed on the merits and the application to set aside the decree is made by one or more of the defendants against whom the decree was passed ex parte.—In this case the question arises whether if the decree is of such a nature that it cannot be set aside as against the applicant only but must be set aside also as against the defendants against whom the decree was passed on the merits the Court has the power to set aside the decree as against such defendants also. It is submitted that it has. The words the decree in the proviso mean the decree passed in the suit not only against the defendants who did not appear but also against the defendants who did appear. The words other defendants in the proviso mean defendants other than the applicant against whom the decree is passed whether as against them it was passed ex parte or after a hearing ( )

#### Illustrations

(a) *A* sues *A* and *B* alleging that *A* and *B* are in joint possession of certain immovable property and asking for a declaration that *A* is in joint possession with them. *A* appears and defends the suit. *B* does not appear. The Court finds that *A* and *B* are in joint possession and that *A* is entitled to joint possession with them and a decree is passed against *A* and *B* declaring that *A* is entitled to joint possession with them. Here the decree so far as regards *A* is passed after a hearing and as regards *B* it is ex parte.

(2) See the judgment of Banerjee J. in *Mahomed H. and Co. v. T. Kurren* (1899) 15 Cal 155, 159, 160 and cf.

*Altman J* in *Bhura Mal v. Har Kishan Das* (1902) 24 All 383, 400.

13 But there is *only one decree* and the words *the decree* in the proviso can only refer to that decree. Therefore if *B* applies for an order to set aside the decree and the decree is set aside as against him it must also be set aside as against *A* otherwise in the event of *B* succeeding in the suit this absurd position would arise that *A* and *B* being in joint possession of the property *A* would be in possession of a decree declaring him to be jointly in possession along with *A* and *B* whilst *B* would be in possession of a decree in his favour declaring that *A* is not entitled to joint possession with him and *A*. See *Lhura Mal v. Har Kishan Das* (1902) 24 All 383 at p. 400.

(b) *A* and *B* both Mahomedans pass a promissory note to *X* *B* dies leaving three heirs *H1* *H2* and *H3*. *X* sues *A* (surviving maker of the note) and *H1* *H2* and *H3* as heirs of *B*. *A* and *H1* appear at the hearing, and defend the suit. *H2* and *H3* do not appear. A decree is passed against all the defendants the liability of *H1* *H2* and *H3* under the decree being limited to the extent of the property of *B* inherited by them as *B*'s heirs. Here the decree so far as regards *A* and *H1* is passed after hearing and as regards *H2* and *H3* it is *ex parte*. *H2* and *H3* apply to have the decree set aside all going that the summons was not served upon them. The Court is satisfied that the summons was not served. Upon these facts the High Court of Calcutta held under the old section that the decree should be set aside not only as against *H2* and *H3* but also as against *A* and *H1* the ground of the decision being that the decree was *one and indivisible*. *Mahomed Harudulla v. Tokurenni* 1 I L R (1899) 2 Cal 130.

(c) *A* sues *B* and *B*'s mother *C* Native Christian upon a promissory note jointly passed by them. *B* appears at the hearing and defends the suit. *C* does not appear. A decree is passed against both defendants for the amount of the note. Here the decree so far as regards *B* is passed after a hearing and as regards *C* is *ex parte*. *C* applied for an order to set aside the decree all going that the summons was not served upon her. The Court finds that the summons was not served upon *C*. Upon these facts the High Court of Bombay held under the old section that if the decree were set aside as against *C* it should not be set aside as against *B* also. *B* having appeared and defended the suit. *Minakshi v. Sitaram* (1911) 18 Bom 147. If the Bombay decision means that the setting aside of a decree *ex parte* against a defendant does not necessarily revive the suit as against a defendant who has appeared and defended the suit the decision is still good law. But if it means that where a decree is passed *ex parte* against *A* and after a hearing against *B* the Court can set aside the decree only against *A* and cannot set it aside as against *B* the decision is no longer law as the proviso to the rule.

(d) *A* sues *B* and *C* for a declaration of title to certain lands and *D* and *E* (tenants of *B* and *C*) for possession of the lands. *B* and *C* appear and defend the suit. *D* and *E* do not appear. The Court passes a decree against all the four defendants, as against *A* and *C* declaring that the lands belong to *A* and as against *D* and *E* directing them to deliver possession of the lands to *A*. Here the decree against *D* and *E* is *ex parte* for they did not appear at the hearing. *D* and *E* apply for an order to set aside the decree all going that the summons was not served upon them. The Court is satisfied that the summons was not served. Should the decree be set aside as a whole that is against all the defendants *A* *C* *D* and *E* or should it be set aside against *D* and *E* only. The decree should not be set aside as a whole for the decree is not one and indivisible. The relief granted to *A* as against *B* and *C* is a declaration of title to the lands. The relief granted to *A* as against *D* and *E* is that they should deliver up possession of the lands to *A*. In fact the decree though nominally one really consists of two decrees each as against one set of defendants, the relief granted against each set being separately specified. Hence the decree may be set aside as against *D* and *E* but not as against *B* and *C*. If the relief granted against *B* and *C* is distinct from that granted against *D* and *E* who alone applied for an order to set aside the decree. *Mohammed Ali v. Varghese* (1919) 4 C W N 467.

(e) Issues *B C* and *D* the holders of a holding, for rent and an ex parte decree is passed against them *B* alone applies to set aside the decree. The decree may be set aside as against *B* but it should not be set aside as against *C* and *D* the reason being that a decree for rent can be passed against some holders of a holding without impleading the other holders. *Keshav Chandra v Joyfulnessa* (1927) 32 C.W.N. 507 (28) A.C. 397

Whether this rule applies to execution proceedings—This rule does not apply to proceedings in execution. See notes under the same head to r 9 above

Dismissal for default of application to set aside ex parte decree—See note to r 9 above. Dismissal for default of application to restore suit

Application to set aside ex parte decree after it has been executed—The fact that an ex parte decree has been satisfied does not preclude the defendant from applying to the Court for an order to set it aside under this rule. *A* obtains an ex parte decree against *B* and attaches *B*'s goods in execution of the decree. *B* pays the amount of the decree under protest and applies for an order to set aside the decree on the ground that the summons was not served upon him. The Courts may make an order setting aside the decree notwithstanding that the decree has been satisfied (a)

Effect of setting aside ex parte decree—When an ex parte decree is set aside all proceedings from the stage of the non appearance of the defendant are equally set aside (b)

Ex parte decree against firm—A decree against a firm cannot be said to be ex parte against a partner in the firm because he has not appeared at the hearing. An ex parte decree against a firm can be set aside on the ground that the summons was not duly served on the firm. If the summons was duly served upon the firm the decree cannot be set aside because one of the partners was not served. Under O 30 r 3 it is not necessary to serve every partner. Issues 1 & 2 (Co) a firm. The firm consists of two partners 1 and 2. The summons is served on 1 alone as a partner 2 is not served with the summons. Neither 1 nor 2 appears at the hearing and an ex parte decree is passed against the firm. The summons having been duly served on the firm the decree against the firm cannot be set aside because 2 was not served and he did not appear at the hearing (c)

Appeal—Where an application under this rule is dismissed an appeal lies from the order dismissing the application whether the dismissal was on merits or for default (d) [O 43 r 1 cl (d)]. But where the application is granted no appeal lies from the order granting the application (e). Where an application to set aside an ex parte decree has been dismissed for default and a fresh application is made to set aside such dismissal and the fresh application also is refused no appeal lies from the order refusing the fresh application (f)

Revision—It has been held by the High Court of Allahabad that an order setting aside an ex parte decree is not subject to revision under s 115 the reason given being that the validity of the order may be attacked under s 103 in an appeal from the final decree (g). The High Court of Madras has held that an order setting aside an ex parte decree may be set aside in revision if it is not based on any ground recognised by law (h)

(c) *Kerdool v Kachordal* (1899) 3 Ponn 716

(b) *Sal van v Am I rparanal m* (19-3) 5 Mad 1 J 6 11 I C 691 (4) A M 909 (1)

(c) *Id vppa v Ty ai* (19 1) 6 Bom I R 383 80 I C J (4) 4 R 366

(d) *M m m v Yodha v Firm C7a d a* (19 1) 6 Pat 4 4 101 I C 33 (7) A 1 440 *U ft v Lak* (19-3) 8 I C 333 11 I C 31 (7) 4 1 5-2

(e) *Shama Das v H rbum* (18 3) 18 Cal 4 6 *F al v H Am t* (1916) I K no 40 p 115 31 I C 914

(f) *Sharif v Ha t* (1922) 70 All L J 19 6 J I (22) A A 337 *Chad a ah t v Durga Prasad* (19-1) 16 All 535 72 I C 33 (1) A 4 6-2

(g) *Shridh Kaa v V Sur Fakir* (19 1) 19 All 1 J 90-61 I C 5-7 (22) A A 441

(h) *Subrama as v Vardarajal* (19-1) 33 Mad L J 110 103 I C 14 (7) 4 M 722

Where no application to set aside an ex parte decree is made within the period of limitation the Court has no inherent power under s. 151 to set it aside after the expiry of the period (3)

**14 [S 109]** No decree shall be set aside on any such application as aforesaid unless notice thereof has been served on the opposite party

**Opposite party** —Where in a suit for partition by A against B and C an ex parte decree is passed against B the opposite party on whom notice should be served under this rule is A the plaintiff and not C the co defendant (1)

## ORDER X

### *Examination of Parties by the Court*

1 [S 117] At the first hearing of the suit the Court shall ascertain from each party or his pleader whether he admits or denies such allegations of facts as are made in the complaint or written statement (if any) of the opposite party, and as are not expressly or by necessary implication admitted or denied by the party against whom they are made. The Court shall record such admissions and denials.

2 [S 118] At the first hearing of the suit, or at any subsequent hearing, any party appearing in person or present in Court, or any person able to answer any material questions relating to the suit by whom such party or his pleader is accompanied may be examined orally by the Court, and the Court may, if it thinks fit, put in the course of such examination questions suggested by either party.

Object of examination under this rule.—The object of examination under this rule is not to take evidence or ascertain what is to be the evidence in the case but to determine the *matters in dispute* between the parties (i)

**3** [S 119] The substance of the examination shall be reduced to writing by the Judge, and shall form part of the record

Substance of examination to be written

- (N) Kruthna sach na v Gutang mmal (19 4)  
47 Mad 8 1 80 I C 87 (°) A M 14  
(J) Ajodha v M attamm PA Iker (19 1) Pat  
77 65 I C 341 (°) A P 479 See also  
Decud d v Iru m Day (19 5) 7 Lah I  
L 13 80 I C 35 (°) A L 31

- (K) *Ha k dha v lbrah m* (19 ) 47 Elm 11 6  
I C 169 (79) A B 207
- (J) *S l v tne in* (1977) Cal 3 103 IC  
890 ( ) A C 69
- (u) *G ya v Tw chr m* (1993) 15 Cal 533  
1 I A 119

**Chartered High Courts**—This rule does not apply to Chartered High Courts in the exercise of their ordinary or extraordinary original civil jurisdiction [O 49 r 3 cl (2)]

**4 [S 120]** (1) Where the pleader of any party who appears by a pleader or any such person accompanying a pleader as is referred to in rule 2 refuses or is unable to answer any material question relating to the suit which the Court is of opinion that the party whom he represents ought to answer, and is likely to be able to answer if interrogated in person, the Court may postpone the hearing of the suit to a future day and direct that such party shall appear in person on such day

(2) If such party fails without lawful excuse to appear in person on the day so appointed, the Court may pronounce judgment against him, or make such order in relation to the suit as it thinks fit

**Direct that such party shall appear in person**—Under this rule an order directing a party to appear in person can only be made if the pleader who represents him has refused or is unable to answer material questions (a) See O 9 r 12

**Appeal**—An appeal lies from an order pronouncing judgment against a party under sub r (2) [O 43 r 1 cl (c)] Where in a suit by A against B C and D the Court struck off B's defence owing to his failure to appear in person but ultimately decided the case on the merits and passed a decree against all three defendants their defences being similar it was held that B was not entitled to appeal from the order striking off his defence but that he was at liberty to appeal from the final decree and in that appeal to object to the order striking off his defence [a 10a] (o)

**Res judicata**—A dismissal of a suit under sub r (2) operates as res judicata so as to bar a subsequent suit in respect of the same matter (p)

## ORDER XI

### *Discovery and Inspection*

**1 [R S C O 31, 1, Cf S 121]** In any suit the plaintiff or defendant by leave of the Court may deliver interrogatories in writing for the examination of the opposite parties or any one or more of such parties and such interrogatories when delivered shall have a note at the foot thereof stating which of such interrogatories each of such persons is required to answer Provided that no party shall deliver more than one set of interrogatories to the same party without

Discovery by Interrogatories

an order for that purpose. Provided also that interrogatories which do not relate to any matters in question in the suit shall be deemed irrelevant, notwithstanding that they might be admissible on the oral cross examination of a witness.

**Discovery by interrogatories**—Every party to a suit is entitled to know the nature of his opponent's case (g) so that he may know beforehand what case he has to meet at the hearing (r). But he is not entitled to know the facts which constitute exclusively the evidence of his opponent's case the reason being that it would enable an unscrupulous party to tamper with his opponent's witnesses and to manufacture evidence in contradiction and so shape his case as to defeat justice (s). The nature of a plaintiff's case is disclosed in his plaint. The nature of a defendant's case is disclosed in his written statement. But a plaint or a written statement may not sufficiently disclose the nature of a party's case and to make good the deficiency either party may administer interrogatories in writing to the other through the Court. Interrogatories may also be administered by a party to his opponent to obtain admissions from him to facilitate the proof of his own case. The party to whom interrogatories are administered must answer them in writing and on oath (r 8). This is called *discovery* by interrogatories. The party to whom the interrogatories are administered discloses or discloses by his affidavit in answer to the interrogatories the nature of his case.

Every suit contemplates two sets of facts namely, (1) facts which constitute a party's case and (2) facts by which a party's case is to be proved (see O 6 r 2). The first set of facts discloses the nature of a party's case. The second set forms the evidence of his case. Thus if A sues B for damages for breach of a contract A must prove (1) the contract and (2) breach of the contract. These two facts constitute A's case and determine the nature of A's case. Therefore B may administer interrogatories to A to elicit particulars of (1) the contract and (2) the breach thereof. He may also interrogate A to obtain admissions from him to facilitate the proof of his own case. But he is not entitled to administer interrogatories to ascertain the evidence by which A will prove these two facts. Thus B may not ask who was present at the time when the alleged contract was made in other words it is not permissible to ask the names of A's witnesses (t). But if the name and address of a person is itself a relevant fact an interrogatory as to that name and address is not rendered inadmissible merely because it involves the disclosure of a witness's name (u). In a suit for the recovery of the amount of a hundi drawn by the defendant for an advance of Rs 5000 made by the plaintiff and to have been dishonoured by non payment the defendant is entitled to discovery of the form in which consideration was paid and particulars of the time and place when and where defendant accepted the hundi and the names and addresses of persons by whom and the time and place at which the hundi was presented for payment. All these are material facts which constitute the plaintiff's case (v). See notes to O 6 r 4. Object of particulars. See also note below. Interrogatories relating to names of persons.

**What interrogatories may be allowed**—In England interrogatories are allowed for the following purposes—

- (1) To ascertain the nature of your opponent's case or the material facts constituting his case (w).

(g) *Sunders v. Jones* (1877) 7 C D 43.  
(r) *Marrvott v. Chamberlain* (1886) 17 Q B D 151.  
(s) *Debo v. Low* (1880) 16 C D 93 9. *Re Strahan* (1891) 11 Ch 439 44. 447 448.  
(t) *McColla v. Jones* (1887) 4 Times Rep L.  
*Eade v. Jacobs* (1871) 3 Ex D 335.  
*Marrvott v. Chamberlain* (1886) 17 Q B D 151.  
*Nash v. Layton* [1911] Ch 71.

(u) *Marrvott v. Chamberlain* (1886) 17 Q B D 151.  
(v) *Bajjnath v. F. ghunath* (1914) 41 Cal 6 11.  
(w) *Eade v. Jacobs* (1877) 3 Ex D 335 337.  
*Almonet v. Neal v. C. Hall* (1881) 0 C D 519 533. *Marrvott v. Chamberlain* (1886) 17 Q B D 151.

(2) *To support your own case either*

- (a) directly by obtaining admissions or  
(b) indirectly by impeaching or destroying your adversary's case (2)

Case (1) has already been dealt with. The following is an illustration of Case 2. *A* sues *B* to recover P<sup>o</sup> 5 000 for making model machinery for exhibition. The defence is that the machinery was defective and unworkable. *A* may interrogate *B* whether the machinery did not obtain a prize at the exhibition. If it did it is clear that the answer would tend to destroy *B*'s case and support *A*'s case (y). Moreover the answer will serve as an admission from *B* and the getting of admissions by interrogatories is always allowed for it supports the party's case. ( )

There is one *exception* to the rule in Case 2 (b). *A* sues to eject *B* from a piece of land alleging that the land belongs to him and that *B* is wrongfully in possession thereof. This is an action of ejectment. *A* is plaintiff in ejectment and *B* is defendant in ejectment. In an action of ejectment the plaintiff must prove his own title affirmatively. It is not enough for him to impeach or destroy the defendant's title. If he does not establish his own title to the land he will not be entitled to a decree though he may succeed in impeaching or even destroying the defendant's title. The reason is that the defendant being in possession he cannot be dispossessed of the land except by proof of title on the part of the claimant. Hence the plaintiff in ejectment should not be allowed to interrogate the defendant merely for the purpose of destroying or impeaching the defendant's title (a). And this is the *Exception* above referred to. But the plaintiff in ejectment is entitled to interrogate the defendant as to any matter relating to the defendant's title that may support his case directly (b). The same principles apply in the case of discovery by production of documents.

The High Court of Calcutta has said that interrogatories in India should not be allowed for the first of the above purposes that is to ascertain the nature of your opponent's case but that they may be allowed for the second that is to support your own case (c). This is on the ground that where a party has not sufficiently disclosed his case it is the Court that has to determine the exact nature of his case by procedure under O 9 r 7 and O 14 rr 12 and that it is not therefore permissible to the *opposite party* to get that information by *discovery*. But these rules are it is submitted intended not to supersede but to supplement discovery and there is no reason why any distinction should be drawn between the English and the Indian practice (d).

What interrogatories may not be allowed — The c may be divided into three

1. A party is not entitled to a ministerial interrogatories for admission of facts which constitute exclusively the evidence of his adversary's case or title (e).

4 partly is not entitled to interrogate as to any confidential communications between him and his legal advisers

3. A party is not entitled to execute interrogatories which would invade claims as injurious to public interests.

See notes to r 11 below (rounds of objection to production of documents)

(x) *Gray brecht* 1 y (1 41) S W R (1 42) 4 5 11 *Gray brecht* (1901) 4 Q 11 45 4 17 *Gray brecht* (1 42) 4 Q 11 45 4 17 *Gray brecht* (1 42) 4 Q 11 45 4 17

(y) *Hall's L. red* (1 43) W N F 1 5

(z) *W. v. General* (1 44) 4 Q 11 45 4 17

(a) *W. v. General* (1 44) 4 Q 11 45 4 17

(b) *W. v. General* (1 44) 4 Q 11 45 4 17

(c) *W. v. General* (1 44) 4 Q 11 45 4 17

(d) *W. v. General* (1 44) 4 Q 11 45 4 17

(e) *W. v. General* (1 44) 4 Q 11 45 4 17



1

**Interrogatories relating to names of persons**—Interrogatories relating to the names of persons not already parties to the action are only allowable where the object is either to make the proceedings complete and effective for all purposes or to enable the plaintiff more effectively to substantiate the case which he makes against the existing defendant (f) Such interrogatories are not allowable in any other case Thus in a suit by the vendor against the purchaser for specific performance of a contract for sale the plaintiff is not entitled to interrogate the defendant for the purpose of discovering whether he was acting as agent for an undisclosed principal The only object of such an interrogatory is to give the plaintiff the opportunity of releasing the defendant and of securing for the plaintiff some other person liable under the contract in substitution for and not jointly with the defendant (g)

As to interrogatories as to names of witnesses see note above Discovery by interrogatories and notes to O 6 r 4 Object of particulars As to interrogatories as to names of informants in defamation cases see the undermentioned cases (h)

**Refusal by company to register transfer**—Where an article of a company's articles of association empowers the directors without assigning any reason to decline to register any transfer of shares not fully paid up made to any person not approved by them or made by any member jointly or alone indebted to the company and the company refuses to register a transfer the company is not entitled in an action for a declaration that the refusal was wrongful to refuse to state which of the grounds mentioned in the article the directors had acted under although it might refuse to say what reasons influenced them in exercising their discretion before that ground (i)

**Foreign law**—An interrogatory involving a question of foreign law is not permissible unless the party interrogated is shown to be an expert in that law (j)

**Time for delivery of interrogatories**—A plaintiff may under this rule deliver interrogatories to a defendant even before the filing of the written statement But there is this difference if the English practice is to be followed here that in what are called *common law actions* interrogatories if delivered before filing the written statement will as a rule be struck out under r 7 as unnecessary and vexatious unless sufficient reasons are given by the plaintiff to explain why the interrogatories are necessary at that stage of the suit (l) while in suits of the nature of *chancery actions* (l) they may as a rule be allowed though no written statement has been filed (m)

A defendant as a rule is not allowed to deliver interrogatories to the plaintiff before he has filed his written statement (n)

**Leave of Court**—The application for leave to administer interrogatories is as a rule made ex parte In determining whether leave should be granted the Court should consider whether it is a fit and proper case for administering interrogatories Leave should be refused if the interrogatories are scandalous or are an abuse of the process of the Court But it is not the duty of the Court when granting leave to consider what particular questions the party interrogated should be compelled to answer The proper time for considering that question is after the party interrogated has made his affidavit in answer [r 8] (o) See r 2 below

(f) *Thol v L* 18 5) 10 Ex 701 *Hancock v Leblanc* (1878) 3 C P D 197 10

(g) *Sebright v Hoadley* [1916] 2 Ch 215

(h) *Chapman v Leach* [1900] 1 K B 338 [1900] 1 K B 135 [action for libel in a newspaper] *Lyle v Mulholland* 18 11 135 [action for libel in a newspaper]

(i) *Sheriff v D* 18 11 135 [action for libel in a newspaper] *Settlem v Corporation* [1906] 1 Ch 746

(j) *Perlet v Petroleum* [1906] 1 Ch 746 [1906] 1 Ch 746

(k) *Mercer v Cotton* (1876) 1 Q B D 44 and

*see Strong v Tappin* (1876) W N [Eng]

(l) That is actions assigned by the Judicature Act 1873 s 34 to the Chancery Division

(m) *Hoadley v Bank of London* (1878) 9 C D 616 [1878] 9 C D 616

(n) *Doe v Langborne* (1876) C D 61 [1876] C D 61

(o) *Sham Kishore v Shalabhoor* (1880) 5 Cal 70 [1880] 5 Cal 70

Where opposite party is a minor or lunatic—Where a party to a suit is a minor or a lunatic interrogatories may be administered to his next friend or guardian *ad litem* as the case may be see r 23 below

(1) Not every question which could be asked to a witness in the box may be put as an interrogatory. Thus questions which are put only to test the credibility of a person will not be allowed although of course they may be asked in cross examination (g)

**Impleading party for discovery**—A person cannot be made a party to a suit solely for the purpose of discovery (s)

**Probate proceedings**—O 11 applies by virtue of s 266 of the Indian Succession Act 39 of 1925 to proceedings in probate (u)

Particular interrogatories  
to be submitted

Power of Court under this rule.—It is to be noted that the Court has no power under this rule to settle interrogatories but to state only what interrogatories shall be administered (c). Further the allowance by the Court of interrogatories to be administered to a party does not amount to a decision that the party is bound to answer them but leaves him at liberty to take any objection to answers which he might otherwise have taken (c). See p. 67 below.

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| (p) <i>Follow v. Kirby</i> (1900) 15 C. D. 16 5890<br>v. <i>Smith</i> (1906) 14 Q. B. D. 193 10961   | (r) <i>Attorney General v. Gask</i> (1771) 2 Q. B. 11, 17            |
| (q) <i>HA. en v. Ladoche</i> (1868) 3 Q. B. D. 654<br>654 <i>Kennedy v. Dodson</i> [1901] 1 Ch. 338<br>338 538 <i>RA. Owen v. E. Ryors</i> (1913)<br>371 m 347 171 C. 15 | (s) <i>Attorney General v. Gask</i> (1771) 2 Q. B. 11, 17<br>519 524 |
| (r) <i>Attorney General v. Gask</i> (1771) 2 Q. B. 11, 17<br>519 524   | (t) <i>Attorney General v. Gask</i> (1771) 2 Q. B. 11, 17<br>519 524 |
| (s) <i>Attorney General v. Gask</i> (1771) 2 Q. B. 11, 17<br>519 524   | (u) <i>Attorney General v. Gask</i> (1771) 2 Q. B. 11, 17<br>519 524 |
| (t) <i>Attorney General v. Gask</i> (1771) 2 Q. B. 11, 17<br>519 524   | (v) <i>Attorney General v. Gask</i> (1771) 2 Q. B. 11, 17<br>519 524 |
| (u) <i>Attorney General v. Gask</i> (1771) 2 Q. B. 11, 17<br>519 524   | (w) <i>Attorney General v. Gask</i> (1771) 2 Q. B. 11, 17<br>519 524 |
| (v) <i>Attorney General v. Gask</i> (1771) 2 Q. B. 11, 17<br>519 524   | (x) <i>Attorney General v. Gask</i> (1771) 2 Q. B. 11, 17<br>519 524 |
| (w) <i>Attorney General v. Gask</i> (1771) 2 Q. B. 11, 17<br>519 524   | (y) <i>Attorney General v. Gask</i> (1771) 2 Q. B. 11, 17<br>519 524 |
| (x) <i>Attorney General v. Gask</i> (1771) 2 Q. B. 11, 17<br>519 524   | (z) <i>Attorney General v. Gask</i> (1771) 2 Q. B. 11, 17<br>519 524 |
| (y) <i>Attorney General v. Gask</i> (1771) 2 Q. B. 11, 17<br>519 524   |  |
| (z) <i>Attorney General v. Gask</i> (1771) 2 Q. B. 11, 17<br>519 524   |  |

**Running down cases**—In running down cases only such interrogatories should be allowed as may be necessary for disposing fairly of the suit or for saving costs within this rule (x)

**3 [R S C, O 31 r 3 Cf S 123]** In adjusting the costs of the suit inquiry shall at the instance of any party be made into the propriety of exhibiting such interrogatories, and if it is the opinion of the taxing officer or of the Court, either with or without an application for inquiry, that such interrogatories have been exhibited unreasonably, vexatiously, or at improper length, the cost occasioned by the said interrogatories and the answer thereto shall be paid in any event by the party in fault

*Costs of interrogatories.*

**4 [New R S C, O 31, r 4]** Interrogatories shall be in Form No 2 in Appendix C, with such variations as circumstances may require

*Form of interrogatories*

**5 [R S C O 31 r 5 Cf S 124]** Where any party to a suit is a corporation or a body of persons, whether incorporated or not, empowered by law to sue or be sued whether in its own name or in the name of any officer or other person any opposite party may apply for an order allowing him to deliver interrogatories to any member or officer of such corporation or body, and an order may be made accordingly

*Corporations*

**Delivery of interrogatories to an officer of a corporation**—A corporate body cannot answer for itself and if it is necessary that some officer should answer for it His answer is the answer of the Company and can be read against the Company Therefore he is only bound to answer with reference to knowledge acquired in the course of his employment by the Company and as the result of inquiries made by him of the other officers and agent of the Company with regard to their knowledge acquired in the same way He is not bound to answer as to his own knowledge or to make inquiries of the other officers or agents of the Company as to their knowledge acquired accidentally or in some other capacity (y)

**6 [R S C O 32 r 6 Cf S 125]** Any objection to answering any interrogatory on the ground that it is scandalous or irrelevant or not exhibited bona fide for the purpose of the suit, or that the matters inquired into are not sufficiently material at that stage, or on any other ground, may be taken in the affidavit in answer

*Objections to interrogatories by answer*

(x) *Griebart v Morris* [1901] 1 K. B. 69  
(y) *Welbeck Incandescent Gas Light Co v* [1900] Ch. 1 S. Light Inc. Incandescent Co

**Scandalous interrogatories**—Certainly nothing can be scandalous which is relevant ( ) Interrogatories which tend to incriminate a party are not scandalous if they are relevant (a)

**Irrelevant interrogatories**—The discovery by interrogatories as distinguished from cross examination must be *directly relevant* to the matter in issue (b) Thus in an action for damages against the defendant for seducing the plaintiff's daughter the defendant cannot be asked how rich he is as it is perfectly irrelevant in such cases whether the defendant is rich or poor the true measure of damages being the amount of compensation to be paid to the plaintiff for the injury he has sustained by the seduction of his daughter But interrogatories as to whether the defendant has had sexual intercourse with the daughter and whether he had stated that he believed that she had not had such intercourse with any other man are allowable (c) Similarly interrogatories will not be allowed if the defence at which they aim would be no defence in law to the suit (d)

Where a party seeks discovery of documents and the opposite party alleges that the documents are *not relevant* the procedure to be followed is that laid down in r 19 sub r (a) below A party should not be compelled by means of interrogatories to give discovery of document the relevancy of which is denied (e)

**Not exhibited bona fide for the purpose of the suit**—Though an interrogatory may be relevant it may be objected to on the ground that it is put with a view to serve an ulterior object beyond the scope of the suit

**Not sufficiently material at that stage**—An interrogatory may be perfectly relevant to a suit and put *bona fide* for the purposes of the suit but if it is premature it will not be allowed (f) This may be illustrated by the following cases—

- (1) *A* sues *B* for breach of an alleged trust and for profits made by *B* by such breach *B* denies the alleged trust *A* is not entitled to interrogate *B* so as to require from him an account of profits of the alleged trust fund unless the trust is proved (g) but it is otherwise if the breach of trust is admitted (h)
- (2) In *Fennessy v Clark* (i) the plaintiff's interrogatories as to the amount of damages were held to be premature as it was not yet decided whether the plaintiff was entitled to any damages at all Cotton J said "The Court is always unwilling before the right to relief is established to make an order for discovery which may be injurious to the defendant and will only be useful to the plaintiff if he succeeds in establishing his title to relief"

**Or any other ground**—Besides the three specific grounds mentioned in the rule a party interrogated may object to answer an interrogatory on the ground that it is *prolix*, *oppressive*, *unnecessary* or *scandalous* (r 7) or on the grounds specified in the notes to r 1 What interrogatories may not be allowed on p 51 above

**Fishing interrogatories not allowed**—The questions asked must not be fishing that is to say they must refer to some definite and existing state of circumstances and must not be put merely in the hope of discovering something which may help the party interrogating to make out some case (j) See *Ogden* on 11 a line 9th Ed p 118 For instances of fishing interrogatories see *41s Kalar v Gobind Das* (k)

- (1) *Fisher v O'Connell* (1855) 8 C D 615 655 per Cotton L J
- (2) *Clitherton v Lobo* (1894) 3 Q B D 654 (1888) 8 C D 615 per Lord
- (3) *Fisher v O'Connell* (1855) 8 C D 615 655 per Lord
- (4) *Hodgson v Taylor* (1873) 12 B 9 Q B 9
- (5) *Lover v Lamberth & Co* (1901) 1 Q B 1153

- (6) *Lawson v Scott* (1894) 13 Cal 11
- (7) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (8) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (9) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (10) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (11) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (12) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (13) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (14) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (15) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (16) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (17) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (18) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (19) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (20) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (21) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (22) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (23) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (24) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (25) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (26) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (27) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (28) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (29) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (30) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (31) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (32) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (33) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (34) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (35) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (36) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (37) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (38) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (39) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (40) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (41) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (42) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (43) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (44) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (45) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (46) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (47) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (48) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (49) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (50) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (51) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (52) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (53) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (54) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (55) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (56) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (57) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (58) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (59) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (60) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (61) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (62) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (63) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (64) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (65) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (66) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (67) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (68) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (69) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (70) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (71) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (72) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (73) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (74) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (75) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (76) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (77) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (78) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (79) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (80) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (81) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (82) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (83) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (84) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (85) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (86) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (87) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (88) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (89) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (90) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (91) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (92) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (93) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (94) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (95) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (96) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (97) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (98) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (99) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11
- (100) *Verlarm v Le & Co* (1891) 13 Cal 11

**Contracts by way of wager**—In cases where the defence of wager is set up the Court will refuse to allow the party setting up this defence to interrogate his opponent generally as to his business transactions apart from the particular transactions in the suit the reason being that it is manifestly unfair to compel a person to disclose his general dealings on the chance that thereby his opponent may discover something that will support his case (l)

**Defamation**—Where a statement of claim in an action for slander alleges publication to one named person and publication also to various other persons unnamed it is not generally permissible to ask the defendant whether he uttered the words complained of to any person or persons other than the person named and if so to give their names. Such an interrogatory is a fishing interrogatory the object being to find out some cause of action against the defendant other than the specific cause of action alleged in the plaint (m)

**7 [New R S C, O 31, r 7]** Any interrogatories may be set aside on the ground that they have been exhibited unreasonably or vexatiously, or struck out on the ground that they are prolix, oppressive, unnecessary or scandalous, and any application for this purpose may be made within seven days after service of the interrogatories

Setting aside and striking out interrogatories

**Setting aside and striking out interrogatories**—4 as trustee in the bankruptcy of C sues B for a declaration that a piece of land purchased by B and C in 1883 was purchased by B and C in partnership B denies the partnership A exhibits interrogatories to B asking for particulars of purchases of land by B and C previous and subsequent to 1883 to prove that they had been co partners in various other purchases similar to that of 1883 The interrogatories are irrelevant and oppressive and must be struck out To ask the defendant to take the trouble to go through his books and papers for so many years is vexatious and oppressive (n)

The present rule does not apply where the interrogatories are merely irrelevant. An objection that an interrogatory is irrelevant must be taken in the affidavit in answer (r 6) and is no ground for setting aside the interrogatory under this rule (o)

There is no foundation for the opinion that a person who has a ground for refusing to answer [an interrogatory] is precluded from availing himself of that ground because he has not applied to have the interrogatory struck out (p)

**8 [R S C, O 31, r 8, S 126]** Interrogatories shall be answered by affidavit to be filed within ten days, or within such other time as the Court may allow

Affidavit in answer

**Answers as to matters done by agent or servant of party interrogated**—A party to a suit is not excused from answering interrogatories relevant to the question in issue on the ground that they are as to matters which are not within his own knowledge but are only within the knowledge of his agents or servants if such knowledge has been acquired by them in the ordinary course of their employment. He is bound to obtain the information from such agents or servants unless he shows that it would be unreasonable to require him to do so as for instance if either such agents or

(l) *Bhakra Lal v Burfory* (1913) 37 Bom 317  
171 C 15  
(m) *Barlam v Hrd gfield* (1913) 4 P 193

( ) *Kennedy v Dodson* [1895] 1 Ch 331  
(o) *Dalgleish v Louth* [1899] Q B 590  
(p) *Fisher v O'ern* (1878) 8 C D 615 64

servants have left his employment or if it would occasion unreasonable expense or an unreasonable amount of delay or the like (q) A party's banker or solicitor is his agent within the meaning of the above rule (r) But a party is not bound to disclose matters that have come to the knowledge of his agents or servants otherwise than in the ordinary course of their employment (s)

**9** [New R S C, O 31, r 9] An affidavit in answer to interrogatories shall be in Form No 3 in Appendix C, with such variations as circumstances may require

Form of affidavit in answer

**10** [New R S C O 31, r 10] No exceptions shall be taken to any affidavit in answer, but the sufficiency or otherwise of any such affidavit objected to as insufficient shall be determined by the Court

No exception to be taken

**11** [R S C O 32 r 11 S 127] Where any person interrogated omits to answer, or answers insufficiently, the party interrogating may apply to the Court for an order requiring him to answer, or to answer further, as the case may be And an order may be made requiring him to answer or answer further, either by affidavit or by *in loco* examination, as the Court may direct

Order to answer or answer further

**Application for further answer to interrogatories**—An application for a further answer to interrogatories ought to specify the interrogatories or parts of interrogatories to which a further answer is required (t)

**Answers insufficiently**—With regard to an answer to interrogatories what the Court has to consider is this simply whether the answer is insufficient not to go into the question of the truthfulness of the answer but to see whether it is sufficient or not and if it is insufficient then only can it require a further answer (u)

When an answer is couched in a form which makes it embarrassing that is to say which prevents the person who asks for it from using it without having thrust upon him irrelevant matters as part of it the answer is insufficient and the proper course to pursue is to ask that a further answer shall be made (v)

**Privilege**—Where in an answer to interrogatories the party interrogated declines to give further information on the ground of privilege and the privilege is properly claimed in law the Court will not require a further answer to be put in unless it is clearly satisfied either from the nature of the subject matter for which privilege is claimed or from statements in the answer itself or in documents so referred to as to become part of the answer that the claim for privilege cannot possibly be substantiated There is no *existence of reasonable suspicion* which is sufficient to justify the Court in requiring a further affidavit of documents is not enough when a claim for privilege in an answer

(q) *Dodd v Leigh and Co v Fisher* (1842)  
10 Q B D 161 *Easton v Arop* 4 C  
1 to *Levey and C* (1834)  
24 C D 110 115  
(r) *Alford v Smith* [1901]—Ct 111  
(s) *Welsch v Incorporated Gas Light & Co v*

*New South Wales v Macfarlane* (1900)  
Ch 1 10-11  
(t) *A. J. & Co. v North and South Western & S. Bay*  
(1901) 11 C D 479  
(u) *J. & K. v. J. & K.* (1911) 2 C D 1  
(v) *Id.* p. 5

to interrogatories is sought to be falsified (u) See notes to r 13 below  
 3 Conclusiveness of affidavit of documents

Consequence of failure to answer interrogatories—See r 21 below

12 [R S C, O 31, r 12, S 129] Any party may, with  
 out filing any affidavit, apply to the Court  
 Application for discovery of documents for an order directing any other party  
 to any suit to make discovery on oath of the  
 documents which are or have been in his possession or power,  
 relating to any matter in question therein. On the hearing  
 of such application the Court may either refuse or adjourn the  
 same, if satisfied that such discovery is not necessary, or not  
 necessary at that stage of the suit, or make such order, either  
 generally or limited to certain classes of documents, as may,  
 in its discretion, be thought fit. Provided that discovery  
 shall not be ordered when and so far as the Court shall be of  
 opinion that it is not necessary either for disposing fairly of  
 the suit or for saving costs.

13 [R S C, O 31, r 13, S 129, 2nd para] The affidavit  
 Affidavit of documents to be made by a party against whom  
 such order as is mentioned in the last pre-  
 ceding rule has been made, shall specify which (if any) of  
 the documents therein mentioned he objects to produce, and it  
 shall be in Form No 5 in Appendix C, with such variations  
 as circumstances may require.

Discovery and production of documents—Besides discovery by way of  
 answer to interrogatories there is another species of discovery called *discovery of docu-*  
*ments*. The parties to a suit may have in their possession or power documents relating  
*to the matters in question in the suit*. These documents may be divided into two classes—

- (i) those which the adversary is entitled to inspect and
- (ii) those which he is not entitled to inspect

Documents which belong to class (ii) are described and classified below under the  
 head Grounds of objection to production of documents. As to class (i) it may be  
 said that the adversary is entitled to inspection of all documents which do not come  
 within class (ii). Speaking generally we may say that the adversary is entitled to  
 inspection of all documents which do not of themselves constitute *exclusively* the party's  
*evidence* of his case or title. But how is inspection to be obtained? If A wants to  
 inspect documents in the possession of B which he is entitled to inspect it is clear that  
 he cannot inspect them unless they are produced by B. A must therefore call upon  
 B to produce the documents. But how can A do this unless he knows what documents  
 are in the possession or power of B? To enable him to obtain this information A is  
 entitled to *discovery* from B of the documents in his possession or power (x). For this

(u) *Lyell v Kennedy* (1831) — C D 1

(x) See Municipal Board of Ypres v *Chapelle*

Lal (1900) 41 All 606 65 I C 991 (2)  
 A A 1

purpose *A* may apply to the Court for an order requiring *B* to make an affidavit called *O 11 affidavit of documents* stating what documents are in his possession or power relating to the matters in dispute in the suit. When the Court makes the order *B* is bound to make his affidavit of documents and if he fails to do so he will be subjected to the penalties specified in r 21 below. After *B* has disclosed his documents by affidavit *A* may require him to *produce* for his inspection such of the documents as he is in law entitled to inspect.

**Contents of affidavit of documents**—A party who is ordered to make his affidavit of document should *set forth* in the affidavit all documents which *are* or *have been* in his possession or power relating to all matters in question in the suit. As to documents which *are not but have been* in his possession or power he must state what has become of them and in whose possession they are in order that the opposite party may be enabled to get production from the persons who have possession of them. For the same reason if there are any documents in which he has a *joint* property with other persons not before the Court he must state the names of those persons. Rule 13 provides that every affidavit of documents should also specify which of the documents therein *set forth* the declarant objects to *produce* for the inspection of the opposite party together with the grounds of such objection (see App C Form No 5). These grounds are three in number and are detailed below. The Court examines these grounds when it is called upon to make an order for *production* of the documents in a party's possession for the inspection of the opposite party (r 14).

**Grounds of objection to production of documents**—Production of documents can be resisted as of right on three grounds (1) as disclosing the party's evidence (2) as being within the doctrine of legal professional privilege and (3) as being injurious to public interests.

1 A party is not bound to produce for the inspection of his opponent documents which of themselves evidence exclusively the party's own case or title (y)—Documents constituting evidence of the party's case or title are not protected unless they are solely or exclusively evidence of it. Where a document is or may be evidence for the adversary as well as the party the party cannot withhold inspection of it from the adversary (z) although his own evidence may be thus disclosed (a). It is not enough for a man to say such and such documents are the title deeds of his property: it is no ground for refusing their production if they are necessary to support the adversary's case (b). But a document is protected from production and inspection if it exclusively evidences a party's own case and does not support the adversary's case (c). To entitle the party to this protection the privilege must be properly claimed: that he must state in his affidavit that the documents constitute evidence of his own case or title, that they contain nothing supporting or tending to support the adversary's case or title, and that they contain nothing impugning his own case or title (d). As to discovery in actions of ejectment see notes to r 1 above. What interrogatories may be allowed.

and his legal adviser(s) — The object of this rule is to enable persons to obtain legal advice

- [illegible]



to interrogatories is sought to be falsified (u) See notes to r 13 below  
 Conclusion of affidavit of documents

Consequence of failure to answer interrogatories—See r 21 below

**12** [R S C, O 31, r 12, S 129] Any party may, with out filing any affidavit, apply to the Court for an order directing any other party to any suit to make discovery on oath of the documents which are or have been in his possession or power, relating to any matter in question therein. On the hearing of such application the Court may either refuse or adjourn the same, if satisfied that such discovery is not necessary, or not necessary at that stage of the suit, or make such order, either generally or limited to certain classes of documents, as may, in its discretion, be thought fit. Provided that discovery shall not be ordered when and so far as the Court shall be of opinion that it is not necessary either for disposing fairly of the suit or for saving costs.

**13** [R S C, O 31 r 13 S 129, 2nd para] The affidavit to be made by a party against whom such order as is mentioned in the last preceding rule has been made, shall specify which (if any) of the documents therein mentioned he objects to produce, and it shall be in Form No 5 in Appendix C, with such variations as circumstances may require.

**Discovery and production of documents**—Besides discovery by way of answer to interrogatories there is another species of discovery called *discovery of documents*. The parties to a suit may have in their possession or power documents relating to the matters in question in the suit. These documents may be divided into two classes—

- (i) those which the adversary is entitled to inspect and
- (ii) those which he is not entitled to inspect

Documents which belong to class (ii) are described and classified below under the head Grounds of objection to production of documents. As to class (i) it may be said that the adversary is entitled to inspection of all documents which do not come within class (ii). Speaking generally we may say that the adversary is entitled to inspection of all documents which do not of themselves constitute *exclusively* the party's evidence of his case or title. But how is inspection to be obtained? If A wants to inspect documents in the possession of B which he is entitled to inspect it is clear that he cannot inspect them unless they are produced by B. A must therefore call upon B to produce the documents. But how can A do this unless he knows what documents are in the possession or power of B? To enable him to obtain this information A is entitled to *discovery* from B of the documents in his possession or power (x). For this

(u) *Lyell v Kennedy* (1881) — C. D. 1  
 (x) See *Municipal Board of Ayra v Ashraf* |

*Lal* (19 ) 41 All 616 I C 634 (22)  
 A A 2

purpose *A* may apply to the Court for an order requiring *B* to make an affidavit called *affidavit of documents* stating what documents are in his possession or power relating to the matters in dispute in the suit. When the Court makes the order *B* is bound to make his affidavit of documents and if he fails to do so he will be subjected to the penalties specified in r 21 below. After *B* has disclosed his documents by affidavit *A* may require him to produce for his inspection such of the documents as he is in law entitled to inspect.

**Contents of affidavit of documents**—A party who is ordered to make his affidavit of documents should set forth in the affidavit all documents which are or have been in his possession or power relating to all matters in question in the suit. As to documents which are not but have been in his possession or power he must state what has become of them and in whose possession they are in order that the opposite party may be enabled to get production from the persons who have possession of them. For the same reason if there are any documents in which he has a joint property with other persons not before the Court he must state the names of those persons. Rule 13 provides that every affidavit of documents should also specify which of the documents therein set forth the declarant objects to produce for the inspection of the opposite party together with the grounds of such objection (App C Form No 5). These grounds are three in number and are detailed below. The Court examines these grounds when it is called upon to make an order for production of the documents in a party's possession for the inspection of the opposite party (r 14).

**Grounds of objection to production of documents**—Production of documents can be resisted as of right on three grounds (1) as disclosing the party's evidence (2) as being within the doctrine of legal professional privilege and (3) as being injurious to public interests.

(1) *A party is not bound to produce for the inspection of his opponent documents which of themselves evidence exclusively the party's own case or title* (y)—Documents constituting evidence of the party's case or title are not protected unless they are solely or exclusively evidence of it. Where a document is or may be evidence for the adversary as well as the party the party cannot withhold inspection of it from the adversary (z) although his own evidence may be thus disclosed (a). It is not enough for a man to say such and such documents are the title deeds of his property: it is no ground for refusing their production if they are necessary to upset the adversary's case (b). But a document is protected from production and inspection if it exclusively evidences a party's own case and does not support the adversary's case (c). To entitle the party to this protection the privilege must be properly claimed: that he must state in his affidavit that the documents constitute evidence of his own case or title, that they contain nothing supporting or tending to support the adversary's case or title and that they contain nothing impeaching his own case or title (d). As to discovery in actions of ejectment see notes to r 1 above. What interrogatories may be allowed.

(2) *A party is not bound to produce any confidential communications between him and his legal adviser* (e)—The object of this rule is to enable persons to obtain legal advice

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>(y) <i>J. Allen v. B. H. Aspin</i> (1933) 47 Q. B. 43.<br/> <i>Frederick v. C. A. S. Co.</i> (1919) 2 Q. B. 6.<br/> <i>Allan v. C. A. S. Co.</i> (1919) 2 Q. B. 4.<br/> <i>Castle v. Fox</i> (1913) 2 Q. B. 4.</p> <p>(z) <i>Irving v. Brown</i> (1914) 144 Q. B. 11.<br/> <i>Adams v. L. M. C. Co.</i> (1914) 144 Q. B. 11.<br/> <i>Irving v. Brown</i> (1914) 144 Q. B. 11.<br/> <i>Adams v. L. M. C. Co.</i> (1914) 144 Q. B. 11.</p> <p>(a) <i>London &amp; S. W. Ry. v. L. M. C. Co.</i> (1914) 144 Q. B. 11.<br/> <i>Adams v. L. M. C. Co.</i> (1914) 144 Q. B. 11.<br/> <i>Irving v. Brown</i> (1914) 144 Q. B. 11.</p> | <p>(f) <i>Attorney-General v. Thompson</i> (1849) 8 Ha. 113.<br/> <i>Thompson v. Attorney-General</i> (1849) 8 Ha. 113.</p> <p>(g) <i>Lyons v. Lyons</i> (1914) 144 Q. B. 11.<br/> <i>Lyons v. Lyons</i> (1914) 144 Q. B. 11.</p> <p>(h) <i>Attorney-General v. Thompson</i> (1849) 8 Ha. 113.<br/> <i>Thompson v. Attorney-General</i> (1849) 8 Ha. 113.</p> <p>(i) <i>Lyons v. Lyons</i> (1914) 144 Q. B. 11.<br/> <i>Lyons v. Lyons</i> (1914) 144 Q. B. 11.</p> |
|---|---|

3 safely and effectually (f) The following are amongst the confidential communications between a client and his legal adviser that are protected from production and inspection (1) statement of facts drawn up by the client for submission to his solicitor and documents prepared by him for the purpose of providing the solicitor with evidence and information for the conduct of his case (g) (2) advice given by the solicitor with reference thereto (h) (3) entries in the solicitor's diary of communications between himself and his client (i) (4) memoranda or minutes made by the client of the communications between himself and the solicitor (j) (v) communications between solicitor and counsel with reference to the client's case (k) (6) draft pleadings (l) (7) case laid before counsel for his opinion and other briefs for counsel (m) (8) solicitor's bill of costs for it is virtually the solicitor's history of the transaction in which he was concerned (n) But the communication is not privileged unless it is of a confidential nature (o) And further it must have been made to the legal adviser with a view to obtain professional advice (p) It is not necessary that it should have been made either during an actual or even an expected litigation. A communication with a legal adviser is protected though it relates to a transaction which is not the subject of litigation provided it is a communication made to him for the purpose of obtaining professional advice (q) But no privilege attaches to communications between a solicitor and his client which are in themselves facts of a criminal or unlawful proceeding (r) Where one of the trustees of a will is a solicitor and acts as the solicitor for the trustees communications passing between him and his co-trustees which would be privileged if the solicitor were not a trustee are privileged notwithstanding that he is a trustee (s) But confidential communications between a principal and an agent who is not a legal agent e.g. a commercial agent are not privileged whether they are made after litigation has become imminent and after legal advice has been taken or even after litigation has commenced (t) Similarly reports made by a servant to his master regarding the subject matter of the suit are not privileged (u) See Evidence Act 1872 ss 126 129

3 A party is not bound to produce any public official document if its production would be injurious to public interests (t)—This head of privilege applies as a rule when a party to a suit is a public officer See Evidence Act 1872 ss 193 124

In all the three heads of privilege mentioned above the privilege must be claimed in the affidavit of documents and the grounds of privilege must be sufficiently disclosed If the affidavit of documents does not sufficiently raise the claim of privilege the party may be allowed to put in a further affidavit in support of that claim (w)

Is a party bound to give discovery of documents which will tend to criminate him or expose him to a penalty or forfeiture? No according to the English law (x) But

- (f) *Wheeler v Le Mercant* (1881) 17 C D 675 pp 681 68 *Re St John* [1895] 1 Ch 439 444 *Bur v v Att gen* General [1901] A C 196 00
- (g) *South v. Co v. Ch* (18 8) 3 Q B D 315 *B. m. gham s d Media d Motor Omnibus Co Ltd v London and North Western Ry Co* [1913] 3 1 B 850 *Re e. d. v. L. d. n. Ge. ral Omnibus Co* [1914] 1 K L 56
- (h) *Fyrie v. Sh. sha t* (1891) 15 Bom 7
- (i) *Ward v. Marshal* (1893) 3 Times Rep 5 8
- (j) *Woolley v. L R C* (1899) L R 4 C P 60
- (k) *M. t. m. v. West M. t. m. Co* (18 6) 34 L T 323
- (l) *Lamb v. Ort* (1853) 1 L J Ch 713
- (m) *W. t. m. v. Staindon* (1863) 1 H & M 1 *M. n. ch. r. a. s. v. New D. h. r. m. s. Co* (1880) 4 Lom 5 6
- (n) *Turton v. D. a. b. r* (1974) L F 17 Eq 3 9 *Ch. a. t. Broun v. H. a. 90*
- (o) *Hajee Haroon v. Abd. l. k. r. m.* (18 9) 37 m 91 *Framj v. M. h. a. s. g.* (1894) 15 Lom
- 63 71 *Emperor v. Fode gues* (1903) 5 Bom L R 1
- (p) *Framj v. Moha s g* (1894) 15 Bom 63 *Fonkes v. Webb* (1884) 3 C D 3
- (q) *W. h. l. v. Le M. a. t.* (1881) 17 C D 6 3
- (r) *Bull v. t. v. Attorney General* (1901) A C 196 00 01 *W. h. l. v. t. v. Attorney General* (1901) A C 196 00 01 *W. h. l. v. t. v. Attorney General* (1901) A C 196 00 01
- (s) *W. h. l. v. t. v. Attorney General* (1901) A C 196 00 01
- (t) *Wallace v. Jefferson* (1875) 2 Bom 433 *B. p. D. s. Secretary of Stat for India* (1865) 11 Cal 653 *Fyrie v. Sh. sha t* (1891) 15 Bom 7 *Umb. a. Ch. r. v. Bengal* (1891) 15 Bom 7 *Umb. a. Ch. r. v. Bengal* (1891) 15 Bom 7
- (u) *C. e. t. l. India Spinning Co. v. G. I. P. Ry Co* (1907) 29 Bom L R 414
- (v) *Wader v. E. I. Co* (1865) 6 De G J 6 0 *p. 18 J. e. h. a. s. g. v. Secretary of State* (1901) 6 Lom L R 131 160
- (w) *Umb. a. Ch. r. v. Bengal* (1891) 15 Bom 7 *Umb. a. Ch. r. v. Bengal* (1891) 15 Bom 7
- (x) *Er. a. t. o. v. Discovery* 311 319 *St. h. 142* art. 1 0

apparently yes according to the Indian law See Evidence Act s 132 where the term witness obviously includes a party to a suit

**Conclusiveness of affidavit of documents** Further affidavit—If a party states in his affidavit of documents that he has no documents relating to the matters in question in the suit other than those set forth in the affidavit his oath is conclusive and the other party cannot cross examine upon it nor adduce evidence to contradict it nor administer interrogatories asking whether he has not in his possession or power documents other than those set forth in his affidavit (y) The oath of the party being conclusive the Court will not order him to make a further affidavit of documents though the opponent may state on oath that the party has got other documents in his possession (z) the reason being that in all questions of discovery the oath of the party making the discovery is conclusive as against the oath of the party claiming the discovery (a) The only case in which the Court may require a party to make a further affidavit is where there is a reasonable probability or presumption or *even ground for suspicion* derived from certain sources that he has other relevant documents in his possession (b) The sources into which the Court may look for this purpose are (1) the affidavit of documents itself (c) the documents therein referred to and (3) the pleadings (c) Unless the affidavit is shown from any of these sources to be insufficient the general rule is that no further affidavit can be ordered But this rule is qualified where the basis on which the affidavit has been made turns out to be wrong Thus if the party making the affidavit has misconceived his case so that the Court is practically certain that if he had acted on a proper view of the law he would have disclosed further documents then the Court will refuse to recognise the affidavit as conclusive and order a further affidavit (d)

The affidavit of documents is also conclusive as to the facts constituting the ground of objection to production Thus if a party sets forth five documents in his affidavit and objects to produce two of them on the assertion that they relate *exclusively* to his own title and that they contain nothing tending to support the adversary's title the Court will not go behind the affidavit (e) and will not order production unless the Court is *reasonably satisfied or reasonably certain* from the sources specified in the preceding paragraph that the nature of the documents as described by the party has been misconceived by the party or that the documents are of such a character that the party cannot properly make such an assertion (f) *Veré suspicion* that the documents are not of the character described by the party though it is sufficient to justify the Court in ordering the party to make a further affidavit of documents (see preceding paragraph) does not entitle the Court to order their production (g)

In a suit for the price of material supplied to the defendant in which the defence was that the materials were defective the defendant objected to produce his engineer's report on the ground that it formed *evidence* of his own case *exclusively* but the Court ordered production on the ground that the defendant *had set forth the nature of the report in his written statement* and the statement showed that the report was not of the character described by the defendant (h)

**Inspection by Court of documents for which privilege is claimed**—Where on an application for an order for inspection privilege is claimed for any document the

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>(y) <i>Hall v Trum</i> (1885) 9 C D 30 1400<br/> <i>Wether</i> (1886) 17 Q B D 101<br/>         (z) <i>Fry v Pry</i> (1853) 11 D M C 66<br/>         (1) <i>Lyell v A</i> (1841) 1 C D 19<br/> <i>Kum Lam</i> (1841) 1 C D 19<br/>         (1901) 51 T L J 550 541 C 44<br/> <i>Nath v Jhawanath</i> (1901) 46 All 41<br/>         80 I C 78 (3) A A 510<br/>         (b) <i>Il v Truma</i> (1885) 9 C D 319<br/> <i>Lyell v A</i> (1841) 1 C D 19<br/> <i>J. Narver v Jernigan &amp; Co</i> (1841) 11 Q B D 55<br/>         (c) <i>Jo et al v Mele &amp; Co</i> (1880) 3 Q B D</p> | <p>556<br/> <i>Kent Coal Concurrence v D &amp; S</i> [1910] 1 K B 901 and cases cit 1<br/>         1st note<br/>         (d) <i>British Association of Glas For M</i><br/> <i>f et v W. J. Ford</i> [1911] A C 99<br/>         (e) <i>J. Nayak v N. N. N. N.</i> [1911] 17 L. J. 41<br/>         (f) <i>Attorney-General v. L. N. N.</i> [1911] 10 Q B D 191<br/> <i>Brink v. L. N. N.</i> [1911] 10 Q B D 191<br/>         (g) <i>Bray on Discovery</i> 503<br/>         (h) <i>Embra Churn v. L. N. N.</i> [1911] 22 Cal 103</p> |
|--|--|



Several plaintiffs or several defendants—Where there are several plaintiffs or several defendants all must join in making the affidavit of documents unless some specific reasons to the contrary are shown. The fact that some of the parties reside in England is no reason why they should be excused from making such affidavit (x).

Minors and lunatics—The next friend or guardian *ad litem* as the case may be of a minor or a lunatic may be required to make an affidavit of documents (r 23).

Affidavit of documents from a co-defendant—An affidavit of documents may be required by a defendant from a co-defendant if there is an issue joined between them but not otherwise (t). See notes to r 1 above. Opposite party.

Advocate General—No order can be made against the Advocate General whether he be plaintiff or defendant requiring him to give discovery on oath. Hence no affidavit of documents can be required from the Advocate General. But an affidavit of documents may be required from the relators (u). See s 9.

Official Liquidator—The Official Liquidator being an officer of the Court should not in the absence of special circumstances be required to make an affidavit as to documents in his possession though he is bound to produce to the adverse litigant the documents which the latter requires to see (z).

Marine Insurance—The affidavit of ship's papers which underwriters are entitled to require from the plaintiff in an action on a policy of marine insurance on cargo is not limited to documents in the possession of the plaintiff or other persons interested in the insurance but extends to all material documents in whomsoever's possession they may be (w).

Sealing up parts of documents—Where one part of a document relates to matter in dispute in the suit and another part does not the latter may be sealed up and so concealed from inspection. Similarly where protection from discovery can be claimed for one part of a document and not for another part the part which can be protected may be sealed up (x). In some cases the Judge has ordered the sealed parts to be unstamped in order that he might inspect them himself (v). See r 19 sub r (2).

Duty of solicitor—Where after a party has made his affidavit of documents his solicitor finds that there are other documents which have not been disclosed it is the duty of the solicitor to bring those documents to the notice of his opponent at the earliest possible opportunity (y).

Inspection of property being subject matter of suit—See O 39 r 7(1)(a).

**14** [R S C, O 31, r 14, s 130] It shall be lawful for the Court, at any time during the pendency of any suit, to order the production by any party thereto upon oath of such of the documents in his possession or power, relating to any matter in question in such suit, as the Court shall think right and

- (i) *Frost v Shanks* (1897) 15 Torts  
(ii) *An Dra v J dra* (1903) 1 Boms 331  
(iii) *Advocate General v Edm* (1908) 8 Lom L R 565 See *Drayton Discovery* pp 6-69  
(iv) *Mutual Society v re* (1883) — Ch D 11  
(v) *Tenney v Mol* a *J anca F ponola v New Zealand I* a *cc C* [1911] 1 K. 1 9

- (x) *J r v on H co v p* 23 *Jal v v K na* (1 11) 1 Cal 5 *Herrald v I m ren* (1 9) 4 Cal 63  
(y) *Lafon v Bulk and Island C* (18 4) 1 J Ct 1 *Caton v Lewis* (1 3) 1 W R [Em.] 114 *Crumm v Loy v Talaram* (1901) 3 Cal 4 4  
(z) *W v W* 99 61 J C 90

A party is entitled under this rule to inspection of letters referred to in an affidavit of the opposite party though the affidavit has not been filed provided it is sworn and a copy thereof is furnished to him (z)

**Inspection by party or his pleader**—No one is entitled under this rule to inspection except a party or his pleader. The term party includes the authorized agent of the party (w). But if such agent was formerly in the employ of the opposite party and in charge of his books the Court ought not to permit inspection to be taken by him (x).

**16 [R S C, O 31, r 16]** Notice to any party to produce any documents referred to in his pleading or affidavits shall be in Form No 7 in Appendix C with such variations as circumstances may require

**17 [R S C, O 31, r 17, S 132]** The party to whom such notice is given shall, within ten days from the receipt of such notice, deliver to the party giving the same a notice stating a time within three days from the delivery thereof at which the documents or such of them as he does not object to produce, may be inspected at the office of his pleader, or in the case of bankers' books or other books of account or books in constant use for the purposes of any trade or business, at their usual place of custody, and stating which (if any) of the documents he objects to produce, and on what ground. Such notice shall be in Form No 8 in Appendix C, with such variations as circumstances may require

**Documents**—This rule applies to all documents mentioned in r 16 it is not confined to cases where there has been an affidavit of documents under rr 12 and 13 (y)

**Bankers' books**—See notes to O 7 r 17 Bankers Books Evidence Act 1891

**Business books**—See r 19 below

**Usual place of custody**—A who owns a ginning factory at Broach agrees with B in Bombay to gin B's cotton in his factory at Broach. B sues A in Bombay for damages for breach of the contract and requires inspection of A's books in Bombay. A offers to give inspection at Broach where the books are kept. B is not entitled to inspection in Bombay for Broach is the place where the books are kept ( )

**18 [R S C, O 31, r 18, Ss 133 134]** (1) Where the party served with notice under rule 15 omits to give such notice of a time for

(c) *Pe Fenner and Lord* [1897] 1 Q B 67  
(w) *William v Prince of Wales Ass Co* (1857)  
23 Lc v 338  
(z) *Enamul v Ekram* 2, 1899) 20 Cal 91

(y) *Le Fenner and Lord* [1897] 1 Q B 667 668  
670  
(z) See *Keraldas v Pedonji* (1841) 5 Bom 46

inspection or objects to give inspection, or offers inspection elsewhere than at the office of his pleader, the Court may, on the application of the party desiring it make an order for inspection in such place and in such manner as it may think fit. Provided that the order shall not be made when and so far as the Court shall be of opinion that it is not necessary either for disposing fairly of the suit or for saving costs.

(2) Any application to inspect documents, except such as are referred to in the pleadings, particulars or affidavits of the party against whom the application is made or disclosed in his affidavits of documents, shall be founded upon an affidavit showing of what documents inspection is sought, that the party applying is entitled to inspect them, and that they are in the possession or power of the other party. The Court shall not make such order for inspection of such documents when and so far as the Court shall be of opinion that it is not necessary either for disposing fairly of the suit or for saving costs.

Served with notice — No order for inspection can be made under this rule unless notice has been served under r. 10 (a).

Sub rule (2) — This sub rule provides for the inspection amongst others of documents not disclosed in the affidavit of documents and the Court may under this sub rule direct a party to give inspection of such documents. But an opportunity should be given to such party to make an affidavit in answer and if he in such affidavit denies possession of the document the affidavit will be conclusive on that fact (b). But he cannot merely rely on his previous affidavit of documents in answer to an application under this sub rule for such an affidavit is conclusive for the purposes only of discovery as distinguished from inspection (c).

Appeal — No appeal lies under the Code from an order for inspection. Nor does an appeal lie under cl. 15 of the Letters Patent for an order directing inspection to be given is not a judgment within the meaning of that clause (d).

Bankers Books Evidence Act — In ordering inspection under the Bankers Books Evidence Act 1891 the Court is guided by the general rule regulating the inspection of documents before trial (e).

19 [New R. S. C., O. 31 r. 19A] (1) Where inspection of any business books is applied for, the Court may, if it thinks fit, instead of ordering inspection of the original books, order a copy of any entries therein to be furnished and verified by the

- (a) *Mahendra v. Ish n Chander* (1884) 10 Cal 56  
*Dhapa v. Jam I shad* (1887) 14 Cal 64  
 (b) See *Mito Moye v. Cool* (1896) 3 Cal 117  
 17  
 (c) *Jadva Coomarp v. Amaldas* (1911) 38 Cal

- 49 L. I. C. 1\*  
 (d) *Sombar v. Ahmed Isi* (1872) 9 Bom. II C 398  
*Ahmed v. Gopalabai* (1909) 11 Bom. L. R. 11 C 16  
 (e) *Waterhouse v. Brier* [1942] 2 K. B. 59



affidavit of some person who has examined the copy with the original entries, and such affidavit shall state whether or not there are in the original book any and what erasures, interlineations or alterations. Provided that, notwithstanding that such copy has been supplied, the Court may order inspection of the book from which the copy was made.

(2) Where on an application for an order for inspection privilege is claimed for any document, it shall be lawful for the Court to inspect the document for the purpose of deciding as to the validity of the claim of privilege.

(3) The Court may, on the application of any party to a suit at any time, and whether an affidavit of documents shall or shall not have already been ordered or made, make an order requiring any other party to state by affidavit whether any one or more specific documents, to be specified in the application, is or are, or has or have at any time been, in his possession or power, and, if not then in his possession, when he parted with the same and what has become thereof. Such application shall be made on an affidavit stating that in the belief of the deponent the party against whom the application is made has, or has at some time had, in his possession or power the document or documents specified in the application and that they relate to the matters in question in the suit, or to some of them.

Specific documents.—To justify an application under sub r (3) the party making the application must in his affidavit *name and specify* so that they can be identified the particular documents of which he desires discovery. It is not sufficient to make a general affidavit based on a *priori* reasoning that certain classes of documents must be in his opponent's possession or power (f).

20 [R S C, O 31, r 20 S 135] Where the party from whom discovery of any kind or inspection is sought objects to the same, or any part thereof, the Court may, if satisfied that the right to the discovery or inspection sought depends on the determination of any issue or question in dispute in the suit, or that for any other reason it is desirable that any issue or question in dispute in the suit should be determined before deciding upon the right to the discovery or inspection, order that such issue or question be determined first, and reserve the question as to the discovery or inspection.

**Issue to decide upon right to inspection**—The object of the rule is to enable the Court to decide an *issue* in a suit as distinguished from the suit itself for the purposes of discovery (g) See notes to r 6 above Not sufficiently material at that stage

**21 [R S C O 31, r 21, S 136]** Where any party fails to comply with any order to answer interrogatories, or for discovery or inspection of documents he shall, if a plaintiff, be liable to have his suit dismissed for want of prosecution, and if a defendant, to have his defence, if any, struck out, and to be placed in the same position as if he had not defended, and the party interrogating or seeking discovery or inspection may apply to the Court for an order to that effect, and an order may be made accordingly

**Dismissal of suit**—This rule cannot be applied unless there has been an order for discovery under r 12 or for inspection under r 18 (h) And even where such an order has been made it is only when the default is wilful and as a last resort that the Court should dismiss the suit or strike out the defence (i) If the parties concerned are *purdanashin* ladies this should be taken into account before making the order (j) The word production which occurred after discovery in the corresponding s 136 of the Code of 1892 has been omitted in the present rule It has hence been held by the High Courts of Allahabad (k) and Madras (l) that this rule does not apply to cases where there has been non compliance with an order for production of documents made under r 14 According to a Lahore decision (m) this rule applies also to orders made under r 14

**Contempt**—Besides the penalty prescribed by this rule a party to a suit filed in a Chartered High Court who has failed to answer or give inspection is liable to be committed for contempt by that Court This power has been conferred on Chartered High Courts by their Letters Patent (n) An order of *commitment for contempt* is appealable according to the Bombay decisions (o) but not according to the Allahabad decisions (p)

**Appeal**—An appeal lies from an order under this rule under O 43 r 1 (f) below (q)

**22 [New R S C, O 31, r 24]** Any party may, at the trial of a suit, use in evidence any one or more of the answers or any part of an answer of the opposite party to interrogatories without putting in the others or the whole of such

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>(a) 44 <i>Althay v Fullah</i> (1888) 6 B M 5</p> <p>(A) <i>A. Ram Lal v. S. Ram Lal</i> (1916) 34 All 3</p> <p>30 I C 53 <i>Decker v. S. S. S. S.</i> (1903)</p> <p>B M L R 621 83 I C 15 (1 A)</p> <p>B 346 <i>I am not v. H. S. S. S.</i> (1906)</p> <p>1 All J 3 5-9 963 C 16 (1 A) 553</p> <p>(i) 42 <i>Woolley v. S. S. S. S.</i> (1893) 7 All 70</p> <p><i>Ashok v. S. S. S. S.</i> (1893) 7 All 70</p> <p><i>1st ruler v. S. S. S. S.</i> (1893) 7 All 70</p> <p><i>1st ruler v. S. S. S. S.</i> (1893) 7 All 70</p> <p>(j) <i>F. A. v. Lal v. S. S. S. S.</i> (1893) 7 All 70</p> <p>(k) <i>Lyalpur v. S. S. S. S.</i> (1893) 7 All 70</p> <p>(l) <i>Ch. S. v. S. S. S. S.</i> (1893) 7 All 70</p> | <p>(1900) 44 All 565 67 I C 3 (2nd) A A</p> <p>35</p> <p>(h) <i>Sethi v. S. S. S. S.</i> (1901) 46 All 1</p> <p>L J 350 1 C 66 (2nd) A A 5</p> <p>(m) <i>Famath v. S. S. S. S.</i> (1911) 6 I C 661</p> <p>(n) <i>Hassan v. S. S. S. S.</i> (1893) 7 All 70</p> <p><i>1st ruler v. S. S. S. S.</i> (1893) 7 All 70</p> <p>1110 11 I C 1 (2nd) A A 11</p> <p>(o) <i>S. S. v. S. S. S. S.</i> (1893) 7 All 70</p> <p>(p) <i>S. S. v. S. S. S. S.</i> (1900) 44 All 1</p> <p>(q) <i>S. S. v. S. S. S. S.</i> (1925) 3 Rang 63</p> <p>63 I C 51 (25) A A 1</p> |
|---|--|

answer Provided always that in such case the Court may look at the whole of the answers, and if it shall be of opinion that any others of them are so connected with those put in that the last mentioned answers ought not to be used without them, it may direct them to be put in

**23** [*New R S C, O 31, r 29*] This Order shall apply to minor plaintiffs and defendants, and to the next friends and guardians for the suit of persons under disability

Minors and lunatics—Prior to this rule the practice of the different High Courts as to discovery from minors and persons of unsound mind was not uniform. It is useless to note the decisions under the old Code

## ORDER XII

### *Admissions*

**1** [*R S C, O 32, r 1*] Any party to a suit may give notice, by his pleading, or otherwise in writing, that he admits the truth of the whole or any part of the case of any other party

Different kinds of admissions—The object of obtaining admissions is to do away with the necessity of proving facts that are admitted [see Evidence Act 18, s 58] Admissions are of three kinds namely—

#### *I Admissions in pleading—*

- (1) *actual* that is those contained in the pleadings (O 7 r 5) or in answer to interrogatories (O 11 r 22)
- (2) *constructive* that is those which are merely the consequence of the form of pleading adopted (O 8 rr 3 4 5)

#### *II Admissions by agreement*

#### *III Admissions by notice*

Admissions by notice are dealt with in this Order

The importance of admission consists in the fact that either party may at any stage of the suit move for judgment on the admissions made by the other side (r 6)

**2** [*R S C, O 32, r 2, S 128*] Either party may call upon the other party to admit any document, saving all just exceptions, and in case of refusal or neglect to admit, after such notice, the costs of proving any such document shall be paid by the party so neglecting or refusing, whatever the result of the suit may be, unless the Court otherwise directs, and no

costs of proving any document shall be allowed unless such notice is given, except where the omission to give the notice is, in the opinion of the Court, a saving of expense

Admissions between co defendants—Admissions between co defendants to which the plaintiff is not a party cannot be entered as evidence against the plaintiff (r)

**3** [*New R S C O 32, r 3*] A notice to admit documents shall be in Form No 9 in Appendix C, with such variations as circumstances may require

*Form of notice*

**4** [*New R S C, O 32 r 4*] Any party may, by notice in writing, at any time not later than nine days before the day fixed for the hearing, call on any other party to admit, for the purposes of the suit only, any specific fact or facts mentioned in such notice. And in case of refusal or neglect to admit the same within six days after service of such notice, or within such further time as may be allowed by the Court, the costs of proving such fact or facts shall be paid by the party so neglecting or refusing, whatever the result of the suit may be, unless the Court otherwise directs. Provided that any admission made in pursuance of such notice is to be deemed to be made only for the purposes of the particular suit, and not as an admission to be used against the party on any other occasion or in favour of any person other than the party giving the notice. Provided also that the Court may at any time allow any party to amend or withdraw any admission so made on such terms as may be just

*Notice to admit facts*

**5** [*New R S C O 32, r 5*] A notice to admit facts shall be in Form No 10 in Appendix C, and admissions of facts shall be in Form No 11 in Appendix C, with such variations as circumstances may require

*Form of admissions*

**6** [*New R S C, O 32, r 6*] Any party may at any stage of a suit, where admissions of fact have been made, either on the pleadings, or otherwise, apply to the Court for such judgment or order as upon such admissions he may be entitled to, without waiting for determination of any other question between the parties and the Court may upon such application make

*Judgment on admissions.*

such order, or give such judgment, as the Court may think just

**Scope of the rule**—This rule is new. It is a reproduction of O 3<sup>a</sup> r 6 of the English Rules. It enables either party at any stage of the suit to move for judgment on the admissions which have been made by the other side. Either party may, by availing himself of this rule, get rid of so much of the suit as to which there is no controversy (s). The rule however is permissive: it does not preclude a party who does not avail himself of it and proceeds to trial in the ordinary way from relying at the trial on the admissions made by the opposite party (t).

The Court may make such order or give such judgment as the Court may think just — A judgment on admissions is not a matter of right but is in the discretion of the Court. If a case involves questions which cannot be conveniently disposed of on a motion under this rule the Court may in the exercise of its discretion refuse the motion (u).

There is no hard and fast rule that where the defendant admits part of the plaintiff's claim and denies the rest of the claim the Court should if it gives judgment under this rule for the plaintiff as to the portion of the claim admitted by the defendant refuse to allow the plaintiff to proceed with the suit as to the remainder of his claim. If there is a clear and unambiguous admission by the defendant as to part of the plaintiff's claim the Court has jurisdiction to enter judgment as to that part of the plaintiff's claim and it is in its discretion having regard to the nature of the case and the allegations contained in the pleadings and the admissions made in Court whether it should allow the plaintiff to proceed to prove the remainder of his claim (i) *A* sues *B* for Rs 8,800. *B* admits that only Rs 4,500 are due and alleges as to the rest of *A*'s claim that it was in respect of goods as to which there was a separate arrangement between the parties. The issue as to the balance of *A*'s claim being an issue independent of the other part of the claim the Court may pass judgment for *A* for Rs 4,500 and give leave to *A* to prove his claim to the balance. It is clear that even if the issue as to the balance of *A*'s claim were decided in *B*'s favour it would not having regard to *B*'s admission reduce *A*'s claim below Rs 4,500 (ii)

In the *United Telephone Co v Donohoe* (x) the plaintiffs sued the defendant for infringement of a patent claiming injunction and damages. The defendant admitted ten instances of infringement but denied he had committed any others. The plaintiffs thereupon moved for judgment upon the admissions in the pleadings. In the Court of first instance the Vice Chancellor granted an injunction against infringement by the defendant of the plaintiffs patent but he refused an enquiry as to damages. The Court of Appeal held that the plaintiffs were entitled to an enquiry as to damage but that it must be limited to the instances of infringement admitted and that the judgment having been obtained upon a motion for judgment upon the pleadings the plaintiffs were bound to take the negative as well as the affirmative allegations therein. I referring to this case Sanderson C J said in the Calcutta case cited above (y) that the question whether the Judge who in the first instance heard the application would have had jurisdiction to give judgment on the admissions and to allow the plaintiffs to proceed to prove the rest of their claim as to the other alleged infringements if such an application had been made was not before the Court.

(i) *Torp v Holdworth* (1876) 3 C D 637 640

(1) *Told leg v H rper* (18 7) 7 C D 40J

(u) *M. flor.* & *Sud. bell.* m (1877) 5 c. D 34. *Re*  
Humboldt & Bonpland (1805) 2 c. 73. 747.

11 112412 K1 ke v North [1993] 2 Ch 747  
O (gladg n v f D S soon & Co

Id (19-3) 27 (a) W N 83 8-1-6

314 (20) A C 100

(r) Item 1 Due to (101) 45 6 1

134 101 44 I C 933 4 de 1 v 7A  
Falsiole Assurance Co of Inc and (1 61)  
I R 18 1r 115

U. S. Census & Hist. Indus. m (1914) 45 Cal 134

44 I C 231

(x) (18, 6) 31 ( ) 329

(u) *Free and Fair Election* (1991) 123

411 C 33

**Admissions on pleadings**—Under this rule either party may move for judgment upon admissions of fact made on the pleadings or otherwise. Admissions in pleadings are either actual or constructive. Actual admissions consist of facts expressly admitted either in pleadings or in answer to interrogatories [O 11 r 22]. The patent case cited in the preceding paragraph is an instance of actual admissions. Constructive admissions on the other hand are admissions which are *inferred or implied* from pleadings as a consequence of the form of pleading adopted [O 8 rr 3 4 5]. Constructive admissions usually arise where a defendant has not specifically dealt with some allegation of fact in the plaint of which he does not admit the truth [O 8 r 3] for as we have seen every allegation of fact in the plaint if not denied specifically or by necessary implication or stated to be not admitted in the written statement will be taken to be admitted except as against persons under disability [O 8 r 5]. Constructive admissions also arise where a defendant denies an allegation of fact in the plaint *exactly* and does not answer the point of substance [O 8 r 1].

#### Illustrations

1. A alleging that he and B having agreed to carry on certain business in partnership, draft articles of partnership were prepared and approved by B and that they both thereupon proceeded with the partnership undertaking, sues B for a declaration that he and B were partners and claims that the partnership may be dissolved. B in his written statement admits that he agreed to enter into partnership as alleged by A but adds that terms of the arrangement between himself and the plaintiff were *not definitely agreed upon* as alleged. This is an *express denial* of the fact of partnership [O 8 r 4] and it will therefore be *construed* as an admission by B of the partnership. A is therefore entitled under this rule to a decree for dissolution of partnership without adducing any evidence to prove the partnership. But though the written statement will be *construed* as an admission of the fact of partnership it will not be construed as an admission of the terms of the partnership. B may therefore claim an inquiry as to the terms of the arrangement of partnership and if such inquiry is claimed the Court will direct it by its decree (i).

2. A defendant by his written statement simply puts the plaintiff to proof of the several allegations in the plaint. The denial not being specific [O 8 r 3] the defendant will be deemed to have admitted the facts alleged in the plaint [O 8 r 5] so as to entitle the plaintiff to a decree under this rule without adducing any evidence in support of his case (a).

In applying the present rule in India it is to be noted that when a plaintiff applies for a decree upon *conclusive admission* in a written statement the Court may in its discretion refuse to pass the decree if it thinks in the special circumstances of the case that the defendant must not be held to have admitted facts not specifically admitted in his written statement (f). See the proviso to r. of O 8 and notes thereto.

An order on admissions on the pleadings will not be made unless the admissions are *clear and unequivocal* (c). Moreover a plaintiff moving for judgment on admissions in the defendant's written statement must have a clear case and the mere admission by the defendant of a right asserted by the plaintiff but which he *in fact exercises in law* is not sufficient to entitle the plaintiff to a judgment establishing his right (d).

- (i) *Thorp v. Hollister* (1863) 3 C. D. 63.  
(j) *H. v. A.* (1893) 1 C. D. 3. See also  
C. v. A. (1893) 34 C. D. 399.  
(k) See *in re A. v. B.* (1893) 1 C. D. 3.  
(l) *See in re A. v. B.* (1893) 1 C. D. 3.  
(m) *See in re A. v. B.* (1893) 1 C. D. 3.  
(n) *See in re A. v. B.* (1893) 1 C. D. 3.  
(o) *See in re A. v. B.* (1893) 1 C. D. 3.

- (p) *See in re A. v. B.* (1893) 1 C. D. 3.  
(q) *See in re A. v. B.* (1893) 1 C. D. 3.  
(r) *See in re A. v. B.* (1893) 1 C. D. 3.  
(s) *See in re A. v. B.* (1893) 1 C. D. 3.  
(t) *See in re A. v. B.* (1893) 1 C. D. 3.  
(u) *See in re A. v. B.* (1893) 1 C. D. 3.  
(v) *See in re A. v. B.* (1893) 1 C. D. 3.  
(w) *See in re A. v. B.* (1893) 1 C. D. 3.  
(x) *See in re A. v. B.* (1893) 1 C. D. 3.  
(y) *See in re A. v. B.* (1893) 1 C. D. 3.  
(z) *See in re A. v. B.* (1893) 1 C. D. 3.

6

**Judgment upon admissions made otherwise than on pleadings**—A judgment may be given under this rule not only upon admissions made in the pleadings but upon admissions *otherwise* made. The words or otherwise in this rule are not confined to admissions made under r 1 or r 4 of this Order but are of general application and justify the giving of an immediate judgment when an admission is made by letter of facts which show that the defendant has no defence to the action (e). A judgment may be given under this rule even upon a verbal admission if it is clearly proved (f).

**Orders which may be made under this rule**—This rule was framed for the express purpose that if there was no dispute between the parties and if there was on the pleadings such an admission as to make it plain that the plaintiff was entitled to a particular order he should be able to obtain that order at once upon motion. It must however be such an admission of facts as would show that the plaintiff is clearly entitled to the order asked for whether it be in the nature of a decree or a judgment or anything else. The rule was not meant to apply when there is any serious question of law to be argued. But if there is an admission on the pleadings which clearly entitled the plaintiff to an order then the intention was that he should not have to wait but might at once obtain any order which could have been made on an original hearing of the action (g). An order amounting to what is called a preliminary decree in this Code may appropriately be made under this rule upon a simple motion. Where such an order was applied for under the corresponding English rule by a plaintiff in a suit for partition and the defendant contended that that would be giving a decree to the plaintiff and that the plaintiff should wait until the action was set down for trial the Court held that the plaintiff was entitled to an order directing the usual inquiries upon the admissions of the defendant and that he was not bound to wait (h) [O 20 r 18]. Such orders have also been made in administration actions (i) [O 20 r 19] in actions for dissolution of partnership (j) [O 20 r 15] in actions for partnership accounts (k) [O 20 r 14], in actions for accounts between principal and agent (l) [O 20 r 16] and in actions for the execution of the trusts of a settlement (m).

**Practice**—Motions in England under the corresponding English rule are brought on upon an ordinary motion day after notice to the other side. As to form of application see Daniel's Ch. Forms 270. The practice in England is when an order is made amounting to what is called a preliminary decree in this Code to adjourn the further hearing of the case without requiring any further prior hearing the words generally used in the order being and without requiring any further prior hearing than this motion of the said cause the further hearing of the said cause is adjourned (n). See Beeton on Decrees Vol I p 399 Form No 5.

**At any stage**—A plaintiff may move for judgment upon admissions at the written statement at any stage of the suit and notwithstanding that he has joined in on the defence (o).

**Co plaintiffs**—An application under this rule for an order against a defendant on admissions of fact must be made by all the plaintiffs and not merely by some of them. If the application is made by some of the plaintiffs only it must be refused (p).

( ) *Finn v Allen* [1914] 1 Ch 904

(U) *Pe Bury* [1944] 1 Ch 499 [order directing payment into court]

(g) *Culbert v Smith* (18 6) = C 31 696 699 G. 2 per M R L J

(h) *Culbert v Smith* (18 6) = C 31 696 B r II  
v *Bur* (18 9) 11 C 13

(i) *Pe Bury* *Hetherington v Longrigg* (18 8) 10 C 10

(j) *Ta v v Hold worth* (18 6) 34 D 5

(k) *T v v H d* (11 1) 11 43

(l) *Lum v v Lads* (14 6) 14 5 61

(m) *Be v v v* (18 6) 1 C 1 2

(n) *Be v v v* (18 6) 1 C 1 2

(o) *Culbert v Smith* (18 6) 1 C 1 2

(p) *Brown v Pearson* (18 1) 1 C 1 716

(q) *Pe Bury* *At v v v* (1 2) 1 C 1 716

**Withdrawal of admission**—Where it is shown that an admission was made by mistake the party may be allowed to amend his pleadings under O 6 r 17 for the purpose of withdrawing it upon such terms as to the Court may appear just (q)

**Appeal**—An order rejecting an application for judgment on admission is a judgment within the meaning of cl 15 of the Letters Patent and is appealable (r)

**7** [*New R S C, O 12, r 7*] An affidavit of the pleader or his clerk, of the due signature of any admissions made in pursuance of any notice to admit documents or facts, shall be sufficient evidence of such admissions, if evidence thereof is required

*Affidavit of signature*

**8** [*New R S C O 32 r 8*] Notice to produce documents shall be in Form No 12 in Appendix C, with such variations as circumstances may require. An affidavit of the pleader, or his clerk, of the service of any notice to produce, and of the time when it was served, with a copy of the notice to produce, shall in all cases be sufficient evidence of the service of the notice, and of the time when it was served

*Notice to produce documents*

**Notice to produce documents**—It is always desirable when a document is in the possession or power of the opposite party to give him notice to produce the same for unless such notice is given secondary evidence of the document cannot be given see Indian Evidence Act 1872 s 65 cl (a) and s 66

**9** [*New R S C, O 32, r 9*] If a notice to admit or produce specifies documents which are not necessary, the costs occasioned thereby shall be borne by the party giving such notice

*Costs*

see rr 2 and 8 above

## ORDER XIII

### *Production, Impounding and Return of Documents*

**1** [*Ss 135 140*] (1) The parties or their pleaders shall produce, at the first hearing of the suit, all the documentary evidence of every description in their possession or power, on which they intend to rely and which has not already been filed in Court, and all documents which the Court has ordered to be produced

*Documentary evidence to be produced at first hearing*

O 13,



(2) The Court shall receive the documents so produced provided that they are accompanied by an accurate list thereof prepared in such form as the High Court directs

Shall produce at the first hearing —This rule does not exclude the discretion of the Court to receive documentary evidence at a subsequent stage of the proceedings (a) See r 2 below and note

Form of list of documents produced by Parties—See App H Form no 3

2 [S 139] No documentary evidence in the possession or power of any party which should have been but has not been produced in accordance with the requirements of rule 1 shall be received at any subsequent stage of the proceedings unless good cause is shown to the satisfaction of the Court for the non production thereof, and the Court receiving any such evidence shall record the reasons for so doing

Unless good cause is shown —This rule has been enacted to prevent fraud by the late production of suspicious documents But no suspicion can attach to certified copies of public documents such as records of Government or records of judicial proceeding Such copies therefore may be received in evidence though they have not been produced at the first hearing (f) The rule however is not confined to public documents only The Court may in its discretion admit other documents also at a subsequent stage of the proceedings (u) See notes to r 1 above

Appeal—The fact that further documentary evidence is admitted after the first hearing is not a good ground of appeal (v) Nor can an appellate Court reject evidence admitted by the Court of first instance simply on that ground (w)

3 [S 140] The Court may at any stage of the suit reject any document which it considers irrelevant or otherwise inadmissible, recording the grounds of such rejection

Rejection of inadmissible documents—Questions as to the admissibility of evidence should be decided as they arise and should not be reserved until judgment in the case is given (x)

When a Court is doubtful as to whether a document is admissible or not and its decision is open to appeal it is better to admit than to exclude the document (y)

|   |   |
|---|---|
| (a) <i>Imamul d v Mital</i> (1919) 45 I A 387 (1) 4 (1848-49) 471 (513) <i>Ho I m v For I m</i> (12-3) 11101 (36 (4) A 1  | (i) <i>T n v v K o Tu</i> (19-4) 8 K n 33 1111 (4 (4) A R 196   |
| (f) <i>I khat v C r t a g f t</i> (1904) Bom 13 <i>T l war v j h s h g e m D</i> (1904) 1 C W N 31  | (v) <i>C J a v P u k m e e</i> (1 69) 1 W P F 3   |
| (u) <i>S e i I m a m u l a n d v M f r a l l</i> (1918) 45 I A 781 45 Cal 883 47 I C 17 <i>C r p u d a F i m I m v j h s j h</i> (1917) 75 I A 113 1141 (61 (39) 41 (99) <i>I m a m u l a n d v T y j a</i> (19-4) 81 M d 47 1101 (16 (4) A 516 M j | (w) <i>M i k a h v I l u</i> (1943) 83 I 23 <i>H o i I a m v P r i m</i> (19-4) 71 L 111 1 C 36 (4) A P 553 |
|   | (x) <i>J a l u v H h b o l</i> 112 (1) 1 C L 11 <i>I m f n v O y h o r e v a h</i> (1 2) 3 C L 401          |
|   | (y) <i>T h c o l l e c t o r o f C o r R a p r v I a l i t h a r</i> (1 30) 1 A B 1 t p 6                   |

Endorsements on documents admitted in evidence

particulars, namely —

- (a) the number and title of the suit,
- (b) the name of the person producing the document,
- (c) the date on which it was produced, and
- (d) a statement of its having been so admitted.

and the endorsement shall be signed or initialled by the Judge

(2) Where a document so admitted is an entry in a book, account or record, and a copy thereof has been substituted or the original under the next following rule, the particulars aforesaid shall be endorsed on the copy and the endorsement thereon shall be signed or initialed by the Judge

Or initialled — The words which occur after the word signed in sub rr (1) and (2) are new

Shall be endorsed.—The rule as to endorsement of documents admitted in evidence must be strictly followed. In *Sadik Hu san Khan v Hashim Ali Khan* (2) where some of the documents were not so endorsed the Judicial Committee said

Their Lordships, with a view of insisting on the observance of the wholesome provisions of this rule will in order to prevent injustice be obliged in future on the hearing of Indian appeals to refuse to read or permit to be used any document not endorsed in the manner required. Documents admitted on the record without making the endorsement prescribed by this rule cannot be regarded as being legally before the Court (a) but documents should not be endorsed until they are proved (b). Where a document has been duly proved and put in before a commissioner appointed to take evidence and endorsed by him it becomes part of the record and is evidence notwithstanding the fact that the trial Court did not endorse it as required by this rule (c). The High Court of Madras has held that a mere endorsement under this rule does not necessarily imply that the Court has considered the question of the admissibility of the document (d).

**5 [S 141 A]** (1) Save in so far as is otherwise provided by the Bankers' Books Evidence Act, 1891, where a document admitted in evidence in the suit is an entry in a letter

Indorsements on collect admitted entry in clerk accounts and re rli

book or a shop book or other account in current use, the party on whose behalf the book or account is produced may furnish a copy of the entry.

(2) (1916) 43 I A 1 3 34 11 6 664  
36 I A 104  
(a) See turn of I I m t (19 1) 5 Lah  
9 I A 4 (1) 4 51 H r 94  
v 3 m A m (4 d 15) 9 Lah  
1 100 I (1) 4 1 115 I m  
u d I v 9 I m (4 d) 9 Lah d 110

(2) Where such a document is an entry in a public record produced from a public office or by a public officer or an entry in a book or account belonging to a person other than a party on whose behalf the book or account is produced, the Court may require a copy of the entry to be furnished—

- (a) where the record, book or account is produced on behalf of a party, then by that party, or
- (b) where the record, book or account is produced in obedience to an order of the Court acting of its own motion, then by either or any party

(3) Where a copy of an entry is furnished under the foregoing provisions of this rule, the Court shall, after causing the copy to be examined, compared and certified in manner mentioned in rule 17 of Order VII, mark the entry and cause the book, account or record in which it occurs to be returned to the persons producing it

Bankers Books Evidence Act—See notes to O 7 r 17

Stamp—A copy or extract from an entry in an account book filed under the provisions of this rule and rule 7 does not require any stamp (c)

6 [ S 142 ] Where a document relied on as evidence by either party is considered by the Court to be inadmissible in evidence, there shall be endorsed thereon the particulars mentioned in clauses (a), (b) and (c) of rule 4 sub rule (1), together with a statement of its having been rejected, and the endorsement shall be signed or initialed by the Judge

Endorsements on documents rejected as inadmissible in evidence

Or initialed —These words are new

7 [ S 142 A ] (1) Every document which has been admitted in evidence, or a copy thereof where a copy has been substituted for the original under rule 5, shall form part of the record of the suit

Recording of admitted and returned for evidence documents

(2) Documents not admitted in evidence shall not form part of the record and shall be returned to the persons respectively producing them

**8 [ S 143 ]** Notwithstanding anything contained in rule 5 or rule 7 of this Order or in rule 17 of Order VII, the Court may, if it sees sufficient cause, direct any document or book produced before it in any suit to be impounded and kept in the custody of an officer of the Court for such period and subject to such conditions as the Court thinks fit

Court may order any document to be impounded

**9 [ S 144 ] (1)** Any person, whether a party to the suit or not, desirous of receiving back any document produced by him in the suit and placed on the record shall, unless the document is impounded under rule 8, be entitled to receive back the same,

Return of admitted documents

- (a) where the suit is one in which an appeal is not allowed when the suit has been disposed of, and,
- (b) where the suit is one in which an appeal is allowed, when the Court is satisfied that the time for preferring an appeal has elapsed and that no appeal has been preferred or, if an appeal has been preferred, when the appeal has been disposed of

Provided that a document may be returned at any time earlier than that prescribed by this rule if the person applying therefor delivers to the proper officer a certified copy to be substituted for the original and undertakes to produce the original if required to do so

Provided also that no document shall be returned which, by force of the decree, has become wholly void or useless

**(2)** On the return of a document admitted in evidence, a receipt shall be given by the person receiving it

Shall be entitled —On an application being made by a party under this rule the documents are necessarily returned if the application is in the proper form the act of returning the documents is purely ministerial (f)

And undertakes to produce the original if required to do so —These words are new

**10 [ S 137 ] (1)** The Court may of its own motion, and may in its discretion upon the application of any of the parties to a suit send for, either from its own records or from

Court may send for papers from its own records or from (1) Courts

any other Court, the record of any other suit or proceeding  
1 and inspect the same

(2) Every application made under this rule shall (unless the Court otherwise directs) be supported by an affidavit showing how the record is material to the suit in which the application is made, and that the applicant cannot without unreasonable delay or expense obtain a duly authenticated copy of the record or of such portion thereof as the applicant requires, or that the production of the original is necessary for the purposes of justice

(3) Nothing contained in this rule shall be deemed to enable the Court to use in evidence any document which under the law of evidence would be inadmissible in the suit

11 [ S 145 ] The provisions herein contained as to documents shall, as far as may be, apply  
Provisions as to documents applied to material objects to all other material objects producible as evidence

## ORDER XIV

### *Settlement of Issues and Determination of Suit on Issues of Law or on Issues agreed upon*

1 1 [ S 146 ] (1) Issues arise when a material proposition of fact or law is affirmed by the one  
Material issues party and denied by the other

(2) Material propositions are those propositions of law or fact which a plaintiff must allege in order to show a right to sue or a defendant must allege in order to constitute his defence

(3) Each material proposition affirmed by one party and denied by the other shall form the subject of a distinct issue

(4) Issues are of two kinds (a) issues of fact, (b) issues of law

(5) At the first hearing of the suit the Court shall after reading the plaint and the written statements, if any, and after such examination of the parties as may appear

necessary, ascertain upon what material propositions of fact or of law the parties are at variance, and shall thereupon proceed to frame and record the issues on which the right decision of the case appears to depend

(6) Nothing in this rule requires the Court to frame and record issues where the defendant at the first hearing of the suit makes no defence

**Of the framing of issues**—The plaint and written statement in a suit are called *pleadings* [O 6 r 1]. Section 53 of the Evidence Act enacts that no fact need be proved at the hearing which a party has admitted by his pleadings unless the Court requires proof thereof. Admissions on pleadings may be either actual or constructive (g) [O 8 rr 3 & 4]. Issues are to be framed in respect only of those facts which have been alleged by one party and either denied or not admitted by the other party (h). They must however be confined to *material* facts that is to points on which the right decision of the case depends. The practice of raising issues which do not state the main questions in the suit but only various *subsidiary* matters of fact upon which there is not agreement between the parties is embarrassing and must be avoided (i). Where an issue though in terms covering the main question in the cause does not sufficiently direct the attention of the parties to the main questions of fact necessary to be decided and a party may have been prevented from adducing evidence a fresh issue may be directed to try the principal question of fact (j).

The duty of raising issues rests under the Code of Civil Procedure on the Court and it would be unsafe to presume from the failure of the Court to raise the necessary issues an intention of the defendant to admit the facts which the plaintiff was bound to prove (k). See also notes to O 8 r 5.

**Omission to frame issues**—When a material fact stated in the plaint is denied or is not admitted in the written statement the Court must frame an issue on the fact denied. What is the consequence of an omission to frame an issue of fact? The answer depends on the following considerations. If though no issue is framed on the fact the parties adduce evidence on the fact and discuss it before the Court and the Court decides the point *as if there was an issue framed on it* the decision will not be set aside in appeal on the ground merely that no issue was framed. The reason is that mere omission to frame an issue is not fatal to the trial of a suit (l). But if the point denied in the written statement is not tried at all or if tried is tried imperfectly so as to cause failure of justice the case will in appeal be remanded for a re-trial after framing the necessary issue (m). In other words omission to frame an issue is an *irregularity* which *may or may not* affect the disposal of a suit on the merits. If it does the appellate Court should remand the case for a new trial to the lower Court after framing the necessary issue. If it does not the appellate Court should not remand the case (n). In *Mitna v S. J. F. & Co.* (n) their Lordships of the Privy Council said—

In this case the omission to raise the issues was brought before the notice of the appellate Court. The appellate Court expressed its regret and their Lordships are glad

- (j) *See* *17 J. V. 171* (180) 61 O. M. 1 73  
(k) *See* *17 J. V. 171* (180) 61 O. M. 1 73  
(l) *See* *17 J. V. 171* (180) 61 O. M. 1 73  
(m) *See* *17 J. V. 171* (180) 61 O. M. 1 73  
(n) *See* *17 J. V. 171* (180) 61 O. M. 1 73

- (i) *See* *17 J. V. 171* (180) 61 O. M. 1 73  
(j) *See* *17 J. V. 171* (180) 61 O. M. 1 73  
(k) *See* *17 J. V. 171* (180) 61 O. M. 1 73  
(l) *See* *17 J. V. 171* (180) 61 O. M. 1 73  
(m) *See* *17 J. V. 171* (180) 61 O. M. 1 73  
(n) *See* *17 J. V. 171* (180) 61 O. M. 1 73

1 to observe that it did express its regret that the Principal Sudder Ameen had omitted to settle the issues. The [appellate] Court however nevertheless conceived that it was not under any positive obligation to remand the case but seeing that the parties had gone to trial knowing what the real question between them was that the evidence had been taken and that the conclusion had been in the opinion of the appellate Court correctly drawn from that evidence they thought it within their competence to affirm that decision without sending the case back for a re-trial. Their Lordships sitting here are not prepared to say that the Court had not power to do so under the 35th section [now O 41 r 25] of the Civil Procedure Code. Their Lordships think that under all the circumstances of the case substantial justice having been done there has not been that fatal mis-trial of the cause which vitiates all the proceedings and renders a new trial necessary.

**Delay in raising an issue**—In *Sayad Muhammad v Fattah Muhammad* (o) their Lordships of the Privy Council said. It does not quite appear at what period of the suit the question of the sound disposing mind of the Diwan was raised nor is it very material except in one respect. Whatever system of pleading may exist the sole object of it is that each side may be fully alive to the questions that are about to be argued in order that they may have an opportunity of bringing forward such evidence as may be appropriate to the issue and it may perhaps be not altogether immaterial to observe that the question of the capacity of the Diwan does not appear to have been prominently raised at all events in the first instance. Their Lordships are however of opinion that they must assume that the question of his capacity was open upon the proceedings sufficiently to give each Court below the right to form a judgment upon the matter.

**Wrong issue**—If the first Court frames and tries wrong issues the appellate Court should lay down the proper issues and remand the case for a new trial (p). This is however not necessary if the first Court frames a wrong issue but the judgment gives a finding on the correct issue. In such a case the appellate Court need not remand the case (g).

**Relief not founded on pleadings**—As a rule relief not founded on the pleading should not be granted. But where the substantial matters which constitute the title of all the parties are touched though obscurely in the issues and they have been fully put in evidence and have formed the main subject of discussion in the Court the Court may grant a relief though it may not be founded on the pleadings. Thus in a case where the plaintiff and the defendant each claims to be exclusively entitled to certain lands the Court may if the above conditions are satisfied declare each to be entitled to a moiety (r). Similarly the Court may in a suit for ejectment pass a decree for redemption (s). But if a case not alleged by the plaintiff in his pleading is disclosed in the evidence the Court should not deal with it unless a specific issue is raised on it and the defendant is given an opportunity of meeting it (t).

**Variance between pleading and proof**—It is impossible to conclude parties by inferences of fact which are not only not consistent with the allegations that are to be found in the pleadings which constitute the case which the defendant has to meet but which are in reality contradictory of the case made by the plaintiff. It will introduce the greatest amount of uncertainty into judicial proceedings if the final determination of causes is to be founded upon inferences at variance with the case that the plaintiff has pleaded and by joining issue in the cause has undertaken to prove (u).

(o) (1894) 1 I A 44 Cal 395  
(p) *Ber Chunder v Tarnez* (1889) 11 W R 20  
(q) *Tishnu v Gan* (1897) 1 Bom 3  
(r) *re Mahant Gopal Rao v Sita Ram Keshari* (1898) 1 I A 19 6 All 53 69  
(s) *Mahant Bha* 1 I A 11 1 Cal 414 See *see Hasan*

(t) *Umayy* (1904) 8 Bom 153 *Bober*  
(u) *Isaiah* (1875) 1 B m 9 *F H pa*  
*Yank* 1 A (18 6) 2 Bom 676 *Wahid*  
*v Saf* (1890) 12 All 556  
(f) *Parashram v Miraj* (1898) 6 Bom 569  
(u) *Fenchunder v Shachurn* (1868) 11 M  
1 A 7 3 *Joynt v Union* (182)  
8 Cl 975

This principle applies only to *cardinal facts* and *cardinal issues* and not to subordinate facts and issues based thereon. In applying the principle the whole of the circumstances must be taken into account and carefully scrutinized (1)

2 [ S 146 6th para ] Where issues both of law and of

### Issues of law and of fact

Issues of law and of fact  
fact arise in the same suit, and the Court is of opinion that the case or any part thereof may be disposed of on the issues of law only, it shall try those issues first, and for that purpose may, if it thinks fit, postpone the settlement of the issue of fact until after the issues of law have been determined.

Or any part thereof —These words are new

Materials from which  
cases may be framed

3 [S 147] The Court may frame the issues from all or any of the following materials —

- (a) allegations made on oath by the parties, or by any persons present on their behalf, or made by the pleaders of such parties,
- (b) allegations made in the pleadings or in answers to interrogatories delivered in the suit,
- (c) the contents of documents produced by either party

Issues not to be inconsistent with pleadings—Issues whether raised from the allegations in the pleadings or from other materials should not be inconsistent with the pleadings (u). Thus if issues B to set aside a document on the ground that it was not executed by him and that it is a forgery the Court should not raise an issue as to whether the document was executed under coercion or undue influence. The latter ~~assumes~~ assumes that the document was executed by the plaintiff while the case set up by the plaintiff is that it was not executed by him at all (x). But the plea that the document in suit was obtained by the defendant by fraud is not inconsistent with the fact that it was obtained by undue influence. Therefore where fraud is pleaded in the defence and the plaintiff's counsel alleges at the hearing that the plaintiff was subjected to undue influence the Court may allow issues both as to fraud and undue influence (y).

**Appeal**—No appeal lies from an order refusing to frame an issue as to whether a party to a suit ( )

The High Court of Madras once held that an appeal lies under cl. 1 Patent from an order made at the settlement of issues fixing a distant date of the suit (a). But this decision has been disapproved in later cases.

- ( ) Haf Um v bu tadj (1915) O C I W v  
 97 501-301 34 I C -69 [F C]  
 ( ) Mosh v Dompje (1851) 5 Bom 600 v ko a  
 v I dha (1830) 5 Cal 61  
 ( ) Mahmad I k h v Hal ee (1994) 15 Cal  
 684 15 I A 81 Wad ud-Jah v M k m  
 v J (1888) 10 All 67  
 (y) M Aamdad Ibrahim v M t H J Ja (1917)  
 [un] kce no 901 p 30 33 L 91  
 In this case not only a amendment of  
 the pie M s was directed, I t o e r o

- solicited in the name of the  
 comprising the [unclear] and [unclear]  
 India are [unclear] [unclear] [unclear]  
 indeed [unclear] [unclear] [unclear]
- (c) Ebrahim v Furukhan [unclear]  
 Tahiram v [unclear]  
 18112 [unclear] [unclear]
- (d) P. I (11) [unclear]  
 (e) D. [unclear] [unclear] [unclear]  
 31st [unclear] [unclear] [unclear]  
 (1917) [unclear] [unclear] [unclear]



**4 [S 148]** Where the Court is of opinion that the issues cannot be correctly framed without the examination of some person not before the Court or without the inspection of some document not produced in the suit, it may adjourn the framing of the issues to a future day, and may (subject to any law for the time being in force) compel the attendance of any person or the production of any document by the person in whose possession or power it is by summons or other process

Court may examine  
witness or documents  
before framing issues

**5 [S 149]** (1) The Court may at any time before passing a decree amend the issues or frame additional issues on such terms as it thinks fit, and all such amendments or additional issues as may be necessary for determining the matters in controversy between the parties shall be so made or framed

Power to amend and  
strike out issues

(2) The Court may also at any time before passing a decree strike out any issue that appears to it to be wrongly framed or introduced

Sub rule (1)—The first part of sub rule (1) leaves it to the discretion of the Court to amend the issues or frame additional issues as appears from the word *may* while the latter part makes it imperative on the Judge to amend the issues and frame additional issues as appears from the word *shall* (c)

May amend the issues or frame additional issues—As a general rule the Court should not frame even additional issues from materials other than those specified above in r 3 *Lodhasappa v Pradhanappa* (1925) 27 Bom L P 1318 91 I C 426 (b) A B 33 The Court may however under special circumstances allow issues to be raised upon a matter which does not strictly come within the proper scope of the proceedings provided no injustice is done to either party (d) It follows that the Court should not frame any additional issue so as to make for either party a case which he had no intention of making for himself (e) Nor should it frame an additional issue so as to convert a suit or defence of one character into a suit or defence of a different and inconsistent character Thus if A sues B for damages for wrongful occupation of his land treating B as a trespasser he should not be allowed to raise an additional issue claiming rent of the land from B treating him as his tenant (f) But if a suit is brought on a mortgage and it transpires at the hearing that the witnesses to the mortgage deed were not present at its execution but had put their names on the document on the acknowledgment by the executant of his signature it is perfectly competent to the Judge to frame an additional issue as to whether the deed of mortgage was valid under s 59 of the Transfer of Property Act though the invalidity of the deed is not set up as a defence in the written statement

(c) *Shamu Patter v Aldi K. dir* (191...) 35 Mid 607 39 I A 18 16 I C \* O

(d) *Nehora v Padha* (1880) 5 Cal 64

(e) *Naro Hari v Inpurnabas* (18 4) 11 Bom 160 161

(f) *Narayan v H ri* (1889) 13 Bom 661

Every Court trying civil causes has inherent jurisdiction to take cognizance of questions which cut at the root of the subject matter of controversy between the parties (g) See notes to r 3 above Issues not to be inconsistent with the pleadings

At any time before passing the decree—in additional issue may be raised even after the close of the argument on the case (h)

**6 [S 150]** Where the parties to a suit are agreed as to the question of fact or of law to be decided between them, they may state the same in the form of an issue, and enter into an agreement in writing that, upon the finding of the Court in the affirmative or the negative of such issue,—

Questions of fact or law may by agreement be stated in form of issues

- (a) a sum of money specified in the agreement or to be ascertained by the Court, or in such manner as the Court may direct, shall be paid by one of the parties to the other of them, or that one of them be declared entitled to some right or subject to some liability specified in the agreement,
- (b) some property specified in the agreement and in dispute in the suit shall be delivered by one of the parties to the other of them, or as that other may direct, or
- (c) one or more of the parties shall do or abstain from doing some particular act specified in the agreement and relating to the matter in dispute

Compare O 31 r 1

Form—As to form of agreement for issues to be tried see App H form No 1

Court If satisfied that agreement was entered into in good faith may pronounce judgment

**7 [S 151]** Where the Court is satisfied, after making such inquiry as it deems proper—

- (a) that the agreement was duly executed by the parties
- (b) that they have a substantial interest in the decision of such question as aforesaid and
- (c) that the same is fit to be tried and decided it shall proceed to record and try the issue and state its finding or decision thereon in the same manner as if the issue had been framed by the Court,

7 and shall, upon the finding or decision on such issue, pronounce judgment according to the terms of the agreement, and, upon the judgment so pronounced, a decree shall follow

## ORDER XV

### *Disposal of the Suit at the first hearing*

**1 [S 152]** Where at the first hearing of a suit it appears that the parties are not at issue on any question of law or of fact, the Court may at once pronounce judgment

Parties not at issue

**2 [S 153]** Where there are more defendants than one, and any one of the defendants is not at issue with the plaintiff on any question of law or of fact, the Court may at once pronounce judgment for or against such defendant and the suit shall proceed only against the other defendants

One of several defendants not at issue

Admission of claim by one of several defendants—*A* sues *B* and *C* upon a promissory note jointly passed by them. *B* appears and admits the claim and a decree is passed against him. The decree against *B* is no bar to the further prosecution of the suit against *C* (1). See notes to O 1 r 6. Joint liability on a contract

**3 [S 154]** (1) Where the parties are at issue on some question of law or of fact, and issues have been framed by the Court as hereinafore provided, if the Court is satisfied that no further argument or evidence than the parties can at once adduce is required upon such of the issues as may be sufficient for the decision of the suit and that no injustice will result from proceeding with the suit forthwith, the Court may proceed to determine such issues, and, if the finding thereon is sufficient for the decision, may pronounce judgment accordingly, whether the summons has been issued for the settlement of issues only or for the final disposal of the suit

Parties at issue

Provided that, where the summons has been issued for the settlement of issues only, the parties or their pleaders are present and none of them objects

(2) Where the finding is not sufficient for the decision, the Court shall postpone the further hearing of the suit, and shall fix a day for the production of such further evidence, or for such further argument as the case requires

4 [S 155] Where the summons has been issued for the final disposal of the suit and either party fails without sufficient cause to produce the evidence on which he relies, the Court may at once pronounce judgment, or may, if it thinks fit, after framing and recording issues, adjourn the suit for the production of such evidence as may be necessary for its decision upon such issues

## ORDER XVI

### *Summoning and Attendance of Witnesses*

1 [S 159] At any time after the suit is instituted, the parties may obtain, on application to the Court or to such officer as it appoints in this behalf, summonses to persons whose attendance is required either to give evidence or to produce documents

Difference between the old section and the present rule—This rule corresponds with s 159 C P C 1852 except as to the time for application for witness summonses for which see next paragraph

Time for application for witness summonses—Under s 159 of the Code of 1852 the application for summonses to witnesses was to be made *after* the writ of summons was delivered or sent for service on the defendant *and before* the day fixed in the summons for the appearance of the defendant Under the present rule the application may be made *at any time after the institution of the suit*

Whether witness summonses can be refused—A party is entitled as of right to summonses to witnesses (j) So long as the application is made after the institution of the suit the Court is bound to issue the summons It does not matter that the party has himself originally undertaken to bring his witnesses and has failed to do so (k) Nor does it matter that the application is made at such a late stage of the proceedings that the witnesses cannot be present in Court before the final disposal of the suit (l) The Court may in either of the cases refuse to allow the application for the attendance of the witness but it has no power to refuse to issue summonses (m) The only case in which the Court has power to refuse to issue summonses is where the application is not

|  |                                    |
|--|------------------------------------|
| (j) I J I A M Lk (191) 1 1 m 58        | (m) Eha t Job (191) 16 All *1 K 21 |
| 7 A J 12 A (19) 1 Jo L                 | 48m d A t M A 7m f (1-5) 9 1 em    |
| R 4 1 8 1 C (1) A R 3d                 | 30a Aa dra T rapras (1-6) A C      |
| (k) 2 7 a j A h j (1) 6 1 4            | 364 M k A 3000 (1-10) 9 Lah        |
| (l) A 254 1 5 2 4 6 (1) 1 1 1) (1) 564 | LJ 1-3 R 1 R 41 (1) 1 A L - 1      |

made *bona fide* as where a decree holder attaches property belonging to a *muth* and on the head of the *muth* objecting to the attachment applies to summon him as his own witness requiring his personal attendance in Court with the sole object of putting pressure upon him to relinquish his claim In such a case the Court may in the exercise of its inherent power to prevent the abuse of its own process [s 101] refuse to issue the summonses (n)

**Remedy of party when witness summons refused**—Where a party applies for summonses to witnesses but the application is refused he cannot appeal from the *order of refusal* He must wait until the suit is disposed of and if the decree in the suit goes against him he may appeal from the *decree* and set forth the refusal of the lower Court to issue summonses as a ground of objection in the memorandum of appeal (s 100) If the appellate Court finds that the refusal *has* injuriously affected the decision of the case it may set aside the decree and direct the lower Court to issue the summonses but if it finds that the refusal has not injuriously affected the decision it should not interfere with the decree (o) [see s 99]

**Form of summons to witnesses**—See Schedule I App B No 13

**2 [S 160]** (1) The party applying for a summons shall before the summons is granted and within a period to be fixed, pay into Court such a sum of money as appears to the Court to be sufficient to defray the travelling and other expenses of the person summoned in passing to and from the Court in which he is required to attend, and for one day's attendance

Expenses of witness to be paid into Court on applying for summons

(2) In determining the amount payable under this rule, the Court may, in the case of any person summoned to give evidence as an expert, allow reasonable remuneration for the time occupied both in giving evidence and in performing any work of an expert character necessary for the case

Experts

(3) Where the Court is subordinate to a High Court regard shall be had, in fixing the scale of such expenses, to any rules made in that behalf

Scale of expenses

Sub rule (2) is new

**Chartered High Courts**—This rule does not apply to Chartered High Courts in the exercise of their ordinary or extraordinary original civil jurisdiction [O 49 r 3 cl (3)]

**Travelling and other expenses**—A witness is entitled under this rule only to travelling expenses and other expenses of a similar nature but he is not entitled to compensation for loss of time (p) The right to claim travelling expenses is not lost

( ) See *Indra Nath Vataja* (1901) 3 Mad 3 ( ) *Shri J. V. D. B.* (1911) 16 All 213 (p) *Va. v. Proono arai* (1901) 11 Ind 220

merely because the witness did not apply for them before giving his evidence. The reason is that a witness is entitled to demand his travelling expenses at any time even after he has given his evidence (g). If a witness is summoned by the plaintiff he is entitled to claim his travelling expenses from the plaintiff though he has not been examined by the plaintiff but is examined by the defendant as his witness (r). See also the undermentioned case (s).

**Remedy of witness if travelling expenses not paid**—The only remedy is by an application to the Court that heard the case—no separate suit will lie to recover such expenses (1)

**Default on part of process server**—Where a plaintiff pays into Court the process fee and the expenses of his witness but the summons is not served owing to default on the part of the process server it is illegal to dismiss his suit for want of proof in the absence of the witness (u)

**3** [S 161] The sum so paid into Court shall be tendered to the person summoned, at the time of serving the summons, if it can be served personally.

Order of expenses to  
line

4 [S 162] (1) Where it appears to the Court or to such officer as it appoints in this behalf that the sum paid into Court is not sufficient to cover such expenses or reasonable remuneration the Court may direct such further sum to be paid to the person summoned as appeared to be necessary on that account, and in case of default in payment may order such sum to be levied by attachment and sale of the movable property of the party obtaining the summons or the Court may discharge the person summoned without requiring him to give evidence, or may both order such levy and discharge of such person as aforesaid.

Procedure when I am  
at the airport

(2) Where it is necessary to detain the person summoned for a longer period than one day the Court may from time to time, order the person at whose instance he was summoned to pay into Court such sum as is sufficient to

111 1 m r t l on

defray the expenses of his detention for such further period, and in default of such deposit being made may order such sum to be levied by attachment and sale of the movable property of such party or the Court may discharge the person summoned without requiring him to give evidence or may both order such levy and discharge such person as aforesaid.

|     |   |   |   |   |   |     |   |     |   |    |     |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|-----|---|---|---|---|---|-----|---|-----|---|----|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (2) | L | I | I | h | q | I   | M | I   | I | B  | I   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|     |   | M | h | e | f | (1) | 0 | 4   | 1 | 61 |     |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| (3) | I | I | h | e | k | (1) | 0 | 4   | 1 | 11 | 61  |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| (4) | I | f | e | e | h | h   | f | (1) | 0 | 8  | (1) | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

(f) D<sub>10</sub> Hrush LA I (160) W I  
l f u  
( ) Mof I m v K hrs Lat (104) 6 Lals  
J J al b l c s i e A L.

Sale of movable property—Under this rule if the expenses are not deposited only the movable property of the defaulting party may be attached and sold but not his immovable property (v)

- 5 [S 163] Every summons for the attendance of a person to give evidence or to produce a document shall specify the time and place at which he is required to attend, and also whether his attendance is required for the purpose of giving evidence or to produce a document, or for both purposes, and any particular document which the person summoned is called on to produce, shall be described in the summons with reasonable accuracy

Time, place and purpose of attendance to be specified in summons

Where hearing postponed—When a witness attends Court in pursuance of a summons on the day specified in the summons but the case is not reached on that day it is not necessary to issue a fresh summons. He need only be warned that his attendance will be required on the day to which the hearing may be postponed (w)

- 6 [S 164] Any person may be summoned to produce a document, without being summoned to give evidence, and any person summoned merely to produce a document shall be deemed to have complied with the summons if he causes such document to be produced instead of attending personally to produce the same

Summons to produce document

- 7 [S 165] Any person present in Court may be required by the Court to give evidence or to produce any document then and there in his possession or power

Power to require persons present in Court to give evidence or produce document

- 8 [S 166] Every summons under this Order shall be served as nearly as may be in the same manner as a summons to a defendant and the rules in Order V as to proof of service shall apply in the case of all summonses served under this rule

Summons how served

- 9 [S 167] Service shall in all cases be made a sufficient time before the time specified in the summons for the attendance of the person summoned, to allow him a reasonable time for preparation and for travelling to the place at which his attendance is required

Time for serving summons

(v) *Md Warish v Fahman* (1913) 28 Cal W N 87 OLC 1-3 (41) AC 430 | (w) *Subbaraj Ja v Chenchuramayya* (1901) 21 Mad 99

10 [S 168] (1) Where a person to whom a summons

Procedure where witness  
fails to comply with sum-  
mons

has been issued either to attend to give evidence or to produce a document fails to attend or to produce the document in compliance with such summons, the Court shall, if the certificate of the serving officer has been verified by affidavit, and may, if it has been so verified, examine the serving officer on oath or cause him to be examined by another Court, touching the service or non-service of the summons

(2) Where the Court sees reason to believe that such evidence or production is material, and that such person has, without lawful excuse, failed to attend or to produce the document in compliance with such summons or has intentionally avoided service, it may issue a proclamation requiring him to attend to give evidence or to produce the document at a time and place to be named therein, and a copy of such proclamation shall be affixed on the outer door or other conspicuous part of the house in which he ordinarily resides

(3) In lieu of or at the time of issuing such proclamation, or at any time afterwards, the Court may, in its discretion, issue a warrant, either with or without bail, for the arrest of such person, and may make an order for the attachment of his property to such amount as it thinks fit, not exceeding the amount of the costs of attachment and of any fine which may be imposed under rule 12

Provided that no Court of Small Causes shall make an order for the attachment of immovable property

Evidence Act S 69—Before dispensing with the evidence of an attesting witness under sec 69 of the Evidence Act the Court must see that all previous provisions (1) and (2) and (3) have been exhausted (x)

Appeal—An appeal lies from an order under this rule for the attachment of property (O 43 r 1 d (g))

11 [S 169] Where at any time after the attachment of his property such person appears and satisfies the Court,—

If witness appears attachment may be withdrawn

(1) that he did not, without lawful excuse, fail to comply with the summons or intentionally avoid service and



(b) where he has failed to attend at the time and place named in a proclamation issued under the last preceding rule, that he had no notice of such proclamation in time to attend,

the Court shall direct that the property be released from attachment, and shall make such order as to the costs of the attachment as it thinks fit

**12 [S 170]** The Court may, where such person does not appear, or appears but fails so to satisfy the Court, impose upon him such fine not exceeding five hundred rupees as it thinks

Procedure if witness fails to appear

fit, having regard to his condition in life and all the circumstances of the case, and may order his property, or any part thereof to be attached and sold or, if already attached under rule 10, to be sold for the purpose of satisfying all costs of such attachment, together with the amount of the said fine, if any

Provided that if the person whose attendance is required pays into Court the costs and fine aforesaid, the Court shall order the property to be released from attachment

**Scope of the rule**—P 11 applies to the case where the person served appears and satisfies the Court as to his failure to appear. The present rule applies to the case where the person does not appear or appears but fails so to satisfy the Court (y)

**Imposition of fine**—Neither the issue of a proclamation nor an order for attachment under r 10 above is a condition precedent to the imposition of a fine under this rule ( )

**Order releasing property from attachment**—In a case under the Code of 1882 the Court accepted the fine and costs even after sale of the property attached and refused to confirm the sale as the price realised was absurdly low. The auction purchaser appealed from the order but it was held that no appeal lay from the order (α). If a similar case arises under the new Code it will have to be considered in the light of rule 13 of this Order and of O 21 r 89 [which cannot apply unless the Crown is regarded as a decree holder] r 90 and r 91.

**Contempt proceedings**—In the case of a proceeding before a Chartered High Court the defaulting witness may also be proceeded against for contempt (b)

**13 [New]** The provisions with regard to the attachment and sale of property in the execution of a decree shall, so far as they are

Mode of attachment

applicable, be deemed to apply to any attachment and sale under this Order as if the person whose property is so attached were a judgment debtor

(j) See *Sub Kumar v Secretary of State* (1907) 31 Cal 117 363 51 C 45

(k) *Mangray In re* (1914) 48 Mad 241 90 I C 991 ( ) A M 14

(α) *Badr Prasad v Tej Singh* (1910) 33 All. 697 1 C 100

(b) *Ebr v J. J. F. Peror* (1906) 4 Pand 98 1 C (6) 4 R. 15

**14 [S 171]** Subject to the provisions of this Code as to attendance and appearance and to any law for the time being in force, where the Court at any time thinks it necessary to examine any person other than a party

Court may of its own accord summon as witness trans to ult

to the suit and not called as a witness by a party to the suit the Court may, of its own motion, cause such person to be summoned as a witness to give evidence, or to produce any document in his possession, on a day to be appointed, and may examine him as a witness or require him to produce such document

**15 [S 172]** Subject as last aforesaid, whoever is summoned to appear and give evidence in a suit shall attend at the time and place named in the summons for that purpose and whoever is summoned to produce a document shall either attend to produce it, or cause it to be produced, at such time and place

Duty of persons summoned to give evidence or produce document

**16 [S 173]** (1) A person so summoned and attending shall, unless the Court otherwise directs attend at each hearing until the suit has been disposed of

When they may depart

(2) On the application of either party and the payment through the Court of all necessary expenses (if any) the Court may require any person so summoned and attending to furnish security to attend at the next or any other hearing or until the suit is disposed of and in default of his furnishing such security, may order him to be detained in the civil prison

Sub rule (2) — This sub rule is new

**17 [Ss 174 175]** The provisions of rules 10 to 13 shall so far as they are applicable be deemed to apply to any person who having attended in compliance with a summons departs, without lawful excuse in contravention of rule 16

Application of rules 10 to 13

**18 [S 174 5th para]** Where any person arrested under a warrant is brought before the Court in custody and cannot owing to the absence of the parties or any of them give the evidence or produce the document which

17 & 18 will be applied to the person or persons who are brought before the Court in custody and cannot owing to the absence of the parties or any of them give the evidence or produce the document which

the ( )  
 attach  
 attach

12

Procedu  
 to appear

fit, hav  
 stances  
 thereof,  
 rule 10, t  
 attachme

Provi  
 pays into ( )  
 order the p

Scope of thi  
 and satisfies the ( )  
 where the pers n

Imposition of ( )  
 ment under r 10 of  
 rule ( )

Order releasing  
 of 1882 the Court ac  
 refused to confirm th  
 purchaser appealed fr n  
 If a similar case ar  
 rule 13 of this Ord r  
 regarded as a decree h

Contempt procedin  
 Court the defaultin, with

13 [ New ]

Mode of attachm t  
 mci  
 tion

applicable, be deemed  
 under this Order as if th  
 were a judgment debto

(1) See Sub A m m n f f f  
 31 C 1 1 J 30 t 5 1 C 4  
 (2) M q a r g J n r e (10 ) 4 M 1 11  
 931 ( 20 ) A M 1 1

**14 [S 171]** Subject to the provisions of this Code as to attendance and appearance and to any law for the time being in force, where the Court at any time thinks it necessary to examine any person other than a party

Court may of its own accord summon as witness stranger as to suit

to the suit and not called as a witness by a party to the suit the Court may, of its own motion, cause such person to be summoned as a witness to give evidence or to produce any document in his possession, on a day to be appointed and may examine him as a witness or require him to produce such document

**15 [S 172]** Subject as last aforesaid whoever is summoned to appear and give evidence in a suit shall attend at the time and place named in the summons for that purpose and whoever is summoned to produce a document shall either attend to produce it, or cause it to be produced, at such time and place

Duty of persons summoned to give evidence or produce document

**16 [S 173]** (1) A person so summoned and attending shall, unless the Court otherwise directs, attend at each hearing until the suit has been disposed of

When they may depart

(2) On the application of either party and the payment through the Court of all necessary expenses (if any) the Court may require any person so summoned and attending to furnish security to attend at the next or any other hearing or until the suit is disposed of and, in default of his furnishing such security, may order him to be detained in the civil prison

Sub rule (2) — This sub rule is new

**17 [Ss 174 175]** The provisions of rules 10 to 13 shall so far as they are applicable be deemed to apply to any person who having attended in compliance with a summons departs, without lawful excuse in contravention of rule 16

Application of rules 10 to 13

**18 [S 174 5th para]** Where any person arrested under a warrant is brought before the Court in custody and cannot owing to the absence of the parties or any of them give the evidence or produce the document which

Procedure with witness arrested and not at liberty to give evidence or produce document

he has been summoned to give or produce, the Court may require him to give reasonable bail or other security for his appearance at such time and place as it thinks fit, and, on such bail or security being given, may release him, and, in default of his giving such bail or security, may order him to be detained in the civil prison

No witness to be ordered to attend in person unless resident within certain limits

**19** [S 176] No one shall be ordered to attend in person to give evidence unless he resides—

(a) within the local limits of the Court's ordinary original jurisdiction, or

(b) without such limits but at a place less than fifty or (where there is railway or steamer communication or other established public conveyance for five sixths of the distance between the place where he resides and the place where the Court is situate) less than two hundred miles distance from the Court-house

See O 26 r 4

**20** [S 177] Where any party to a suit present in Court refuses, without lawful excuse, when required by the Court, to give evidence or to produce any document then and there in his possession or power, the Court may pronounce judgment against him or make such order in relation to the suit as it thinks fit

Consequence of refusal of party to give evidence when called on by Court

**Appeal**—An appeal lies from an order under this rule pronouncing judgment against a party [O 43 r 1 cl (b)]

**21** [S 178] Where any party to a suit is required to give evidence or to produce a document, the provisions as to witnesses shall apply to him so far as they are applicable

Rules as to witnesses to apply to parties summoned

**Duty of suitors to give evidence on their own behalf**—In *Lal Kunwar v Chirranj Lal* (c) their Lordships of the Privy Council severely condemned the practice followed in some parts of India of advocates omitting to call their own client as a witness in the hope of forcing their opponents to call him as their witness in order that they themselves may have the opportunity of cross examining their own client when called by the other side Referring to this practice their Lordships said It is a vicious practice unworthy of a high toned or respectable system of advocacy It must embarrass and perplex judicial investigation and it is to be feared too often enables fraud falsehood or chicanery to baffle justice

## ORDER XVII

*Adjournments*

- 1 [S 156] (1) The Court may, if sufficient cause is shown, at any stage of the suit grant time to the parties or to any of them, and may from time to time adjourn the hearing

Court may grant time and adjourn hearing

of the suit

- (2) In every such case the Court shall fix a day for the further hearing of the suit, and may make such order as it thinks fit with respect to

Costs of adjournment

the costs occasioned by the adjournment

Provided that, when the hearing of evidence has once begun, the hearing of the suit shall be continued from day to day until all the witnesses in attendance have been examined, unless the Court finds the adjournment of the hearing beyond the following day to be necessary for reasons to be recorded

**May adjourn**—This rule gives a discretion to the Court to grant time to the parties and to adjourn the hearing of a suit. On the one hand no adjournment should be granted if no sufficient cause is shown (d). On the other hand the Court should not refuse an adjournment if sufficient cause is shown (e). What is sufficient cause is a question of fact in each case.

**Payment of costs as a condition precedent**—A sues B for damages. At the hearing of the suit B applies for an adjournment. The hearing is adjourned on the terms that B should pay Rs 50 to A for costs before the next hearing and that if he fails to do so his defence would be struck off and the suit would be proceeded with *ex parte*. B fails to pay the cost. The Court may proceed with the suit *ex parte* (f). But the Court cannot do so if the payment of costs was not a condition precedent to the hearing of B's case (g).

**Pauper suit**—The Patna High Court has held that payment of costs by the plaintiff may be made a condition precedent to his being granted an adjournment although he is suing in forma pauperis (h).

- 2 [S 157] Where on any day to which the hearing of the suit is adjourned the parties or any of them fail to appear the Court may proceed to dispose of the suit in one of the modes directed in that behalf by Order IX or make such other order as it thinks fit

Procedure if parties fail to appear on day fixed

(d) *I d b A v. Govt. of St. L.* (19 4) 51  
(e) *U. O. 91 L. 45 (4) 4 L. 4*  
(f) *M. A. v. H. v. H.* (19 0) 51 at L. J. 390  
(g) *East India L. v. Co.* J. 1 Mol (19 3)

(h) 47 All 534 861 C 86 (25) 4 4 4  
(g) *Forbush v. P. v. A. v. H.* (1 2) 21 M. 1  
403  
(h) *L. v. P. v. E. v. H.* (19 3) 4  
Pan 561 (24) 4 R 3-6

**Distinction between O 9 and O 17**—The provisions of O 9 by themselves do not apply to a case in which the plaintiff or defendant has already appeared but has failed to appear at an adjourned hearing of the suit. For such a case the procedure is laid down in O 17 which deals with adjournments (i)

**One of the modes directed by Order IX**—The effect of this rule is to assimilate the procedure in cases where there is default of appearance at an adjourned hearing with that in cases where there is such default at the first hearing. The result is that though a party may have appeared at the first hearing but fails to appear at an adjourned hearing the procedure laid down in Order 9 will apply that is to say if the plaintiff fails to appear at an adjourned hearing the Court may make an order dismissing the suit under this rule and O 9 r 8 and the plaintiff may if so advised then apply under this rule and O 9 r 9 for an order to set the dismissal aside (j) and if the defendant fails to appear at an adjourned hearing the Court may pass an ex parte decree under this rule and O 9 r 6 and the defendant may if so advised then apply under this rule and O 9 r 13 for an order to set it aside (k). If both parties fail to appear at the hearing the Court may make an order dismissing the suit under this rule and O 9 r 3 and the plaintiff may then if so advised either bring a fresh suit or apply for an order to set the dismissal aside under this rule and O 9 r 4 (l)

After a decree has been passed the Court has no jurisdiction to dismiss the suit under this rule and O 9 r 8 for plaintiff's default. This is because once a decree has been made in a suit the suit cannot be dismissed unless the decree is reversed on appeal (m)

**May proceed under O 9 or make such other order as it thinks fit**—The High Court of Bombay has held that where the plaintiff has made a case which if uncontradicted would entitle him to a decree but does not appear at an adjourned hearing the Court should not dismiss the suit under this rule and O 9 r 8 but should decide the case on the merits. The reason given is that O 9 r 8 does not apply where the plaintiff has made a case which if uncontradicted would entitle him to the relief claimed (n). On the other hand the Allahabad High Court has held that the words "or make such other order as it thinks fit" do not empower the Court to dispose of the suit on the merits but only to grant a further adjournment and if the Court does not adjourn the hearing it should proceed under this rule and O 9 that is to say dismiss the suit under O 9 r 8 if the plaintiff does not appear and pass an ex parte decree under O 9 r 6 if the defendant does not appear (o). In Calcutta it has been held that where there are no materials on the record the Court should proceed under r 2 above but if there are materials on the record the Court ought to proceed under this rule (p). It has been held in some cases that if the Court refuses a further adjournment and dismisses the suit if the plaintiff does not appear or passes an ex parte decree if the defendant does not appear but omits to state whether the order was made under this rule or r 3 below the order must be taken to have been made under this rule (q) unless it clearly appears from the proceedings that there has been a decision on the merits (r)

(i) *Enattali v Jiban* (1914) 41 Cal 96 93 I C 789

(j) *Pillay v Sherman* (18) 1 Mad 9 *Pamaya v Rangayya* (1844) Mad 41 *Mahanna v Pamahala* (190) 34 Cal 235 *Nagendra K. Mah v Nadin Mandi* (1909) 36 Cal 189 1 I C 41 *Pukam v Tara Ch d* (19) 10 All L J 13 65 I C 75 (-) A A 64

(k) *Bh g n v H a* (189) 10 All 35 *Haldreth v S Jay* (1896) 9 Bom 360 *Jo ardam v I mthone* (190) 3 Cal 738 followed in *En tulla v Jiba* (1914) 41 Cal 96 3 I C 69

(l) *Alicar v Sealamm I* (188) 10 Mad 20

(m) *Lahmi v a n v Balmaku d* (1904) 11 A

31 4 Pat 61 81 I C 74 (4) A P C 194

(n) *Ving ppa v Gourdappa* (190) 7 Bom L R 61

(o) *Fulji v uarv Ha hm tulla* (191) 37 All 460 9 I C 53 *Ran Cpa v Singh* (1904) 45 All 618 75 I C 38 (3) A A 551 *Pam Adhin v Pam Bihar* (1905) 4 All 181 8 I C 7 (-5) A A 11

(p) *See Enattali v Jiban* (1914) 41 Cal 96 3 I C 789 *Mari* 1224 *v Pamahala* (190) 34 Cal 235 See also *Kader Ah n v Jugg n a* (1908) 35 Cal 103

(q) *G n v Lal v Debi Das* (1905) 47 All 110 8 I C 470 (3) A A 67

(r) *Shah Muhammad v Ch the Mahlo* (1919) 4 Pat I J 71-6 I C 990

There does not seem to be any doubt that default of appearance *before hearing* in a case of general adjournment as distinguished from an adjournment granted under r 3 to enable a party to perform any act necessary to the further progress of the suit is within this rule and under r 3 so that if the plaintiff does not appear the Court may dismiss the suit under this rule and O 9 r 8 and if the defendant does not appear it may pass an ex parte decree under this rule and O 9 r 6 (5)

**Adjourned hearing**—It has been held by the High Court of Calcutta that the word adjourned in this rule refers to an adjournment upon the application of parties granted under r 1 and not an adjournment necessitated by the rules of the Court relating to the regulation of its own business (1)

**Fail to appear**—See notes to O 9 r 9 Appearance

**Non appearance on day fixed for judgment**—A suit cannot be dismissed for non appearance of parties on the day fixed for delivery of judgment (u)

**Remedy**—See notes to the next rule under the head Remedy

**3 [S 158]** Where any party to a suit to whom time has been granted fails to produce his evidence, or to cause the attendance of his witnesses, or to perform any other act necessary to the further progress of the suit, for which time has been allowed, the Court may, notwithstanding such default, proceed to decide the suit forthwith

Court may proceed notwithstanding either party fails to produce evidence etc

**Scope of the rule**—The provisions of this rule do not apply unless—

(1) the hearing is adjourned on the application of a party to the suit as distinguished from an adjournment by the Court of its own motion (1)

(2) the hearing is adjourned on the application of the party who subsequently makes the default (u)

(3) the adjournment is granted to enable the party to produce his evidence or to cause the attendance of his witnesses or to perform any other act necessary to the further progress of the suit and

(4) the party fails to perform any of the acts for which the adjournment was granted within the time allowed by the Court

**Any other act**—A suitor B to recover possession of certain land. A contends that the suit is not properly valued. The Court thereupon appoints a commissioner on the application of A to value the land and directs A to pay into Court Rs 100 being the commissioner's fee within a specified time. If A fail to make the payment within the prescribed time the Court may proceed under this rule. The payment of the commissioner's fee is an act necessary to the further progress of the suit within the meaning of this rule (x)

**Procedure to be followed under this rule**—Rule 2 applies to cases where the hearing is adjourned *no matter for what purpose* and the parties or any of them fail to appear at the adjourned hearing. The present rule is directed to cases where the

(v) *Kristi* (19) 34 Cal 113  
467 111 (19) 34 Cal 113  
SA 1 (19) 34 Cal 113  
14 (3) 34 Cal 113  
14 (3) 34 Cal 113  
14 (3) 34 Cal 113

(d) *See* (19) 34 Cal 113  
(1) *See* (19) 34 Cal 113

(e) *See* (19) 34 Cal 113  
14 (3) 34 Cal 113  
14 (3) 34 Cal 113  
14 (3) 34 Cal 113  
14 (3) 34 Cal 113  
14 (3) 34 Cal 113



hearing is adjourned at the instance of a party for some one or other of the purposes specified in the rule and the party fails to perform the specified act or acts for which the adjournment was granted within the time allowed by the Court (y) In such a case the rule says the Court may notwithstanding such default proceed to decide the suit forthwith These words do not mean that the Court may dismiss the suit if the plaintiff is in default or pass a decree against the defendant if the defendant is in default ( ) What they mean is that the Court may further adjourn the hearing or it may without granting any further adjournment proceed to try the suit and take such evidence as may be tendered by the parties and decide the suit on the merits (a) Thus where an adjournment is granted to the plaintiff to amend the plaint but the plaintiff fails to amend the plaint and the Court refuses a further adjournment the Court should not dismiss the suit for default but decide it on the merits (b) The word forthwith means without granting any further adjournment [contrast the words at once pronounce judgment in O 15 r 4] Where the adjournment is not for the purpose of performing any act necessary to the further progress of the suit in other words it is a general adjournment default of appearance at the adjourned hearing comes within r 2 above and not under this rule (c)

**Remedy**—Where a suit is disposed of under the first part of r 2 above it is open to the party aggrieved by the order to proceed under O 9 r 9 or O 9 r 13 as the case may be see notes to r 2 above One of the modes directed by Order 9 But where a case is decided under the present rule the decision amounts to a decree and the remedy of the party aggrieved: by way of appeal (d) or by way of review (e) As to what points may be taken in appeal and what in review see the undermentioned case (f)

**Case where default under this rule is coupled with default of appearance under rule 2**—If the hearing of a suit is adjourned on the application of the plaintiff to enable him to produce his evidence or to perform any other act as mentioned in this rule and the plaintiff does not appear at the adjourned hearing should the Court proceed under this rule or under rule 2? The High Court of Madras has held that the Court should in such a case proceed under r 2 and dismiss the suit for default so that the plaintiff may have an opportunity to apply under O 9 r 9 to set aside the dismissal (g) A similar view has been taken by the High Court of Bombay (h) The High Court of Lahore has held that if there are no sufficient materials on the record the Court should proceed under r 2 above (i) but if there are sufficient materials it should proceed to decide the suit under this rule (j) In Allahabad the balance of authority seems to be in favour of the view that the Court should proceed under r 2 and not under this rule (k)

- (y) *Krista Fishore v Pan Haram* (19 8) 47 C 1 L J 467 111 I C 430 ( 8 ) A C 341  
*Mah v Damodar v Paj Kumar* (19 ) 1 Pat 188 196 69 I C 837 ( ) A P 48  
 (z) *Sukh v P m Lot n* (1919) 41 All 663 51 I C 80  
 (a) *S tara v Tulshi* (1901) 73 All 46 *Pam v am v J gico* (1911) 33 All 690 10 I C 903 9 c howe v *gend Kumra v Nab n Ma dol* (1909) 36 Cal 199 191 19 11 C 41 *Puchamma v Sreeram* 1 c (1918) 41 Mad 86 9 43 I C 566  
 (b) (1919) 4 Pat L J 2 51 I C 189 *supra*  
 (c) *A thim lam v Secretary of St te* (19 8) 54 Mad L J 31 *Ma g l ray v Sava Je* (19 6) 4 Rang 409 99 I C 71 ( ) A R 46 *Chandanam v Samasany* (1923) 6 Rang 766 115 I C 668 ( 9 ) A R 73 *M i Chand v Pra v Lal* (19 9) 77 All I J 391  
 (d) *Lali Irazad v Nand Kishore* (1899) — All 66 C a *Hibi v Chanta* (1911) 34 All 1 3 1\* I C 603 *Puchamma v S ee m l* (1819) 41 Mad 246 9 43 I C 566 *S kku v Lam Lota* (1919) 41 All

- 663 51 I C 80 *Ma Chon v Ma 99 Ma i* (19 ) 5 Rang 833 101 I C 619 ( ) A R 148  
 (e) *Pi tuma v Sreeramulu* (1919) 41 Mad 86 9 43 I C 566  
 (f) *Puchamma v Sreeramulu* (1918) 41 Mad 86 9 43 I C 566  
 (g) *Chandramathi v Varaya swami* (1910) 33 Mad 41 51 I C 23 *P chamma v Sreer m i* (1918) 41 Mad 296 43 I C 566 [F B] overruling *Yagan da v Krishna m rth* (1911) 34 Mal 97 6 I C 33  
 (U) *Bas jya v Allayva* (19 5) 7 Bom L R 4 87 I C 710 ( 25 ) A R 3 A *Sarima v Smith* (1900) 20 B m 736  
 ( ) *Haripopal v Harish Cha der* (1919) Punj Rec no 49 p 10 47 I C 596 *Har Al v Ma ga* (1919) Punj Rec no 150 P 32 5 I C 90  
 (j) *Jha da v Soluq* (19 5) 5 Lah. 218 73 I C 433 ( 4 ) A R 345  
 (k) *Ca ceh Lal v Debi Das* (19 3) 47 All 110 146 85 I C 470 ( 3 ) A A 67 P m Adh v P m *Bharose* (1925) 47 All 181 185 8 I C 47 ( 25 ) A A 14 B i *see Badam v Vethu* (1903) 3 All 194 C m B da v *Gha ta* (191 ) 34 All 1-3

The Patna High Court has held that this rule does not apply unless the hearing is commenced (l)

To whom time has been granted —Where a party has paid the process fee for summoning witnesses but the witnesses are not served and the Court adjourns the hearing to enable its officer to serve the summonses the adjournment does not amount to granting of time within the meaning of this rule and the rule does not apply (m)

Execution proceedings —The provisions of this Order do not apply to execution proceedings (n)

## ORDER XVIII

### *Hearing of the Suit and Examination of Witnesses*

1 [S 179, Explan] The plaintiff has the right to begin unless the defendant admits the facts alleged by the plaintiff and contends that either in point of law or on some additional facts alleged by the defendant the plaintiff is not entitled to any part of the relief which he seeks, in which case the defendant has the right to begin

Right to begin —The right to begin is to be determined by the rules of evidence. As a general rule the party on whom the burden of proof rests should begin. Sections 101-114 of the Indian Evidence Act I of 1872 deal with burden of proof. Section 102 of the Act provides that the burden of proof lies on that party who would fail if no evidence at all were given on either side. Thus if A sues B for the recovery of a piece of land of which B is in possession the burden of proof lies on A for if no evidence were given on either side B would be entitled to retain his possession.

Unless the defendant admits the facts alleged by the plaintiff — Facts mean all material facts. Thus where a defendant admits only some of the facts alleged by the plaintiff it does not give him the right to begin (o)

Preliminary issue raised by defendant that suit does not lie — Where the defendant raises a preliminary issue that the suit is barred as *res judicata* the defendant has the right to begin (p)

Preliminary issue raised by respondent that appeal does not lie — In such a case according to the Bombay High Court the appellant has the right to begin. The decision was put on the ground of established practice in the Bombay High Court (q)

2 [S 179, 1st para, S 180 1st and 2nd paras] (1) On the day fixed for the hearing of the suit or on any other day to which the hearing is adjourned the party having the right to begin shall state his case and produce his evidence in support of the issues which he is bound to prove

Statement and production of evidence

(l) Mahabadi I. J. 1919 (1) 11

(m) H. J. 1915 (1) 11

Rec. no. 511, 31.9.1915

(n) T. R. 1915 (1) 11

131

(o) F. 1915 (1) 11

(p) F. 1915 (1) 11

(q) F. 1915 (1) 11

hearing is adjourned at the instance of a party for some one or other of the purposes specified in the rule and the party fails to perform the specified act or acts for which the adjournment was granted within the time allowed by the Court (y) In such a case the rule says the Court may notwithstanding such default proceed to decide the suit forthwith These words do not mean that the Court may dismiss the suit if the plaintiff is in default or pass a decree against the defendant if the defendant is in default ( ) What they mean is that the Court may further adjourn the hearing or it may without granting any further adjournment proceed to try the suit and take such evidence as may be tendered by the parties and decide the suit on the merits (a) Thus where an adjournment is granted to the plaintiff to amend the plaint but the plaintiff fails to amend the plaint and the Court refuses a further adjournment the Court should not dismiss the suit for default but decide it on the merits (b) The word forthwith means without granting any further adjournment [contrast the words at once pronounce judgment in O 15 r 4] Where the adjournment is not for the purpose of performing any act necessary to the further progress of the suit in other words it is a general adjournment default of appearance at the adjourned hearing comes within r 2 above and not under this rule (c)

Remedy—Where a suit is disposed of under the first part of r 2 above it is open to the party aggrieved by the order to proceed under O 9 r 9 or O 9 r 13 as the case may be see notes to r 2 above One of the modes directed by Order 9 But where a case is decided under the present rule the decision amounts to a decree and the remedy of the party aggrieved is by way of appeal (d) or by way of review (e) As to what points may be taken in appeal and what in review see the undermentioned case (f)

Case where default under this rule is coupled with default of appearance under rule 2—If the hearing of a suit is adjourned on the application of the plaintiff to enable him to produce his evidence or to perform any other act as mentioned in this rule and the plaintiff does not appear at the adjourned hearing should the Court proceed under this rule or under rule 2? The High Court of Madras has held that the Court should in such a case proceed under r 2 and dismiss the suit for default so that the plaintiff may have an opportunity to apply under O 9 r 9 to set aside the dismissal (g) A similar view has been taken by the High Court of Bombay (h) The High Court of Lahore has held that if there are no sufficient materials on the record the Court should proceed under r 2 above (i) but if there are sufficient materials it should proceed to decide the suit under this rule (j) In Allahabad the balance of authority seems to be in favour of the view that the Court should proceed under r 2 and not under this rule (k)

- (y) *Frula Fishore v Pancharam* (19 8) 47 Cal L J 467 111 IC 430 ( 8 ) A C 311  
*Maha v Damod r v Pay Fumar* (192 ) 1 Pat 188 198 69 IC 837 ( ) A P 485
- (z) *Sukhu v P m Lotan* (1919) 41 All 663 51 IC 80
- (a) *Sitara v Tulshi* (1901) 73 All 46. *Pam Nara v Jagdeo* (1911) 33 All 690 10 IC 903 9 e however *Yagendra Kuma v Nabin Mandai* (1909) 36 C 1 189 191 19 IC 741 *Pichamma v Sree amila* (1918) 41 Mad 86 99 43 IC 566
- (b) (1919) 4 Pat L J - 51 IC 180 *supra*
- (c) *Auth m la n v Secretary of State* (19 8) 54 Mad L J 31 *Ma ng l a v S r I s* (19 6) 4 Rang 409 99 IC 717 ( 7 ) A R 46 *Chand sam v Sama y* (19 8) 6 Rang 766 115 IC 668 ( 9 ) A R 73 *Mul Chand v Ivars Lal* (1929) 77 All I J 391
- (d) *Lalia Pr sad v Na d K A e* (1899) 4R 66 *C r a B v A hania* (1911) 34 All 13 1 IC 603 *J chamma Sree m l* (1819) 41 M d 48 9 43 IC 566 *S kku v I am Lotan* (1919) 41 All
- 663 51 IC 850 *Ma Chon v Ma ng lant* (19 ) 5 Rang 839 101 IC 816 ( 7 ) A R 148
- (e) *Pic nima v Sreeramulu* (1918) 41 Mad 98 43 IC 566
- (f) *Puchamma v Sreeramulu* (1918) 41 Mad 99 93 43 IC 566
- (g) *Chandramathi v a rajanwami* (1910) 33 Mad 41 5 IC 93 *Puchamma v Sreeramulu* (1918) 41 Mad 86 43 IC 566 [F B] overruling *Naga ada v Krishna m rthi* (1911) 34 Ma l 97 6 IC 33
- (h) *Basa ym v Allayya* (19 5) 77 Bom L R 47 87 IC 710 (25) A B 3 9 *Shrin al v Sm th* (1940) 20 Bom 736
- (i) *Hargopal v Harish Chander* (1919) Punj Rec no 48 p 10 47 IC 598 *Sher Al v Mangu* (1919) Punj Rec no 150 p 39 5 IC 29
- (j) *Jl ada S gh v Sudhi* (19 1) 5 Lah 218 73 IC 453 (21) A L 545
- (k) *Ganesh Lal Debti* (19 5) 47 All 141 146 8 IC 470 ( 5 ) A A 267 *Fam Adhin v Nam Bh ros* (19 5) 47 All 181 18 8 IC 47 ( 5 ) A A 19 *But see B dam v Nath* (1903) 3 All 191 *Gaura Bibi v Chania* (191 ) 34 All 123

The Patna High Court has held that this rule does not apply unless the hearing is commenced (l)

*To whom time has been granted*—Where a party has paid the process fee for summoning witnesses but the witnesses are not served and the Court adjourns the hearing to enable its officer to serve the summonses the adjournment does not amount to granting of time within the meaning of this rule and the rule does not apply (m)

*Execution proceedings*—The provisions of this Order do not apply to execution proceedings (n)

## ORDER XVIII

### *Hearing of the Suit and Examination of Witnesses*

**1 [S 179, Expln]** The plaintiff has the right to begin unless the defendant admits the facts alleged by the plaintiff and contends that either in point of law or on some additional facts alleged by the defendant the plaintiff is not entitled to any part of the relief which he seeks, in which case the defendant has the right to begin

*Right to begin*—The right to begin is to be determined by the rules of evidence. As a general rule the party on whom the burden of proof rests should begin. Sections 101-114 of the Indian Evidence Act I of 1872 deal with burden of proof. Section 102 of the Act provides that the burden of proof lies on that party who would fail if no evidence at all were given on either side. Thus if A sues B for the recovery of a piece of land of which B is in possession the burden of proof lies on A for if no evidence were given on either side B would be entitled to retain his possession.

Unless the defendant admits the facts alleged by the plaintiff—*Facts* mean all material facts. Thus where a defendant admits only some of the facts alleged by the plaintiff it does not give him the right to begin (o)

*Preliminary issue raised by defendant that suit does not lie*—Where the defendant raises a preliminary issue that the suit is barred as res judicata the defendant has the right to begin (p)

*Preliminary issue raised by respondent that appeal does not lie*—In such a case according to the Bombay High Court the appellant has the right to begin. The decision was put on the ground of established practice in the Bombay High Court (q)

**2 [S 179 1st para, S 180 1st and 2nd paras]** (1) On the day fixed for the hearing of the suit or on any other day to which the hearing is adjourned the party having the right to begin shall state his case and produce his evidence in support of the issues which he is bound to prove

(l) *Wishnubhai I. v. S. V. S. I. (1931) 1 L.J. 107 (1931) 1 L.J. 107*

(m) *H. J. v. L. S. V. S. I. (1931) 1 L.J. 107*

(n) *Rec. no. 51 P. 31 91 C. 93*

(o) *Tirth v. S. V. S. I. (1931) 1 L.J. 107*

(p) *131*

(q) *131*

(r) *131*

(s) *131*

(2) The other party shall then state his case and produce his evidence (if any) and may then address the Court generally on the whole case

(3) The party beginning may then reply generally on the whole case

The other party shall then state his case —Where there are two sets of defendants and their interests are practically the same the rule is that after the plaintiff has closed his case both the defendants should state their case before any evidence is given by either defendant (7)

Some of the defendants supporting plaintiff's case—Where there are several defendants and some of them support the plaintiff's case the rule is that the plaintiff and such of the defendants as support his case wholly or in part must address the Court and call their evidence in the first place and then the other party that is the other defendants should address the Court and call their evidence (8)

Hearing of arguments—If in a case where a party having an opportunity of addressing the Court does not do so the judgment cannot be set aside because it was delivered without hearing arguments (1)

**3 [S 180 3rd para]** Where there are several issues the burden of proving some of which lies on the other party, the party beginning, may, at his option, either produce his evidence on those issues or reserve it by way of answer to the evidence produced by the other party, and, in the latter case, the party beginning may produce evidence on those issues after the other party has produced all his evidence and the other party may then reply specially on the evidence so produced by the party beginning, but the party beginning will then be entitled to reply generally on the whole case

**4 [S 181]** The evidence of the witnesses in attendance shall be taken orally in open Court in the presence and under the personal direction and superintendence of the Judge

Evidence of witnesses It is the duty of the Judge to examine every witness tendered unless it appears clearly that the object of summoning a large number of witnesses is to obstruct or delay justice (u) It is not right for the Judge to select a certain number of witnesses and send away the rest because he thinks that they would only prove the same facts as those already deposed to (t) or because he is satisfied on the evidence already recorded (w) If he does so the Appellate Court may remand

( ) P D 1 A a (190 ) 29 Cal 3

( ) H J 1 I v S Han Mahomet Khan (1904) 3 Bom 599

(t) H J 1 v D v D Ha (19 3) 4 Lah 361 7 I C 394 (A) A L 107

(u) Pambh v Pajballab (18 0) 6 B L R.

APP 10  
( ) Jes v J t v J t v (1841) M 1 A

4 4  
(w) Bray voodur v Ki oon lra (18 4) 3 W R 63

the case with a direction to him to take the evidence of the witnesses tendered by the party but not examined by the Judge (x)

Evidence shall be taken in open Court —As to the examination of witnesses on commission see Order 26 below

**5 [S 182]** In cases in which an appeal is allowed the evidence of each witness shall be taken down in writing, in the language of the Court by or in the presence and under the personal direction and superintendence of the Judge, not ordinarily in the form of question and answer, but in that of a narrative and, when completed, shall be read over in the presence of the Judge and of the witness and the Judge shall, if necessary, correct the same, and shall sign it

**Chartered High Courts**—This rule does not apply to Chartered High Courts in the exercise of their ordinary or extraordinary original civil jurisdiction [O 49 r 3 cl (4)]

**Presence of parties**—Where evidence is taken in the absence of the opposite party it will be rejected by the Court of appeal if the objection to the reception of the evidence was taken before the Court trying the suit. If no such objection was taken the appellate Court will not remand the case especially if the other evidence in the case is sufficient to support the decision of the lower Court (y) See Indian Evidence Act 1872 s 107

**Shall be read over**—There is a difference of opinion whether if the deposition is not read over to the witness as required by this rule or interpreted to him as required by r 6 below it is admissible in evidence in trials for perjury and forgery it being held in some cases that the deposition is not admissible in evidence (z) while in others that it is (a). The former view proceeds on the ground that the deposition not being read over or interpreted to the witness it does not prove itself under s 80 of the Evidence Act 1872 and that it cannot be proved in any other way having regard to the provisions of s 91 of that Act. The latter view proceeds on the ground that though the deposition does not in such a case prove itself under s 80 of the Evidence Act it may be proved in any other way e.g. by the Judge who took it down and that s 91 of the Act is no bar to such proof

Where a witness understands English and the deposition is read over by him instead of being read over to him it is a substantial compliance with the rule (b)

**Signature of witness**—The rule does not require a witness to sign his evidence (c)

**Signature of Judge**—A prosecution for perjury cannot be maintained if the deposition is not signed by the Judge. The signing of the deposition by the Judge is made essential to the application of s 80 of the Evidence Act 1872 by the section itself (d)

(x) *Ahuda Faksh v I am et* (1887) 9 All 339

(y) *Bhimarao v I a p amy* (18 5) 6 M I A 3

(z) *Emp et v Maw d b* (1881) 6 Cal 6 [d position not even held by the Judge]

(a) *Mad h nalka v Emperor* (190 ) 34

Mad 308 *Emperor v Jagendra k sh*

(1911) 4 Cal 40 11 C 871 3111 v A g *Empero* (1919) 5 M d 561 50

I C 987 *Empero v A dob Ah* (1901)

51 Cal 736 811 C 803 (4) 4 1 704

( ) *Flak B ksh Emperor* (1916) 45 Cal 825

451 C 59 *Igra v Empero* (1911) 34

Mad 141 71 C 414 *Mea go v Larksh*

(191 ) Mad W N 37

(f) *Ramesh Chand v Emperor* (1919) 46 Cal

895 901 501 C 660

( ) 46 Cal 895 901 50 I C 660 *supra*

(d) *Empero v M jod b* (1881) 6 Cal 6

6 [S 183] Where the evidence is taken down in a language different from that in which it is given, and the witness does not understand the language in which it is taken down, the evidence as taken down in writing shall be interpreted to him in the language in which it is given

When deposition to be interpreted

Chartered High Courts—This rule does not apply to Chartered High Courts in the exercise of their ordinary or extraordinary original civil jurisdiction [O 49 r 3 cl (4)]

Shall be interpreted —See notes to r 5 above. Shall be read over

7 [New] Evidence taken down under section 138 shall be in the form prescribed by rule 5 and shall be read over and signed and as occasion may require, interpreted and corrected as if it were evidence taken down under that rule

Evidence under section 138

8 [S 184] Where the evidence is not taken down in writing by the Judge, he shall be bound, as the examination of each witness proceeds, to make a memorandum of the substance of what each witness deposes and such memorandum shall be written and signed by the Judge and shall form part of the record

Memorandum when evidence not taken down by Judge

Chartered High Courts—This rule does not apply to Chartered High Courts in the exercise of their ordinary or extraordinary original civil jurisdiction [O 49 r 3 cl (4)]

Where evidence not taken down by Judge—If the evidence is taken down not by the Judge but by some other person the Judge also should make or cause to be made a memorandum as provided by this rule even if the evidence was taken down by the other person in the presence and under the personal direction and superintendence of the Judge as required by r 5 above. If evidence is dictated to a typist by a Judge and no memorandum is made by him the provisions of this rule and of rr 5 and 14 are not complied with. But the case is then one not of illegality but of irregularity (c)

9 [S 185] Where English is not the language of the Court but all the parties to the suit who appear in person, and the pleaders of such as appear by pleaders, do not object to have such evidence as is given in English taken down in English the Judge may so take it down

When evidence may be taken in English

Chartered High Courts—This rule does not apply to Chartered High Courts in the exercise of their ordinary or extraordinary original civil jurisdiction [O 49 r 3 cl (4)]

**10 [S 186]** The Court may, of its own motion or on the application of any party or his pleader, take down any particular question and answer, or any objection to any question, if there appears to be any special reason for so doing

Any particular question and answer may be taken down

**Chartered High Courts**—This rule does not apply to Chartered High Courts in the exercise of their ordinary or extraordinary original civil jurisdiction [O 49 r 3 cl (4)]

**11 [S 187]** Where any question put to a witness is objected to by a party or his pleader, and the Court allows the same to be put, the Judge shall take down the question, the answer, the objection and the name of the person making it, together with the decision of the Court thereon

Questions objected to and allowed by Court

**Chartered High Courts**—This rule does not apply to Chartered High Courts in the exercise of their ordinary or extraordinary original civil jurisdiction [O 49 r 3 cl (4)]

**Where no objection is taken**—If evidence has been admitted without objection in the Court of first instance it must not be rejected by the appellate Court (f)

**12 [S 188]** The Court may record such remarks as it thinks material respecting the demeanour of any witness while under examination

Remarks on demeanour of witnesses

**Remarks on demeanour of witnesses**—See the undermentioned case (g)

**13 [S 189]** In cases in which an appeal is not allowed, it shall not be necessary to take down the evidence of the witnesses in writing at length, but the Judge, as the examination of each witness proceeds, shall make a memorandum of the substance of what he deposes, and such memorandum shall be written and signed by the Judge and shall form part of the record

Memorandum of evidence in unappealable cases

**Chartered High Courts**—This rule does not apply to Chartered High Courts in the exercise of their ordinary or extraordinary original civil jurisdiction [O 49 r 3 cl (4)]

**14 [S 190]** (1) Where the Judge is unable to make a memorandum is required by this Order he shall cause the reason of such inability to be recorded and shall cause the memorandum to be made in writing from his dictation in open Court

Judge unable to make a memorandum to record reasons of his inability

(f) *Chandrasekhar v. Dastagir* (1945) 11 L.R. 3-0  
*Bodhinathan v. Omeria* (1950) 15 M.L.J. 4  
519 5-29

(g) *Emperor v. C.D.* (1922) 41 All. 431  
66 L.C. 1005 (222) A.A. 11 [a criminal case]



6 (2) Every memorandum so made shall form part of the record

**Chartered High Courts**—This rule does not apply to Chartered High Courts in the exercise of their ordinary or extraordinary original civil jurisdiction [O 49 r 3 cl. (4)]

**15 [S 191]** (1) Where a Judge is prevented by death, transfer or other cause from concluding the trial of a suit, his successor may deal with any evidence or memorandum taken down or made under the foregoing rules as if such evidence or memorandum had been taken down or made by him or under his direction under the said rules and may proceed with the suit from the stage at which his predecessor left it

Power to deal with evidence taken before another Judge

(2) The provisions of sub rule (1) shall, so far as they are applicable, be deemed to apply to evidence taken in a suit transferred under section 24

**Chartered High Courts**—This rule so far as it relates to the manner of taking evidence does not apply to Chartered High Courts in the exercise of their ordinary or extraordinary original civil jurisdiction [O 49 r 3 cl. (4)]

**16 [S 192]** (1) Where a witness is about to leave the jurisdiction of the Court, or other sufficient cause is shown to the satisfaction of the Court why his evidence should be taken immediately, the Court may upon the application of any party or of the witness, at any time after the institution of the suit, take the evidence of such witness in manner hereinbefore provided

Power to examine witness immediately

(2) Where such evidence is not taken forthwith and in the presence of the parties, such notice as the Court thinks sufficient, of the day fixed for the examination, shall be given to the parties

(3) The evidence so taken shall be read over to the witness, and, if he admits it to be correct, shall be signed by him and the Judge shall, if necessary, correct the same and shall sign it, and it may then be read at any hearing of the suit

**Chartered High Courts**—This rule so far as it relates to the manner of taking evidence does not apply to Chartered High Courts in the exercise of their ordinary or extraordinary original civil jurisdiction [O 49 r 3 cl. (4)]

**Notice**—For form of notice see App II form No 6

**17 [S 193]** The Court may at any stage of a suit recall any witness who has been examined and may (subject to the law of evidence for the time being in force) put such questions to him as the Court thinks fit

Court may recall and examine witness

**18 [New]** The Court may at any stage of a suit inspect any property or thing concerning which any question may arise

Lower of Court to inspect

**View by Judge**—This rule does not entitle a Judge to put his own view on inspection in the place of evidence. Thus in an action of deceit brought on the ground that a particular article used by the defendant is a colourable imitation of the plaintiff's the conclusion of the Judge on a view by him of the two articles—such as two rival omnibuses that the defendant's article is calculated to deceive is not sufficient by itself to support an injunction. The Judge must be satisfied by independent evidence that there is at least a reasonable probability of deception (*h*)

## ORDER XIX

### *Affidavits*

**1 [S 194]** Any Court may at any time for sufficient reason order that any particular fact or facts may be proved by affidavit, or that the affidavit of any witness may be read at the hearing on such conditions as the Court thinks reasonable

Lower to order a point to be proved by affidavit

Provided that where it appears to the Court that either party *bona fide* desires the production of a witness for cross examination, and that such witness can be produced, an order shall not be made authorizing the evidence of such witness to be given by affidavit

**2 [S 195]** (1) Upon any application evidence may be given by affidavit, but the Court may at the instance of either party, order the attendance for cross examination of the deponent

Power to order attendance of deponent for cross examination

(2) Such attendance shall be in Court unless the deponent is exempted from personal appearance in Court or the Court otherwise directs

3      3 [S 196] (1) Affidavits shall be confined to such facts as the deponent is able of his own knowledge to prove, except on interlocutory applications, on which statements of his belief may be admitted provided that the grounds thereof are stated

Matters to which affidavits shall be confined

(2) The costs of every affidavit which shall unnecessarily set forth matters of hearsay or argumentative matter, or copies of or extracts from documents, shall (unless the Court otherwise directs) be paid by the party filing the same

Grounds of belief—The grounds of belief must be stated with sufficient particularity to enable the Court to judge whether it would be safe to act on the deponent's belief (s)

## ORDER XX

### *Judgment and Decree*

r 1      1 [S 198] The Court, after the case has been heard, shall pronounce judgment in open Court, either at once or on some future day, of which due notice shall be given to the parties or their pleaders

Judgment when pronounced

See s 33 above

Chartered High Courts—This rule does not apply to Chartered High Courts in the exercise of their ordinary or extraordinary original civil jurisdiction [O 49 r 3 cl (c)]

Evidence taken before another Judge—As a general rule judgment must be given upon evidence taken by the Judge before himself and not upon evidence taken before another person (j) In the three following cases the Judge may give judgment upon evidence recorded by some other Judge or person—

- (1) Under O 18 r 15 when the Judge who has heard the evidence is prevented by death transfer or other cause from concluding the trial of the suit
- (2) Under O 26 r 1 where the evidence has been taken by a commissioner of a witness residing within the jurisdiction who is exempted under the Code from attending the Court or is unable to attend from sickness or infirmity
- (3) Under O 26 r 4 where the evidence has been taken by a commissioner of a witness residing beyond the jurisdiction and of other persons specified in the rule

Notice to parties—Notice should be given in the manner prescribed by s 140 A judgment delivered without notice to parties is not a judgment pronounced within the meaning of this rule (k)

Judgment not pronounced—A judgment not pronounced in Court does not operate as a judgment it operates only as minute or memoranda made by the Judge

(i) *Padmabati v. Parik Lal* (1910) 37 Cal. 259

61 C 666

(j) *Nara Bhai v. Narasimha* (1867) 4 B H

C A C 98

(k) *Khar v. Lachman* (1907) 47 All. 322, 86 I C 869 (1905) A A 793

who wrote it (l) The posting of a notice on the notice board of the Court announcing the result of a case is not a sufficient compliance with this rule (m)

**Non compliance with rules 1 2 and 3**—Where a judgment is not pronounced dated or signed in conformity with the requirements of the Code it constitutes a mere irregularity within the meaning of s 99 it affords no ground for reversal in appeal of the decree based on it (n)

Power to pronounce judgment written by judge's predecessor

## 2 [S 199] A Judge may pronounce a judgment written but not pronounced by his predecessor

**Chartered High Courts**—This rule does not apply to Chartered High Courts in the exercise of their ordinary or extraordinary original civil jurisdiction [O 49 r 3 cl (5)] The High Court of Bombay has held that where a Judge of the High Court dictates his judgment to a shorthand writer but does not see or approve the transcript the transcript cannot be treated as his judgment but a letter from him to the Prothonotary stating his final decision and the exact order made and a king that it should be communicated to the parties in Court may be treated as a judgment although it gives no reasons (o)

**Written by his predecessor**—It does not matter that the judgment was written by the Judge's predecessor after he had taken leave or left the judicial post which he occupied when he heard the case or after he had been transferred (p) The fact that the transferred officer himself pronounces the judgment does not make any difference (q)

**May pronounce**—The word may leaves a Judge the option to pronounce a judgment according to his own view of the case though it may be different from the judgment written by his predecessor or who heard the case (r)

**Non compliance with rules 1 2 and 3**—See notes to r 1 above under the same head

## 3 [S 202] The judgment shall be dated and signed by the Judge in open Court at the time of pronouncing it and, when once signed, shall not afterwards be altered or added to, save as provided by section 152 or on review

Judgment to be signed

**Chartered High Courts**—This rule does not apply to Chartered High Courts in the exercise of their ordinary or extraordinary original civil jurisdiction [O 49 r 3 cl (5)]

**Shall not afterwards be altered**—A decree cannot be altered by a Court even with the consent of parties except in the mode prescribed (s) When a District Judge delivers a judgment in open Court but subsequently the judge of the decree pending the production by the plaintiff of a certified copy of the judgment

(l) *Mahomed Ali v Asadu* (1867) 9 W 1 118 B 1

(m) *Adri v v Seah* (1911) 41 M 31 J 38 531 C 8 (21) A M 400 J

*Dahs v Hargovan* (1906) 30 Bom 455

(n) *Port (lost) Jite* (1910) 46 Cal 94 511 C 40

(o) *Mather (Nizam) Express Co Ltd v La* (1911) 31 Bom 61 100 IC 961

(p) *Sw A* (1911) 31 Bom 61 100 IC 961

(q) *Sw A* (1911) 31 Bom 61 100 IC 961

(r) *Sw A* (1911) 31 Bom 61 100 IC 961

(s) *Grj Sha Rev* (1901) 31 Bom 11 118 B 1

(t) *Stat* (1911) 35 All 4 191 C 5

(u) *Laurati* (1911) 35 All 4 191 C 5

(v) *Stat* (1911) 35 All 4 191 C 5

(w) *Stat* (1911) 35 All 4 191 C 5

(x) *Stat* (1911) 35 All 4 191 C 5

(y) *Stat* (1911) 35 All 4 191 C 5

(z) *Stat* (1911) 35 All 4 191 C 5

that it was not competent to the Judge to cancel the judgment and deliver another judgment inconsistent with the first (t) Where it is held by one Judge that the Court fee paid on a plaint is sufficient his successor has no power to alter that judgment and hold that it is insufficient (u)

**Amendment.**—S. 152 enables the Court to correct clerical or arithmetical mistakes or errors arising from accidental slips in judgments decrees or orders

**Review.**—See s 114 and O 47 r 1

**Non compliance with rules 1 2 and 3.**—See notes to r 1 above under the same head

**4 [S 203]** (1) Judgments of a Court of Small Causes need not contain more than the points for determination and the decision thereon

Judgment of Small Cause Courts

(2) Judgments of other Courts shall contain a concise statement of the case, the points for determination, the decision thereon, and the reasons for such decision

Judgments of other Courts

**Chartered High Courts.**—This rule does not apply to Chartered High Courts in the exercise of their ordinary or extraordinary original civil jurisdiction [O 49 r 3 cl. (3)].

**Judgments of Small Cause Court.**—Where the judgment of a Small Cause Court after setting out a number of issues merely stated I find all the issues for the plaintiff it was held that it was not a sufficient compliance with the provisions of sub rule (1) and the judgment was set aside and the case remanded to the lower Court for being disposed of according to law (v) The judgment must convey some indication that the Judge has applied his mind to the evidence on the record (w)

**Court invested with Small Cause Court powers.**—A Court invested with Small Cause Court powers is governed by sub r (1) and not sub r (2) (x)

**Unintelligible judgment.**—If a judgment is unintelligible the appellate Court may set it aside and remand the case to the lower Court for the recording of judgment according to law after hearing afresh the arguments of pleaders (y)

**5 [S 204]** In suits in which issues have been framed, the Court shall state its finding or decision, with the reasons therefor, upon each separate issue, unless the finding upon any one or more of the issues is sufficient for the decision of the suit

Court to state its decision on each issue

**Chartered High Courts.**—This rule does not apply to Chartered High Courts in the exercise of their ordinary or extraordinary original civil jurisdiction [O 49 r 3 cl. (5)].

**Object of judgment.**—The proper object of a judgment is to support by the most cogent reasons that suggest themselves the final conclusion at which the Judge has conscientiously arrived That object is defeated by the Judge elaborately recording

(t) *Kisha K. war v. Ganga Prasad* (1909) 31 All 153 11 C 200

(u) *H. R. v. M. Newari* (1906) 3 Pat 654 8 1 C 815 (25) A P 4

(v) *Moiden v. Moiden* (1907) 49 Mad L J 254 901 C 969 (2) A M 1029

(w) *Kund n Lal v. S. e. Dayal* (1923) 10 Lab. L. J 218

(x) *S. e. v. Bhagat* (1907) 31 Bom 311 11 C 815 (25) A P 4

(y) *H. Bhagwan v. Ahmed* (1907) 4 Lab. L. J 55 (2) A L 100

the fluctuations of his mind from day to day in reference to the witnesses the evidence and the arguments. It is a substantial objection to a judgment that it does not dispose of the question as it was presented by the parties e.g. when it finds a particular signature to be a forgery which both sides admit to be genuine (z)

## 6 [S 206, 1st and 2nd paras, S 221] (1) The decree

Contents of decree

shall agree with the judgment, it shall contain the number of the suit, the names and descriptions of the parties, and particulars of the claim, and shall specify clearly the relief granted or other determination of the suit

(2) The decree shall also state the amount of costs incurred in the suit, and by whom or out of what property and in what proportions such costs are to be paid

(3) The Court may direct that the costs payable to one party by the other shall be set off against any sum which is admitted or found to be due from the former to the latter

**Chartered High Courts**—This rule does not apply to Chartered High Courts in the exercise of their ordinary or extraordinary original civil jurisdiction [O 40 r 3 cl (5)]

**How decrees should be drawn up**—Decrees should be drawn up in such a way as to make them self contained and capable of execution without referring to any other document (a)

**Sub rule (3)**—This sub rule corresponds to s 221 of the Code of 1882

**Power to amend decree**—See s 152 and notes thereto

## 7 [S 205] The decree shall bear date the day on

Date of decree

which the judgment was pronounced, and when the Judge has satisfied himself that the decree has been drawn up in accordance with the judgment he shall sign the decree

**Chartered High Courts**—This rule does not apply to Chartered High Courts in the exercise of their ordinary or extraordinary original civil jurisdiction [(1) 41 r 3 cl (5)]

**Date of decree**—The period of limitation for an appeal from a judgment runs from the date on which it is pronounced, and not from the date on which it is written and signed (b)

## 8 [Aru] Where a Judge has vacated office after pro-

Procedure where Judge  
has vacated office before  
signing decree

nouncing judgment but without signing the decree a decree drawn up in accordance with such judgment may be signed by his successor or if the Court has ceased

(1) *Vara Prasad v. B. S. Rao* (1922) 1 Pat. 154

(2) *Joyti v. Malomed* (1925) 8 Cal. 95

(b) *garnal v. Lachmanrao* (1922) 1 Pat. 154

51 C 69 (23) A P 19

that it was not competent to the Judge to cancel the judgment and deliver another judgment inconsistent with the first (t) Where it is held by one Judge that the Court fee paid on a plaint is sufficient his successor has no power to alter that judgment and hold that it is insufficient (u)

**Amendment**—S 152 enables the Court to correct clerical or arithmetical mistakes or errors arising from accidental slips in judgments decrees or orders

**Review**—See s 114 and O 47 r 1

**Non compliance with rules 1 2 and 3**—See notes to r 1 above under the same head

**4 [S 203]** (1) Judgments of a Court of Small Causes need not contain more than the points for determination and the decision thereon

Judgment of Small Cause Courts

(2) Judgments of other Courts shall contain a concise statement of the case, the points for determination, the decision thereon, and the reasons for such decision

Judgments of other Courts

**Chartered High Courts**—This rule does not apply to Chartered High Courts in the exercise of their ordinary or extraordinary original civil jurisdiction [O 49 r 3 cl (5)].

**Judgments of Small Cause Court**—Where the judgment of a Small Cause Court after setting out a number of issues merely stated I find all the issues for the plaintiff it was held that it was not a sufficient compliance with the provisions of sub-rule (1) and the judgment was set aside and the case remanded to the lower Court for being disposed of according to law (v) The judgment must convey some indication that the Judge has applied his mind to the evidence on the record (w)

**Court invested with Small Cause Court powers**—A Court invested with Small Cause Court powers is governed by sub r (1) and not sub r (2) (x)

**Unintelligible judgment**—If a judgment is unintelligible the appellate Court may set it aside and remand the case to the lower Court for the recording of judgment according to law after hearing afresh the arguments of pleaders (y)

**5 [S 204]** In suits in which issues have been framed, the Court shall state its finding or decision, with the reasons therefor, upon each separate issue, unless the finding upon any one or more of the issues is sufficient for the decision of the suit

Court to state its decision on each issue

**Chartered High Courts**—This rule does not apply to Chartered High Courts in the exercise of their ordinary or extraordinary original civil jurisdiction [O 49 r 3 cl (5)].

**Object of judgment**—The proper object of a judgment is to support by the most cogent reasons that suggest themselves the final conclusion at which the Judge has conscientiously arrived That object is defeated by the Judge elaborately recording

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>(i) <i>Kishan Kwar v Ganga Prasad</i> (1900) 31 All. 1 3 11 C 870</p> <p>(u) <i>Harikar v Mahasari</i> (1904) 3 Pat 64 871 C 813 (-) A P 47</p> <p>(v) <i>Molden v Molden</i> (1905) 49 Mad L J 34 903 C 968 (-) A M 17-9</p> | <p>(w) <i>Kundan Lal v Shie Dayal</i> (1923) 10 Lab. L. J 18</p> <p>(x) <i>Naray v Bhaga</i> (1907) 31 Bom 314</p> <p><i>Man g Sa v Ma Uma</i> (1903) 1 Band 24 761 C 600 (1903) A R. 5</p> <p>(y) <i>Harbhawan v Ahmad</i> (1900) 4 Lab L J 53 (2.) A L 17</p> |
|--|---|

the fluctuations of his mind from day to day in reference to the witnesses the evidence and the arguments. It is a substantial objection to a judgment that it does not dispose of the question as it was presented by the parties *e.g.* when it finds a particular signature to be a forgery which both sides admit to be genuine (2)

## 6 [S 206, 1st and 2nd paras, S 221] (1) The decree

Contents of decree

shall agree with the judgment, it shall contain the number of the suit, the names and descriptions of the parties, and particulars of the claim, and shall specify clearly the relief granted or other determination of the suit

(2) The decree shall also state the amount of costs incurred in the suit, and by whom or out of what property and in what proportions such costs are to be paid

(3) The Court may direct that the costs payable to one party by the other shall be set off against any sum which is admitted or found to be due from the former to the latter

Chartered High Courts—This rule does not apply to Chartered High Courts in the exercise of their ordinary or extraordinary original civil jurisdiction [O 49 r 3 cl (5)]

How decrees should be drawn up—Decrees should be drawn up in such a way as to make them self contained and capable of execution without referring to any other document (a)

Sub rule (3)—This sub rule corresponds to s 221 of the Code of 1882

Power to amend decree—See s 142 and notes thereto

## 7 [S 205] The decree shall bear date the day on

Date of decree

which the judgment was pronounced and when the Judge has satisfied himself that the decree has been drawn up in accordance with the judgment he shall sign the decree

Chartered High Courts—This rule does not apply to Chartered High Courts in the exercise of their ordinary or extraordinary original civil jurisdiction [O 41 r 3 cl (5)]

Date of decree—The period of limitation for an appeal from a judgment runs from the date on which it is pronounced and not from the date on which it is written and signed (b)

## 8 [New] Where a Judge has vacated office after pro-

Procedure where Judge has vacated office before signing decree

nouncing judgment but without signing the decree a decree drawn up in accordance with such judgment may be signed by his successor, or if the Court has ceased

(2) *Sri I. Jhu adha v. Sri Bro. & K. Kora* (1906) 31 A 154

(a) *Joytara v. Mahomed* (1908) 38 Cal. 95

(b) *Garwal v. Lachmura* (1922) 1 Pat. 771

51 C 89 (1923) A P 19



to exist, by the Judge of any Court to which such Court was subordinate

*Chartered High Courts*—This rule does not apply to Chartered High Courts in the exercise of their ordinary or extraordinary original civil jurisdiction [O 49 r 3 cl (5)]

**9 [S 207]** Where the subject-matter of the suit is immovable property, the decree shall contain a description of such property sufficient to identify the same, and where such property can be identified by boundaries by numbers in a record of settlement of survey, the decree shall specify such boundaries or numbers

*Decree for recovery of immovable property*

*Decree for possession of land*—A decree for possession of land carries with it possession of account books and other papers relating to the management of the land (c)

**10 [S 208]** Where the suit is for movable property, and the decree is for the delivery of such property, the decree shall also state the amount of money to be paid as an alternative if delivery cannot be had

*Decree for delivery of movable property*

*Decree for delivery of movable property*—This rule contemplates suits for the recovery of specific movable property referred in arts 48 and 49 of the Limitation Act (d) The decree holder cannot execute the decree without having recourse to the procedure prescribed by O 21 r 31 he has not an option not to take delivery of the property and to fall back upon the money portion of the decree (e)

**11 [S 210]** (1) Where, and in so far as a decree is for the payment of money, the Court may for any sufficient reason at the time of passing the decree order that payment of the amount decreed shall be postponed or shall be made by instalments with or without interest, notwithstanding anything contained in the contract under which the money is payable

*Order may direct payment by instalments*

(2) After the passing of any such decree the Court may, on the application of the judgment debtor and with the consent of the decree holder, order that payment of the amount decreed shall be postponed or shall be made by instalments on such terms as to the payment of interest, the attachment of the property of the judgment debtor, or the taking of security from him, or otherwise, as it thinks fit

*Order after decree for payment by instalments*

(c) *Sri Bharoni v. Decree* (188) 21 Bom 485 | (e) *Bal Mukunda v. Bengal Nagpur Ry* (1899) 35 Cal 6 1031 C 40 (7) A C 4

(d) *Muge a v. Jotharam* (1879) — Mad 48

Old section—This rule corresponds with s 210 of the Code of 1882 except in the following particulars—

- (1) The words shall be postponed in sub rules (1) and (2) are new
- (2) The words notwithstanding anything contained in the contract under which the money is payable in sub rule (1) are also new see notes below under those words

In so far as the decree is for the payment of money—This rule applies to money decrees only and not to mortgage decrees (f)

Sufficient reason—The possibility of the judgment debtor obtaining a cross decree in another pending litigation has been held not to be sufficient cause for postponing payment of the decretal amount (g)

Notwithstanding anything contained in the contract under which the money is payable—These words are new They have been added to overrule the decision of the Bombay High Court in *Ragho v Dipchnad* (h) In that case it was held that if A executed a bond to B payable by instalments with a proviso that if default was made in payment of any one of the instalments the whole amount should become due and payable forthwith and if on default being made by A in payment of any one instalment B sued A to recover the whole of the balance due the Court could not at the time of passing the decree order the amount decreed to be paid by instalments for to do so it was said, would be inconsistent with the terms of the bond Under the present rule the Court has the power to order payment of the amount decreed by instalments notwithstanding the terms of the bond

Interest—Where a decree is made payable by instalments under sub rule (1) the rate of interest is in the discretion of the Court (i)

Summary Suit—It is irregular for the Court in a summary suit instituted under O 3, where the defendant has failed to obtain leave to appear and defend to pass an order at his instance for the payment of the decretal amount by instalments (j)

Sub rule (2)—Sub rule (1) applies where an application is made by the judgment debtor at the time of passing the decree Sub rule (2) applies where an application is made after the passing of the decree In the latter case no order can be made for payment by instalments nor can payment be postponed except with the consent of the decree holder Sub rule (2) has been altered by Burma Schedule Notification and an order can be made for payment by instalments under the altered rule even without the consent of the decree holder but after notice to him (k)

Taking of security—Immovable property given by the judgment debtor as security under sub rule (2) may be realized by the decree holder in execution and he is not obliged to have recourse to a regular suit for the purpose O 34 r 14 does not apply to a charge created by the decree itself or one created by the act of parties subsequent to the decree. It applies only to a charge existing prior to the decree (l)

Limitation—An application by a judgment debtor under this rule for payment of the amount of a decree by instalments should be made within 6 months from the date of the decree [Limitation Act 1908 Sch I art. 13]

Execution of decree payable by instalments—In the case of an ordinary instalment decree that is a decree payable by instalments in certain specified rates

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>(f) <i>Shankarappa D. vs. (1881) 5 Bom. 604</i><br/> <i>(g) A. M. I. M. v. P. Govan D. (1886) Lab. 313</i><br/> <i>(h) 1907 I C 109 (C-6) A. L. 604</i><br/> <i>(i) (1880) 4 Bom. 90</i><br/> <i>(j) C. v. D. v. S. M. (1879) 3 Bom. 0</i><br/> <i>Pudonj v. Jemondj (1906) 50 I. M. 8</i></p> | <p><i>(k) 94 I. C. 109 (C-6) A. L. 604</i><br/> <i>(l) S. v. H. v. M. J. v. S. (1906) 4 Lab. 47</i><br/> <i>(m) 1907 I C. 109 (C-6) A. L. 604</i><br/> <i>(n) Original J. v. S. v. S. (1905) 49</i><br/> <i>Mad. L. J. 613 v. 2 C. 42 (C-6) A. M. 194</i></p> |
|---|---|



continuation of the original suit (g) Such an application cannot be dismissed for default under O 9 r 3 for that would involve dismissal of a claim which has already been decreed (r)

**Decree for possession and mesne profits**—In a suit for the recovery of possession of immovable property the plaintiff may claim mesne profits which have accrued due during a period *prior to the institution of the suit* He may also claim mesne profits which have accrued due *subsequent to the institution of the suit* The decree to be passed in such a case will now be as follows —

- 1 That the defendant do put the plaintiff in possession of the property specified in the schedule annexed to the decree [To this extent the decree is final]
- 2 { That the defendant do pay to the plaintiff the sum of Rs with interest thereon at the rate of per cent per annum to the date of realization on account of mesne profits which have accrued due *prior to the institution of the suit* [To this extent the decree is final]  
Or [where accounts have to be taken of the mesne profits]—  
That an inquiry be made as to the amount of mesne profits which have accrued due *prior to the institution of the suit* [To this extent the decree is preliminary see s 2 Explan]
- 3 That an inquiry be made as to the amount of mesne profits *from the institution of the suit* until the point of time specified in cl (c) of the section [To this extent the decree is preliminary] See Sch I App D Form No 23

The inquiry referred to above may be held before an officer of the Court appointed in that behalf who must report to the Court the result of the inquiry After that is done and the parties are heard on the report a final decree will be passed in respect of the mesne profits

**Where decree silent as to mesne profits**—Where a preliminary decree is silent as to mesne profits the Court has no power to direct such enquiry by its final decree (s)

**Mesne profits where no date fixed**—Where a preliminary decree awards possession and mesne profits but is silent as to the date up to which mesne profits are awarded the decree holder is entitled to mesne profits up to the date of delivery of possession to him (t)

**Joint Hindu family**—This rule applies not only where the plaintiff sues for possession of the whole of an immovable property but also where he sues for possession of a portion thereof But the portion must be a specified portion that is a portion to the profits of which the plaintiff is exclusively entitled Hence the provisions of the rule do not apply to a suit for partition by a member of a joint Hindu family for until partition no member is entitled to a specific share of the property (u) This does not mean that a member of a joint Hindu family is not entitled in a suit for partition to claim his share of the rent and profits of the joint property from which he may have been wrongfully excluded He is entitled to such share (v) But the Court in deciding

(c) *Indra Prasth v. Indu* (19) 47 All 543

(d) *Indra Prasth v. Indu* (19) 47 All 543

(e) *Indra Prasth v. Indu* (19) 47 All 543

(f) *Indra Prasth v. Indu* (19) 47 All 543

(g) *Indra Prasth v. Indu* (19) 47 All 543

(h) *Indra Prasth v. Indu* (19) 47 All 543

(i) *Indra Prasth v. Indu* (19) 47 All 543

(j) *Indra Prasth v. Indu* (19) 47 All 543

(k) *Indra Prasth v. Indu* (19) 47 All 543

(l) *Indra Prasth v. Indu* (19) 47 All 543

(m) *Indra Prasth v. Indu* (19) 47 All 543

(n) *Indra Prasth v. Indu* (19) 47 All 543

(o) *Indra Prasth v. Indu* (19) 47 All 543

(p) *Indra Prasth v. Indu* (19) 47 All 543

(q) *Indra Prasth v. Indu* (19) 47 All 543

(r) *Indra Prasth v. Indu* (19) 47 All 543

(s) *Indra Prasth v. Indu* (19) 47 All 543

(t) *Indra Prasth v. Indu* (19) 47 All 543

(u) *Indra Prasth v. Indu* (19) 47 All 543

(v) *Indra Prasth v. Indu* (19) 47 All 543

(w) *Indra Prasth v. Indu* (19) 47 All 543

(x) *Indra Prasth v. Indu* (19) 47 All 543

(y) *Indra Prasth v. Indu* (19) 47 All 543

(z) *Indra Prasth v. Indu* (19) 47 All 543

(aa) *Indra Prasth v. Indu* (19) 47 All 543

(ab) *Indra Prasth v. Indu* (19) 47 All 543

2 upon his claim must be guided not by the provisions of this rule but by the rules of Hindu law relating to partition (w) See notes to r 18 below

**Procedure**—Where an appellate Court disagreeing with the lower Court finds that the plaintiff is entitled to possession it should pass a preliminary decree for possession and direct an inquiry as to mesne profits it is not proper merely to remand the case to the lower Court for disposal (x) The Madras High Court has added a clause to this rule as to which see the case in footnote (y)

**Mesne profits**—The expression mesne profits is defined in s 2 cl (1) as meaning those profits which the person in wrongful possession of property actually received or might with ordinary diligence have received therefrom together with interest on such profits but shall not include profits due to improvements made by the person in wrongful possession

The claim for mesne profits is virtually a claim for damages Hence there is no rigid rule for determining the amount of mesne profits and the amount must be assessed in every case by a proper exercise of judicial discretion (z) Mesne profits are in the nature of damages which the Court may mould according to the justice of the case Hence in calculating mesne profits payments of revenue and cesses made by the defendant should be deducted (a) But the costs of collecting the rents or profits should not be allowed to the defendant unless he entered on the property in the exercise of a bona fide claim of right (b)

Wrongful possession by the defendant is the very essence of a claim for mesne profits and the very foundation of a decree therefor and this rule cannot apply if the possession of the defendant has not been wrongful (c) Hence a defendant cannot be rendered liable for mesne profits during the period the property was under attachment by virtue of an order made under s 146 of the Criminal Procedure Code (d) Where a defendant has been in wrongful possession for a certain period and is subsequently dispossessed by a third party the defendant can only be charged with mesne profits for the period for which he was in wrongful possession. He cannot be charged with mesne profits that have accrued due subsequently to his dispossession though the person who dispossessed him may not have done anything to recover the rents or profits (e) The reason is that if a defendant is dispossessed by a third party he cannot be said to have even impliedly received the profits nor could he with ordinary or extraordinary diligence have received them But where a defendant who has been in wrongful possession abandons the land without giving notice to the plaintiff he will be held liable for mesne profits (f)

Where a person buys immovable property from a defendant pending a suit against him for recovery of the property and for mesne profits and a decree is eventually passed against the defendant the plaintiff is entitled to recover mesne profits not only from the defendant but from the purchaser pendente lite (g) The purchaser however is liable only from the date on which he entered into possession (h)

(w) *Ramasamy v Subramania* (1903) 46 Mad 47 74 I C 804 (3) A M 147

(x) *Subba v Krishnamachari* (1900) 43 Mad 449 64 I C 869 (2) A M 112

(y) *Timmaraaju v Narasimha* (1905) 54 Mad L J 66 109 I C 54 (4) A M 5

(z) *Griha Chander v Shosthi* (1900) 1 Cal 951 2 I A 110 *Surja v Puri* (1900) 29 C I 62 *Shankhu Nath v Sat Chandra* (1900) 1 Cal 16 302 66 I C 49

(a) *Datta v Saroda* (1894) 1 Cal 14 0 1 A 160 *Kachar v Upadhyay* (1893) 1 Iom 3

(b) *Duggir v J. Ram* (1900) 4 All 36 111 A v S od (1893) 0 I A 160 1 Cal 14 *P. J. v. Sh. A. v. J. J. Sarat Chandra* (1901) 34 Cal. L. J 413

(c) 430 O I C 6 (1) A C. 60 *Abul*

(d) *Att v L. J. M. (187) 1 All 515*

(e) *Khub Lal v Jaghubans* (1925) 7 Pat 421 (1) A 1 56

(f) *Ch. gm. U. v. Amanat Ua* (1904) 31 C L 833 838 800 83 I C 69 (4) A C 1010 *Ind. v. S. gh. v. Indhy S. gh* (184) 1 W. R. 602 *R. v. r. la. posses sion* *A. v. (A. v. v. Ashutosh* (191) 3 Cal. L. J 140 35 I C 660

(g) *Abbas v Fazal-ud-d.* (189) 4 Cal 412

(h) *Al. hna and v. F. r. b. v. r. a.* (1884) 10 Cal. 8 111 A 84

(i) *M. d. por. Zrm. ndori Co. Ltd. v. v. r. al*

(j) *Na. v. (191) 39 Cal. 20 111 C 927*

(k) *D. mod. v. v. M. (1901) 6 I. A. L. J 166*

(l) 61 I C 4 (1) A. P. 102.

If one of three zamindars lets the lands on a patni lease and the patnidar lets them for cultivation and a suit is brought by the other zamindars against him and the patnidar for possession of their shares and mesne profits and a decree is passed for them the mesne profits recoverable from the zamindar defendant should be based upon the rent received by him from the patnidar and not upon the produce value of the land but the mesne profits recoverable from the patnidar should be based upon such value. The liability of the zamindar defendant is not in such a case joint and several with the patnidar (v).

**Interest forming part of mesne profits**—It will be seen from the definition of mesne profits that mesne profits consist of two items namely (1) profits of the property and (2) interest on such profits. Hence if a decree awards mesne profits but says nothing about interest that is interest on the profits it must be construed as including not only the profits but the interest on such profits. This was decided by their Lordships of the Privy Council in *Orish Chunder v Shoshi Shikareswar* (j). If the profits were payable from month to month the interest thereon would be calculated month by month and if they were payable from year to year the interest would be calculated year by year. Calculating in this manner the interest on the profits must be allowed up to the date of ascertainment of the aggregate amount of mesne profits (k) but in no case should it be allowed for a period longer than three years from the date of the decree (l). The reason is that the item of interest we are now considering forms an integral part of mesne profits and since mesne profits cannot be allowed for a period longer than three years from the date of the decree so also the interest forming part thereof cannot be allowed for a longer period. It must not however be supposed that because mesne profits are defined as meaning profits plus interest on such profits therefore the Court must always allow interest on such profits. Mesne profits as stated above are in the nature of damages which the Court may award according to the justice of the case. And since the item of interest now under consideration forms part of mesne profits it is equally in the discretion of the Court whether to allow such interest or not (m) for the same reason the Court may while allowing the claim for interest direct the interest to be calculated not month by month or year by year but in a manner less advantageous to the plaintiff. The mode of calculation indicated in the beginning of this paragraph applies only to those cases where the decree is silent as to the mode in which interest is to be calculated.

After the aggregate amount of mesne profits is ascertained the plaintiff may apply to the Court for a final decree for the amount so ascertained and for interest on that amount and the Court may award interest at such rate as it thinks fit (n). The date from which interest may be allowed is the date of the preliminary decree and not the date on which the amount is ascertained (o). The rate of interest allowed is usually 6 per cent (p). See J1.

**Application for ascertaining future mesne profits**—The right to apply for ascertainment of future mesne profits arises not on the date of the decree directing an inquiry as to such profit but on the happening of any one of the three events pointed in sub rule (1) (i) (g). The application is an application in the suit and if the suit is pending the law of limitation does not apply (r).

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| (1) <i>Grud v Hemad</i> (1939) 61 A 20<br>50 Cal L J 363 (9) A Pl. 300                       | (1) <i>Gurha And r v</i> 42nd year (1900)<br>33 Cal 33 331 33       |
| (2) (1900) 11051 96 1 A 110 p All<br>51 Cal L J 101 (1903) (19)<br>44 All 596 11 39 ( ) A 11 | (1) <i>Shri Lal v</i> 1st Pat 57 84<br>All L J 11 31 (1904) A A 101 |
| (2) <i>Shri Lal v</i> (1903) 5 All 5<br>11th am m 39 (1903) 39 11                            | (2) <i>Shri Lal v</i> 1st Pat 57 84<br>11 31 (1904) A A 101         |
| (3) <i>Gurha And r v</i> A A 110 110<br>11 31 963 1 A 110                                    | (3) <i>Shri Lal v</i> 1st Pat 57 84<br>11 31 (1904) A A 101         |
| (4) <i>Gurha And r v</i> A A 110 110<br>11 31 963 1 A 110                                    | (4) <i>Shri Lal v</i> 1st Pat 57 84<br>11 31 (1904) A A 101         |

**12 Notice through Court**—The notice of relinquishment of possession should be given through the Court. But where a judgment debtor gives such notice *directly* to the decree holder and the latter does not object that it should be sent through the Court he is not entitled to mesne profits after the date of the notice (s)

**Three years from the date of the decree**—Decree means a decree capable of execution. Thus if an appeal is preferred from a decree for mesne profits and the decree is confirmed in appeal the period of three years is to be computed from the date of the appellate decree (t). Similarly if a decree for mesne profits is taken to the Privy Council and is confirmed the period of three years is to be counted from the date of the King's order in Council (u). See notes to s 36. What decree may be executed

When a decree awards possession with mesne profits to be ascertained in an inquiry but specifies no time down to which mesne profits are to be computed the decree cannot be construed as giving mesne profits for a period longer than three years from the date of the decree (v). The plaintiff therefore is not entitled to mesne profits for more than three years from the date of the decree though possession was not delivered to him until after the expiration of the three years note the words *whichever event first occurs* in sub r (1) of (c). But in no case can mesne profits be awarded to the plaintiff for any period subsequent to an offer by the defendant to restore him possession (w).

**Limitation**—As regards mesne profits accrued due *prior* to the institution of the suit the defendant is only liable for the mesne profits accrued due during the *three years before the date of the suit*. A claim for mesne profits during a period preceding the three years next before the date of the suit is barred under the Limitation Act 1908 sch. I art 103 (x).

**Court Fee**—Where in a suit for recovery of immovable property and for mesne profits antecedent to as well as subsequent to the institution of the suit the decree directs the profits to be ascertained in execution the court fee is payable with respect to the claim for such profits but the fee cannot be claimed until the amount actually due on account of the profits has been ascertained (y).

**Burden of proof**—The burden of proving the amount of mesne profits *actually received* is on the person who has received them while that of proving the amount of profit that *might with ordinary diligence have been received* is on the person claiming them (z).

**Order supplementing preliminary decree**—Where after the passing of a preliminary decree for accounts an order is made determining the period and the mode of accounting the order itself is a preliminary decree and appealable as such (a). See notes to s 97. Two preliminary decrees

**Appeal**—Under the Code of 1882 [s. 44] the amount of mesne profits was determined in execution proceedings and the decision determining mesne profits being an order in execution proceedings was appealable as a decree. Under the present rule the amount of mesne profits is to be determined by the decree itself and a party aggrieved

(s) *Shambh v. Th v. Sat & Ch. ud. a* (1909) 1 W. N. 369 66 I. C. 49

(t) *Jadhav v. Nath & Ch. ud. a* (1903) 30 Cal. 660 *Jadhav v. Nath & Ch. ud. a* (1903) 30 Cal. 660 *Jadhav v. Nath & Ch. ud. a* (1903) 30 Cal. 660

(u) *Shambh v. Th v. Sat & Ch. ud. a* (1909) 1 W. N. 369 66 I. C. 49

(v) *Shambh v. Th v. Sat & Ch. ud. a* (1909) 1 W. N. 369 66 I. C. 49

(w) *Shambh v. Th v. Sat & Ch. ud. a* (1909) 1 W. N. 369 66 I. C. 49

(x) *Shambh v. Th v. Sat & Ch. ud. a* (1909) 1 W. N. 369 66 I. C. 49

(\*) A. C. 620

(y) *Shambh v. Th v. Sat & Ch. ud. a* (1909) 1 W. N. 369 66 I. C. 49

(z) *Shambh v. Th v. Sat & Ch. ud. a* (1909) 1 W. N. 369 66 I. C. 49

(a) *Shambh v. Th v. Sat & Ch. ud. a* (1909) 1 W. N. 369 66 I. C. 49

(b) *Shambh v. Th v. Sat & Ch. ud. a* (1909) 1 W. N. 369 66 I. C. 49

(c) *Shambh v. Th v. Sat & Ch. ud. a* (1909) 1 W. N. 369 66 I. C. 49

(d) *Shambh v. Th v. Sat & Ch. ud. a* (1909) 1 W. N. 369 66 I. C. 49

by the determination as to mean profits may now prefer an appeal from the decree (6)

**Mesne profits and jurisdiction**—See notes to § 6 and § 38

**Res judicata**—Where after the passing of a preliminary decree under this rule the plaintiff applies in execution for ascertaining the mesne profits wrongly believing that such profits are to be ascertained in execution proceedings and the application is dismissed the dismissal does not operate as *res judicata* so as to bar a subsequent application *in the suit* for ascertaining the mesne profits (c)

13 [ S 213 ] (1) Where a suit is for an account of any property and for its due administration under the decree of the Court, the Court shall, before passing the final decree, pass a preliminary decree ordering such accounts and inquiries to be taken and made, and giving such other directions as it thinks fit.

(2) In the administration by the Court of the property of any deceased person if such property proves to be insufficient for the payment in full of his debts and liabilities, the same rules shall be observed as to the respective rights of secured and unsecured creditors and as to debts and liabilities provable, and as to the valuation of annuities and future and contingent liabilities respectively, as may be in force for the time being within the local limits of the Courts in which the administration suit is pending with respect to the estates of persons adjudged or declared insolvent, and all persons who in any such case would be entitled to be paid out of such property, may come in under the preliminary decree, and make such claims against the same as they may respectively be entitled to by virtue of this Code

Judicature Act 1875 s 10—The words of the present rule are almost the same as s 10 of the Judicature Act of 1875.

**Administration suit**—Where a person dies leaving a will his estate is administered by his executor and where he dies intestate it is administered by his administrator. The administration of the estate of a deceased person consists first in paying his funeral expenses next his debts and then the legacies under his will (if any). The residue of his estate is then divided among the *residuary legatees* under his will or among his heirs if he has left no will. In an administration suit the court takes upon itself to a large extent the functions of an executor or administrator and administers the estate of the deceased.

(b)  $I A P I t$   $I J i$  (1901) 3 All 1 5 H m 360 109 I C 31 (~8) & B  
 $I A O s N i l m I I f m$  (1914) 36  
 $71 1 1 J 106 11 45 I$  ~ 10  
 $I A M M r t$  (191) 1 1 J 3 4  
 $41 1 c 71 h k t o m$  (19 1)  
( )  $I m h d x F j E A j p s$  (19 4)  
 $46 Mad L J 46 w l c 633 c t A M$   
413



13 The following persons may maintain an administration suit —

- (1) A creditor of the deceased when his claim is not paid off by the legal representatives of the deceased (d)
- (2) A legatee whether specific or pecuniary where the legacy is not paid to him by the legal representatives of the deceased.
- (3) The next of kin of the deceased for their share in the estate of the deceased.
- (4) An executor or administrator when there are disputes among the legatees or next of kin as to the amount of the property left by the deceased and the amount to which the legatees or next of kin are entitled

Forms of plaint in administration suit—See Sch I App A forms Nos 41 to 43

Preliminary decree—This rule provides that in an administration suit the Court shall pass a preliminary decree before passing the final decree directing accounts to be taken and enquiries to be made. For forms of preliminary decree see Sch. I App D forms Nos 17 and 19 and for forms of final decree see forms Nos 18 and 20.

Insolvent estate—Sub rule (2) provides that when it appears in an administration suit that the estate of the deceased is insolvent the rules laid down in the Presidency towns Insolvency Act 1909 as to Presidency towns and in the Provincial Insolvency Act 1920 as to the other parts of British India where that applies shall apply so far as regards (1) the respective rights of secured and unsecured creditors (2) debts and liabilities proveable and (3) the valuation of annuities and future and contingent liabilities. Note that this sub rule does not apply all the rules and principles of insolvency to insolvent estates but only the rules in respect of the three heads enumerated above (e).

Rights of secured creditors under the Presidency towns Insolvency Act—See s 48 of the Act and cls 9 to 17 of Sch II to the Act

Rights of secured creditors under the Provincial Insolvency Act—See s 47 of the Act

Debts and liabilities proveable under the Presidency towns Insolvency Act—See sections 46 and 48 and Schedule II of the Presidency towns Insolvency Act 1909

Debts and liabilities proveable under the Provincial Insolvency Act—See s 45 and 46 of the Act

Suit to recover assets improperly applied by Administrator General—This section does not apply to a suit brought by a creditor of the deceased against the Administrator General (to whom letters of administration have been granted) and against other creditors of the deceased to recover assets alleged to have been improperly paid by the Administrator General to those creditors in priority to the plaintiff (f).

Effect of decree in administration suit upon prior attachments—A decree in an administration suit is a decree in favour of all creditors of the deceased and as all of them are included in the same decree it would be inequitable that one should be in a better position than another under that decree. The assets are therefore divided amongst all creditors pro rata. Even a creditor who has obtained an attachment on the estate of the deceased prior to the decree in the administration suit is not entitled to priority over the other creditors. An attachment does not create a charge upon the property attached and the Court will stay all proceedings in execution after the passing of the decree in the suit (g).

(d) See *Coper v Hill* 18 61 I Ch D 691  
*Forster v Perry* 18 62 I Ch D 109  
 (e) Re *D'Foy's will* (18 61) 20 Ch D 717 *Narajee*  
*vs Adm Gen of Madras* (1913) 33 Ma 1  
 500 503 22 I C 60

(f) *Narajee vs Adm Gen of Madras* (1913) 33  
 Mad 600 = I C 566  
 (g) *Goobul Chund v Furrick Jell* (1848) 15  
 Cal. 70

**14 [S 214]** (1) Where the Court decrees a claim to pre-emption in respect of a particular sale of property and the purchase money has not been paid into Court, the decree shall—

- (a) specify a day on or before which the purchase-money shall be so paid, and
- (b) direct that on payment into Court of such purchase money, together with the costs (if any) decreed against the plaintiff, on or before the day referred to in clause (a), the defendant shall deliver possession of the property to the plaintiff, whose title thereto shall be deemed to have accrued from the date of such payment, but that, if the purchase money and the costs (if any) are not so paid, the suit shall be dismissed with costs

(2) Where the Court has adjudicated upon rival claims to pre-emption, the decree shall direct—

- (a) if and in so far as the claims decreed are equal in degree that the claim of each pre-emptor complying with the provisions of sub-rule (1) shall take effect in respect of a proportionate share of the property including any proportionate share in respect of which the claim of any pre-emptor failing to comply with the said provisions would, but for such default, have taken effect, and,
- (b) if and so far as the claims decreed are different in degree, that the claim of the inferior pre-emptor shall not take effect unless and until the superior pre-emptor has failed to comply with the said provisions

Difference between the old section and the present rule.—This rule corresponds with § 14 C L C 188 except in the following particulars—

- 1 The words "whose title thereto shall be deemed to have accrued from the date of such payment" are new. See notes below under those words.
- 2 Sub-rule (1) is also new. See notes below. Sub-rule (2) Rival pre-emptors.

Pre-emption.—The right of pre-emption can only be exercised in respect of *immovable property* if and if both Mahomedan are co-sharers of a house. If A sells his share to X for Rs 1000 and X intends to pre-empt B's share on payment of Rs 1000 that is to say if A sells it to X and X may require B to sell his share to him in preference to X. The same rule applies if A and B are owners of *al-jouari* houses. If B refuses to sell his share to A A may institute a suit for pre-emption against B and X. It has been held by the High Court of Allahabad that if the sale by B to X has been completed before

- 14 the date of the suit *B* having no longer any interest in the property he is not a necessary party to the suit (*b*). If a decree is passed for *A* and if he has not paid the amount of purchase money into Court the decree should specify a day on or before which the purchase money should be paid into Court. If the amount is paid within the time fixed by the Court *A* will be entitled to enter into possession of *B*'s share. But if he fails to pay the amount within that time he will lose the benefit of the decree (*c*). If a decree is passed for *A* with costs *A* may pay into Court the purchase money less the costs (*d*). As to extension of time for payment see notes below.

It is important to note that the right of pre-emption is a *personal* right. This leads to the following results—

- 1 If the pre-emptor that is the person entitled to pre-emption transfers the right to a third party the right is lost and the transferee cannot maintain a suit for pre-emption (*l*).
- 2 It is not settled whether if the pre-emptor dies during the pendency of the suit for pre-emption the right according to Sunni Mahomedan Law is extinguished (*h*) or whether it survives to his heirs or to his legal representatives (*m*).
- 3 If the pre-emptor transfers the right of pre-emption during the pendency of the suit for pre-emption the right of pre-emption is lost and the suit will be dismissed. And even if he obtains a decree and transfers the decree the right of pre-emption will be lost and the Court will not allow execution of the decree. But if he obtains a decree and transfers not the decree but the property which is the subject of pre-emption the right of pre-emption is not lost and he may execute the decree though execution will not be allowed to the *trans fere* (*n*).

Whose title thereto shall be deemed to have accrued from the date of such payment.—These words have been added to make it clear that the title to the property vests in the plaintiff on payment of the purchase money and that it is not necessary to complete the title that there should be a document in writing, and registered as required by the Transfer of Property Act in the case of a sale of immovable property. The object of inserting these words in the rule is to supersede the opinion expressed by the High Court of Madras that since the passing of the Transfer of Property Act the title to a pre-empted property could not vest in the plaintiff without an instrument of transfer (*o*).

The plaintiff's title accrues on payment of the purchase money and not from the date of the sale (*p*). No registered document is necessary to transfer the property (*q*) from the date of payment though he cannot obtain possession by reason of the defendant being himself in possession in another capacity (*r*) or by reason of a usufructuary mortgage existing in possession (*s*).

Mesne profits.—If upon a pre-emption decree the property and the right to mesne profits therefrom vest in the pre-emptor only from the date when he pays the amount of the purchase price finally decreed until that time the original purchaser retains possession and is entitled to the rents and profits (*t*).

- (A) *J. m. v. rup v. Sal* (1904) 6 All. 40  
 (B) *Jat Kaur v. Bhola Nath* (18) 114 All. 59  
*Jaggar Nath v. Jodha* (1899) 12 All. 73  
*Neelam v. Jodha* (18) 114 All. 400  
*Bhag v. Jodha* (1910) 11 All. 400  
*Rec. no. 6 p. 1 q. 6 I. C. 94*  
 (C) *K. p. v. B. I. (18) 114 All. 400*  
 (D) *P. J. v. Lalma* (18) 114 All. 400  
 (E) *M. m. v. J. m. v. Jodha* (1899) 12 All. 69  
 (F) *S. v. J. m. v. Jodha* (191) 126 P. m. 143  
 (G) *11 C. 0. S. m. v. S. Raj* (1917) 41 Bom. 636 633 4 I. C. 32

- (H) *J. m. v. Jodha* (1895) 7 All. 10  
 (I) *J. m. v. Jodha* (1901) 4 Mad. 447  
 (J) *J. m. v. Jodha* (191) 126 P. m. 143  
 (K) *J. m. v. Jodha* (191) 126 P. m. 143  
 (L) *J. m. v. Jodha* (191) 126 P. m. 143  
 (M) *J. m. v. Jodha* (191) 126 P. m. 143  
 (N) *J. m. v. Jodha* (191) 126 P. m. 143  
 (O) *J. m. v. Jodha* (191) 126 P. m. 143  
 (P) *J. m. v. Jodha* (191) 126 P. m. 143  
 (Q) *J. m. v. Jodha* (191) 126 P. m. 143  
 (R) *J. m. v. Jodha* (191) 126 P. m. 143  
 (S) *J. m. v. Jodha* (191) 126 P. m. 143  
 (T) *J. m. v. Jodha* (191) 126 P. m. 143



parties and it should be in form No 21 Sch I App D (f) After the accounts are taken a final decree is passed directing that the partnership assets be applied, first in payment of the partnership debts next in payment of the cost of the suit and lastly in payment to each partner of the amount found due to him on taking the accounts. If it turns out on taking the accounts that there is a balance due to the defendant a decree may be passed in favour of the defendant (g) See Sch. I App. D form No --

**Appeal**—A preliminary decree in a suit for the dissolution of a partnership or the taking of partnership accounts is appealable under s 96 But the appeal must be filed within the period prescribed by the law of limitation. If no appeal is preferred within the period of limitation the party aggrieved by such decree is precluded by virtue of the provisions of s 97 from disputing its correctness in an appeal from the final decree See s. 97 and notes thereto

**Letters Patent appeal**—Where a commissioner appointed to take accounts applies to the Court for directions and an order is made giving the directions the order being merely one regulating procedure and not a final adjudication of the rights of the parties is not a judgment within the meaning of cl 13 of the Letters Patent of the High Court of Rangoon and is not appealable as such (h)

**16 [S 215A]** In a suit for an account of pecuniary transactions between a principal and an agent, and in any other suit not herein before provided for, where it is necessary

Decree in suit for account between principal and agent

in order to ascertain the amount of money due to or from any party, that an account should be taken, the Court shall, before passing its final decree, pass a preliminary decree directing such account to be taken as it thinks fit

**Shall pass a preliminary decree directing accounts**—The provisions of this rule must be strictly followed If the fact of agency is established it is the duty of the Court to direct an account to be taken of the dealing between the parties before passing the final decree It is not proper to pass a final decree at the hearing (i) But the Court must be satisfied before directing an inquiry into accounts that the taking of accounts is necessary (j)

**Whether decree can be passed in favour of defendant**—In a suit for account between principal and agent a decree can, if necessary be passed in favour of the defendant on payment of the necessary Court fee (k) See notes to r 19 below

**Appeal**—See notes to r 15 above Appeal.

**Stay of proceedings**—Where an appeal is pending against a preliminary decree the Appellate Court may make an order under O 41 r 5 staying the inquiry into accounts pending the hearing of the appeal (l) See notes to O 41 r 5 Stay of proceedings under a decree

**17 [Ncu]** The Court may, either by the decree directing an account to be taken or by any subsequent order, give special directions with regard to the mode in which the account

Special directions as to accounts

(f) *TA Iwmare a v S Lla oya* (189) 40 M 1 313  
(g) *Fam Cha v I Lapi* (194) 4 All I J 43 H 1 C 80 (24) A 8 4  
(h) *Lee Jang v Hong Yeng & Co* (194) 2 Pang 469 H 1 C 401 (45) A 3 43

(i) *Raghu Nath v Ga palj* (190) 7 All 3 4  
(j) *Sh t Chand v A A (Lund)* (191) 5 Cal 66 D 1 C 914 (45) A 1 100  
(k) *Jarmanand v Jagat* (1910) 20 All 3 5 A 1 163  
(l) See *Lalalish v K A gnu* (1904) 31 Cal ---

is to be taken or vouched and in particular may direct that in taking the account the books of account, in which the accounts in question have been kept, shall be taken as *prima facie* evidence of the truth of the matters therein contained with liberty to the parties interested to take such objection thereto as they may be advised

**18** [New] Where the Court passes a decree for the partition of property or for the separate possession of a share thereof, then,—

(1) if and in so far as the decree relates to an estate assessed to the payment of revenue to the Government, the decree shall declare the rights of the several parties interested in the property, but shall direct such partition or separation to be made by the Collector, or any gazetted subordinate of the Collector deputed by him in this behalf, in accordance with such declaration and with the provisions of section 54,

(2) if and in so far as such decree relates to any other immovable property, or to movable property, the Court may, if the partition or separation cannot be conveniently made without further inquiry, pass a preliminary decree declaring the rights of the several parties interested in the property and giving such further directions as may be required.

**Receiver not rendered functus officio**—A receiver appointed in a suit for partition does not after the passing of the decree under sub-rule (1) become *functus officio* as regards agricultural land comprised in the suit. The Court may therefore grant an interim injunction restraining a party from interfering with the receiver's possession (m). See a.w. and notes thereto.

Giving such further directions.—These words are wide enough to include a direction for an inquiry into future mesne profits. But under the rule the direction should be in the preliminary decree. If no such direction is included in the preliminary decree the Court has no power to direct an inquiry into future mesne profits by its final decree (n).

**Joint Hindu family**—In a suit for partition of joint Hindu family property the property not being of the kind referred to in sub rule (1) a preliminary decree may be passed as provided by sub rule (2) (c). See notes to r. 1a above. Joint Hindu family.

**19 [S 210]** (1) Where the defendant has been allowed a set off against the claim of the plaintiff, the decree shall state what amount is due to the plaintiff and what amount

(m) Sha 1 D sa I ch e L I (10) 38 Lah 44.  
 201 ( 03 ( 3) A 1 445 r ral g (10 5)  
 lah L 2 4 261 C = 44 ( 1 A L 33  
 ( ) Ch I am v th mada (1010) 4 Mad 90

511 C 140  
(c) See *M. smol Leland v Mst Nicks* (19\*)  
61ab 14 931 C 01 ( ) & L-403

is due to the defendant, and shall be for the recovery of any sum which appears to be due to either party

(2) Any decree passed in a suit in which a set off is claimed shall be subject to the same provisions in respect of appeal to which it would have been subject if no set off had been claimed

Appeal from decree relating to set off

(3) The provisions of this rule shall apply whether the set off is admissible under rule 6 of Order VIII or otherwise

Appeal from decree relating to set off—This rule corresponds with s 216 of the Code of 1882 except as regards the provision as to the Court to which an appeal should lie from a decree passed in a suit in which a set off is claimed. The second paragraph of s 216 ran as follows—

The decree of the Court with respect to any sum awarded to the defendant shall have the same effect and be subject to the same rules in respect of appeal or otherwise as if such sum had been claimed by the defendant in a separate suit against the plaintiff

The present rule provides that appeals from decrees relating to set off shall lie to the Courts to which appeals in respect of the original claim would lie

Decree for defendant where set off is claimed—It has been held by the Allahabad High Court that in a suit by a principal against his agent for account the Court can grant a decree to the agent for the amount found due to him on the taking of accounts between the parties (p). The ground on which the decision is based is that a suit for accounts against an agent necessarily involves an undertaking by the principal to pay to the agent any sum that may be found due to him. Commenting on this case Phillips J in a Madras case (q) said "This I think is taking a somewhat large view of the intention of a plaintiff in such a suit for it could rarely be his intention to bring a suit in order that a decree might be given against him." See notes to O 8 r 6. The amount claimed to be set off must be legally recoverable.

20 [S 217] Certified copies of the judgment and decree shall be furnished to the parties on application to the Court, and at their expense

Certified copies of judgment and decree to be furnished

## ORDER XXI

### *Execution of Decrees and Orders*

Of execution of decrees in general—The present order is the longest Order in the whole Schedule. It consists of 103 rules. It is proposed here to give a summary of these rules and at the same time a description of the different modes of execution and the procedure to be observed. The references to the rules given in this summary are to the rules of the present Order.

(p) *J. Ramchand v. J. Gopal Na.* (1910) 32 All. 525 6 I C 163. See also *J. on Ch. on Judgments* (1904) 22 All. L. J. 83 83 I C 800 (1904) A. A. 854.

(q) *Na. Ram v. Zaminda of Tirunel.* (1917) 4 Mat. 872, 89-90 53 I C 734 (L.C. def. Na. Ram's claim for excess in L.C. most time-barred).

*A* obtains a decree against *B* for Rs 5 000. Here *A* is the decree holder *B* is the judgment debtor and Rs 5 000 is the judgment debt. If *B* fails to satisfy the decree *A* may apply for execution of the decree against *B* a person or against his property or both (r 30). But the Court may in its discretion refuse execution *at the same time* against the person and property of the judgment debtor (r 21). Execution against the person of the judgment debtor consists in arresting him and detaining him in jail. Execution against the property of a judgment debtor consists in attaching and selling his property and paying the decree holder the amount of the judgment debt out of the sale proceeds.

**Application for execution**—All proceedings in execution are commenced by an application for execution (r 10). The application for execution must be in writing [r 11 (2)] and should contain the particulars set forth in rr 11 (2) to 14. The only exception is where the decree is for the payment of money and the judgment debtor is in the precincts of the Court when the decree is passed in which case the Court may order immediate execution on the oral application of the decree holder at the time of passing the decree [r 11 (1)]. If the application complies with the requirements of rr 11 (2) to 14 the Court will direct execution to issue (r 24). If he does not the Court may reject it or may require it to be amended (r 17). If the application is rejected the decree holder may present another application properly framed.

**Who may apply for execution**—The application for execution must be made by the decree holder. If the decree is transferred by the decree holder the transferee may apply for execution (r 10). If the decree has been passed jointly in favour of more persons than one any one of such persons may apply for execution (r 15). If the decree holder is dead his legal representative may apply for execution (r 16).

**Against whom execution may be applied for**—If the judgment debtor is living execution will be applied for against him. If he is dead execution may be applied for against his legal representative. In the latter case the decree may not be executed against the person of the legal representative but only against the property of the judgment debtor which has come to the hands of the legal representative and has not been duly disposed of by him (s 50). As to notice to the legal representative see the next paragraph.

**Notice before ordering execution**—The law does not require any notice to be issued to the party against whom execution is applied for except in the following two cases—

- 1 Where the application for execution is made more than one year after the date of the decree or more than one year after the date of the last order made on any previous application for execution.
- 2 Where execution is applied for against the legal representative of the judgment debtor.

In these two cases the Code provides that the Court executing the decree *shall* issue a notice (r 2-). There is one case in which it is *discretionary* with the Court to issue a notice before making an order for execution and that is where the decree is for money and execution is sought against the *person* of the judgment-debtor (r 3).

#### Execution against person of judgment debtor—

(i) *Decrees for the payment of money*—*A* obtains a decree against *B* (r 1 s. 5000) and costs. [This is a money decree.] *B* fails to pay the amount of the judgment-debt. *A* applies for execution of the decree against *B* a person [r 11 (-) cl. (j)]. The decree being a money decree the Court may in stead of issuing a warrant for *B*'s arrest issue a notice calling upon him to appear and show cause why he should not be committed to the civil prison in execution of the decree (r 37). If *B* appears and satisfies the Court that he is unable to pay the amount of the decree from poverty or other sufficient cause



and if there are no circumstances which disentitle *B* to the indulgence of the Court the Court may make an order disallowing *A*'s application for *B*'s arrest and detention [r 40 (1)] If *B* does not appear the Court should issue a warrant for his arrest if the decree holder so desires (r 37) If *B* appears but fails to show cause to the satisfaction of the Court the Court should cause him to be arrested [r 40 (a)]

Where a warrant of arrest is issued it should be executed by an officer of the Court appointed in that behalf (rr 24 25) If when the officer goes to execute the warrant *B* offers payment of the amount of the judgment debt (which must always be specified in the warrant) the officer should receive the payment and the warrant should not then be executed (r 38) But if no payment is made *B* should be arrested and brought before the Court as soon as practicable (s 55) If no notice was issued prior to his arrest under r 37 it is open to *B* to show that he is unable to pay the amount of the decree from poverty or any other sufficient cause [r 40 (1)] If the Court is satisfied that *B* is unable to pay the amount of the decree from poverty or any other sufficient cause and if there are no other circumstances which would disentitle *P* to the indulgence of the Court the Court will make an order directing *B*'s release [r 40 (1)] Otherwise the Court will make an order committing *B* to prison [r 40 (5)] The prison will be a civil prison (s 55) and the term of detention in prison is six months if the amount of the decree exceeds 1 s. 50 and six weeks if the amount of the decree does not exceed 1 s. 50 (s 58) If while in prison, *B* pays the amount mentioned in the warrant to the officer in charge of the prison or the decree is otherwise fully satisfied as by attachment and sale of the property he will be released from detention (s 58) Otherwise he will be detained in prison until expiration of the term of his detention unless the decree holder requests the Court to release him from detention or omits to pay the subsistence allowance of the judgment debtor A judgment debtor released from detention in any one of the above cases cannot be re-arrested in execution of the same decree [s 58 (-)] though the judgment debt has remained unpaid. This does not mean that his liability to pay the debt ceases for the decree still subsists and it may yet be executed against *B*'s property [s 58 (2)] though not against his person

No woman can be arrested in execution of a money decree [s 56]

(ii) *Decrees other than those for the payment of money*—A judgment debtor may be arrested and imprisoned not only in execution of a decree for the payment of money but also in execution of other decrees (rr 31 32 33) The procedure to be followed in these cases is as follows If the application is in proper form the Court will issue a warrant for arrest of the judgment debtor (r 24) If the judgment debtor is arrested in execution of the warrant he must be brought before the Court as soon as practicable (s 55) The Court will then make an order committing him to the civil prison. If while in jail the decree is fully satisfied he will be released from detention [s 58 (1)]. Otherwise he will be detained in prison until expiration of the term of his detention, unless the decree holder requests the Court to release him from detention, or omits to pay the subsistence allowance of the judgment debtor as provided by r 39

**Execution against property of judgment debtor**—This subject may be considered under two heads namely (1) attachment and (2) sale The rules relating to attachment may be stated first and then the rules governing sale for attachment precedes sale Attachment is levied and the sale of the property attached is effected by an officer of the Court under a warrant issued from the Court

Before considering the rules relating to attachment and sale it is to be observed that there are certain kinds of property which are not liable to attachment or sale in execution of a decree These are described in s 60 Subject to these exceptions all saleable property which belongs to the judgment debtor or over which he has a *jura in rem* power which he may exercise for his own benefit is liable to attachment and sale in execution of a decree against him (s. 60)

*I Attachment*—Attachable property belonging to a judgment debtor may be divided into two classes (1) movable and (2) immovable

*As to attachment of movable property*—See rr 43 to 53

*Attachment of immovable property*—If the property be immovable the attachment is to be made by an order prohibiting the judgment debtor from transferring or charging the property in any way and prohibiting all other persons from taking any benefit from such transfer or charge. The order must be proclaimed at some place on or adjacent to the property and a copy of the order is to be affixed on a conspicuous part of the property and then upon a conspicuous part of the Court house (r 54)

Where an attachment has been made any private transfer of the property attached whether it be movable or immovable is void as against all claims enforceable under the attachment (r 64)

If a claim is preferred to any property attached in execution of a decree by any person other than a party to the suit the procedure prescribed by rr 58 to 63 must be followed. If any questions arise in the course of execution proceedings between the parties to the suit or their representatives they should be dealt with under s 47

If during the pendency of the attachment the judgment debtor satisfies the decree through the Court the attachment will be deemed to be withdrawn (r 55). Otherwise the Court will order the property to be sold (r 64). If the property attached is current coin or currency notes the Court may direct payment to the decree holder in satisfaction of his decree (r 56) for it is not necessary to sell coin or currency notes

*II Sale of attached property*—If the property attached be movable property which is subject to speedy and natural decay may be sold at once (r 43). Every sale in execution of a decree should be conducted by an officer of the Court except where the property to be sold is a negotiable instrument or a share in a corporation which the Court may order to be sold through a broker (r 76)

After the property whether movable or immovable is attached the first step to be taken with a view to its sale is to cause a proclamation to be made stating the time and place of sale and specifying the property to be sold the revenue (if any) assessed upon the property the encumbrances (if any) to which it is liable the amount for the recovery of which the sale is ordered and such other particulars as the Court considers material for a purchaser to know in order to judge of the nature and value of the property (r 66). No sale should take place until after the expiration of at least thirty days in the case of immovable property and of at least fifteen days in the case of movable property calculated from the date on which a copy of the proclamation has been fixed on the Court house of the Judge ordering the sale unless the judgment debtor consents in writing to the sale being held at an earlier date (r 68). The Court may in its discretion adjourn the sale from time to time but if the sale is adjourned for longer period than seven days a fresh proclamation should be made unless the judgment debtor consents to waive it (r 69)

It is important to note that no holder of a decree in execution of which property is sold can bid for or purchase the property without the express permission of the Court (r 72)

*Irregularity in the conduct of sale of attached property*—No sale of immovable property can be set aside on the ground of irregularity in publishing or conducting the sale unless upon the facts proved the Court is satisfied that the party seeking to set aside the sale has sustained substantial injury by reason of such irregularity (r 80). As regards movable property the rule is that a sale of movable property is not liable to be set aside in any case on the ground of irregularity in publishing or conducting the sale. The only remedy open to the party who has sustained an injury by reason of such irregularity is to institute a suit for compensation against the person responsible for the



**Notice of payment into Court**—Sub r (2) which requires notice to be given to the decree holder where payment is made into Court is new. Payment of the decretal amount into Court operates as a satisfaction of the decree to that extent though no notice of payment is given to the decree holder as provided by sub r (2). Similarly where a decree is assigned by the decree holder and the judgment debtor pays the decretal amount into Court without notice of the assignment the payment operates as a satisfaction of the decree to that extent though no notice of payment is given to the decree holder and the assignee is not entitled to execute the decree (w). But where interest is awarded by the decree on the decretal amount the decree holder is entitled to interest until he receives notice of the payment into Court (x).

**2 [S 258]** (1) Where any money payable under a decree of any kind is paid out of Court or the decree is otherwise adjusted in whole or in part to the satisfaction of the decree-holder the decree holder shall certify such payment or adjustment to the Court whose duty it is to execute the decree, and the Court shall record the same accordingly.

*Payment out of Court to decree holder*

(2) The judgment debtor also may inform the Court of such payment or adjustment, and apply to the Court to issue a notice to the decree holder to show cause, on a day to be fixed by the Court, why such payment or adjustment should not be recorded as certified, and if, after service of such notice, the decree holder fails to show cause why the payment or adjustment should not be recorded as certified, the Court shall record the same accordingly.

(3) A payment or adjustment, which has not been certified or recorded as aforesaid, shall not be recognised by any Court executing the decree.

S 257A CPC 1882 omitted in this Code.—With reference to the present rule it is important to note that s 257A of the Code of 1882 has been omitted in this Code. That section ran as follows—

Every agreement to give time for the satisfaction of a judgment debt shall be void unless it is made for consideration and with the sanction of the Court which passed the decree and such Court deems the consideration to be under the circumstances reasonable.

*Agreement to give time to judgment debtor*

Every agreement for the satisfaction of a judgment debt which provides for payment directly or indirectly of any sum in or towards the sum due or to accrue due under the decree shall be void unless it is made with the like sanction.

*Agreement for the satisfaction of judgment-debt*

Any sum paid in contravention of the provisions of this section shall be applied to the satisfaction of the judgment debt and the surplus if any shall be returned by the judgment debtor.

(w) *Tata Iron & Steel Co. Ltd. v. P. S. S. & Co.* (1933) 118 Ind. 118.

(x) *F. M. S. v. S. M. S.* (1933) 118 Ind. 118.

This section was first enacted by Act XII of 1879 with a view to protect judgment debtors from undue pressure by decree holders. It gave rise to conflicting decisions and as interpreted by the majority of the High Courts was found in practice to be of little service to judgment debtors. It has been therefore omitted in this Code with the result that—

- (1) agreements to give time to the judgment debtor and
- (2) agreements for the satisfaction of a judgment debt which provide for the payment of any sum in excess of the decretal amount may now be entered into between the decree holder and the judgment debtor without the sanction of the Court and if otherwise valid they may be enforced as any other agreement.

Points of difference between old section 258 and the present rule.—The present rule corresponds with s. 258 of the Code of 1882 except in the following particulars—

- (1) The words of any kind have been inserted in sub r. (1). See notes below. Decree of any kind.
- (2) In para. 3 of s. 258 the words as a payment or adjustment or the decree followed the word recognized. These words have been omitted [see sub r. (3)] to make it clear that the Court cannot recognise an uncertified payment or adjustment for any purpose whatever. See notes below. Uncertified payment and limitation.

Scope and application of the rule.—This rule provides that—

- (1) where any money payable under a decree of any kind is paid out of Court or
- (2) where a decree is otherwise adjusted in whole or in part to the satisfaction of the decree holder

the decree holder shall certify such payment or adjustment to the Court whose duty it is to execute the decree so that the same may be recorded by that Court.

If the decree holder fails to inform the Court of the payment or adjustment it is open to the judgment debtor to protect himself from execution of the decree by applying to the Court within 90 days from the date of the payment or adjustment (y) to issue a notice to the decree holder to show cause why the payment or adjustment should not be recorded as certified. If the payment or adjustment is not certified by either party it shall not be recognised by any Court executing the decree. This will appear from the following

#### *Illustration*

A obtains a decree against B for Rs. 2,000. It is subsequently agreed between A and B that A should accept Rs. 1,000 in full satisfaction of the decree. B pays A Rs. 1,000 out of Court but neither the payment nor adjustment is certified to the Court. A applies for execution of the full amount of the decree notwithstanding receipt by him of Rs. 1,000. B objects to execution on the ground that the decree has been adjusted and payment has been made. The payment not being certified cannot be recognised by the Court executing the decree and the Court must direct execution to issue. It will not avail B that A had agreed to certify the payment to the Court but has omitted to do so. See notes below under the head Fraud.

History of sub rule 3.—The Codes of 1859 (s. 206) and 1877 (s. 208) provided that a payment or adjustment made out of Court should not be recognised by any Court executing the decree unless it had been certified to that Court. The Code of 1877 was amended in the year 1879 and the amendment provided that an uncertified payment or adjustment should not be recognised by any Court and the same provision

occurred in the Code of 1882 (z) In the year 1888 the section was again altered by providing that an uncertified payment or adjustment should not be recognized by any Court *executing the decree* and this is the form in which the rule now stands

Sub rule (3) —Sub rule (3) provides that an uncertified payment or adjustment shall not be recognized by any Court *executing the decree* The words by any Court *executing the decree* indicate the extent to which an uncertified payment or adjustment should not be recognized by a Court These words show that the prohibition to take cognizance of an uncertified payment or adjustment is limited to the Court which is called upon to *execute the decree* It is in execution proceedings alone that an uncertified payment or adjustment cannot be recognized by a Court The rule does not prohibit a Court from taking cognizance of such payment or adjustment in proceedings other than execution proceedings An uncertified payment or adjustment may therefore be recognized by a Court *trying a suit* for a relief based upon such payment or adjustment (a) This gives rise to the following questions —

1 Whether if the Court orders execution in the case put in the above illustrations (p 636) *B* can maintain a *suit* against *A* for a declaration that the decree has been adjusted and for an injunction restraining *A* from executing the decree?

2 Whether if *A* executes the decree notwithstanding the adjustment and *B*'s property is sold in execution *B* can maintain a *suit* against *A* to set aside the sale on the ground that the decree having been adjusted *A* ought not to have caused the same to be executed?

3 Whether if *A* executes the decree notwithstanding the adjustment *B* can maintain a *suit* against *A* to recover damages for breach of the contract represented by the adjustment? In other words whether if *B* is compelled to pay in execution of the decree the full amount of the decree namely Rs 2000 he is entitled to recover back that sum from *A* as damages for breach of the contract on *A*'s part not to execute the decree?

Each of suits referred to above would involve recognition of an *uncertified adjustment* and *B*'s success in each would depend *inter alia* upon the recognition of such adjustment by the Court *trying the suit* Now it has been made sufficiently clear that the prohibition against the recognition of an *uncertified adjustment* is confined to Courts *executing decrees* and does not extend to Courts *trying suits* Therefore a Court *trying* any of the above suits would not be precluded from recognizing the adjustment though the adjustment has not been certified But this circumstance is not of itself sufficient to entitle *B* to a decree for in the first two cases there is an initial difficulty in *B*'s way That difficulty is the bar of s 47 which enjoins that all questions relating to the execution discharge or satisfaction of a decree shall be determined by the Court *executing the decree* and not by a *separate suit*

As regards the first question it is quite true that if *B* brought a suit for an injunction restraining *A* from executing the decree the Court *trying the suit* would recognize the adjustment though it had not been certified But the Court cannot try the suit at all for such a suit is barred under s 47 the principal question in the suit being whether *A* should be restrained from *executing the decree* This being a question relating to execution cannot be tried in a *separate suit* (b) Hence the answer to the first question is in the negative

(z) *Haji Abdul Juman v Khoja Fiaz Arath* (188) 11 Bom 613 B1

(a) *Sudami aov v A. Aminah* (1891) 15 Bom 419  
*Aaly v Kamta* (1891) 15 AL 333  
*Ghana Ram v Kasibrom* (189) 18 Bom 549  
*Incar Chand v Baris Ch d s* (1894) 3 Cal 15 The operation of sub-r (3) is not excluded because a party proceeds by way of suit instead of pro-

ceeding by an application as required by s 47 *Morav Hasan* (1919) 43 Bom 240 48 I C 135

(b) *An. v Motul Lal* (1894) 21 Cal 43  
*Agulav Bepa na* (189) 15 Mad 302.  
*Deno Lunkhu v Hari* (1904) 31 (al. 430)  
*Ram Lakshya v Meht Adamal* (1900) 3 Lah. 319 67 I C 393 (1900) A L. 43 (F B)

2 This section was first enacted by Act XII of 1879 with a view to protect debtors from undue pressure by decree holders. It gave rise to conflicting decisions as interpreted by the majority of the High Courts was found in practice to be of little service to judgment debtors. It has been therefore omitted in this Code with the result that—

- (1) agreements to give time to the judgment debtor and
- (2) agreements for the satisfaction of a judgment debt which provide for the payment of any sum in excess of the decretal amount may now be entered into between the decree holder and the judgment debtor without the sanction of the Court and if otherwise valid they may be enforced as any other agreement.

Points of difference between old section 258 and the present rule—The present rule corresponds with s 258 of the Code of 1882 except in the following particulars—

- (1) The words of any kind have been inserted in sub r (1). See notes below Decree of any kind.
- (2) In para 3 of s 258 the words as a payment or adjustment or the decree followed the word recognized. These words have been omitted [see sub r (3)] to make it clear that the Court cannot recognise an uncertified payment or adjustment for any purpose whatever. See notes below. Uncertified payment and limitation.

Scope and application of the rule—This rule provides that—

- (1) where any money payable under a decree of any kind is paid out of Court or
- (2) where a decree is otherwise adjusted in whole or in part to the satisfaction of the decree holder

the decree holder shall certify such payment or adjustment to the Court whose duty it is to execute the decree so that the same may be recorded by that Court.

If the decree holder fails to inform the Court of the payment or adjustment it is open to the judgment debtor to protect himself from execution of the decree by applying to the Court within 90 days from the date of the payment or adjustment (y) to issue a notice to the decree holder to show cause why the payment or adjustment should not be recorded as certified. If the payment or adjustment is not certified by either party it shall not be recognised by any Court executing the decree. This will appear from the following

#### *Illustration*

A obtains a decree against B for Rs 2000. It is subsequently agreed between A and B that A should accept Rs 1000 in full satisfaction of the decree. B pays A Rs 1000 out of Court but neither the payment nor adjustment is certified to the Court. A applies for execution of the full amount of the decree notwithstanding receipt by him of Rs 1000. B objects to execution on the ground that the decree has been adjusted and payment has been made. The payment not being certified cannot be recognized by the Court executing the decree and the Court must direct execution to issue. It will not avail B that A had agreed to certify the payment to the Court but has omitted to do so. See notes below under the head Fraud.

History of sub rule 3—The Codes of 1859 (s 206) and 1877 (s 258) provided that a payment or adjustment made out of Court should not be recognized by any Court executing the decree unless it had been certified to that Court. The Code of 1877 was amended in the year 1879 and the amendment provided that an uncertified payment or adjustment should not be recognized by any Court and the same provision

occurred in the Code of 1882 ( ) In the year 1888 the section was again altered by providing that an uncertified payment or adjustment should not be recognized by any Court *executing the decree* and this is the form in which the rule now stands

Sub rule (3) —Sub rule (3) provides that an uncertified payment or adjustment shall not be recognized by any *Court executing the decree* The words by any Court *executing the decree* indicate the extent to which an uncertified payment or adjustment should not be recognized by a Court These words show that the prohibition to take cognizance of an uncertified payment or adjustment is limited to the Court which is called upon to *execute the decree* It is in execution proceedings alone that an uncertified payment or adjustment cannot be recognized by a Court The rule does not prohibit a Court from taking cognizance of such payment or adjustment in proceedings other than execution proceedings An uncertified payment or adjustment may therefore be recognized by a Court *trying a suit* for a relief based upon such payment or adjustment (a) This gives rise to the following questions —

1 Whether if the Court orders execution in the case put in the above illustrations (p 636) *B* can maintain a *suit* against *A* for a declaration that the decree has been adjusted and for an injunction restraining *A* from executing the decree?

2 Whether if *A* executes the decree notwithstanding the adjustment and *B*'s property is sold in execution *B* can maintain a *suit* against *A* to set aside the sale on the ground that the decree having been adjusted *A* ought not to have caused the same to be executed?

3 Whether if *A* executes the decree notwithstanding the adjustment *B* can maintain a *suit* against *A* to recover damages for breach of the contract represented by the adjustment? In other words whether if *B* is compelled to pay in execution of the decree the full amount of the decree namely Rs 2000 he is entitled to recover back that sum from *A* as damages for breach of the contract on *A*'s part not to *execute the decree*?

Each of suits referred to above would involve recognition of an *uncertified adjustment* and *B*'s success in each would depend *inter alia* upon the recognition of such adjustment by the Court *trying the suit* Now it has been made sufficiently clear that the prohibition against the recognition of an uncertified adjustment is confined to Courts *executing decrees* and does not extend to Courts *trying suits* Therefore a Court trying any of the above suits would not be precluded from recognizing the adjustment though the adjustment has not been certified. But this circumstance is not of itself sufficient to entitle *B* to a decree for in the first two cases there is an initial difficulty in *B*'s way That difficulty is the bar of s 47 which enjoins that all questions relating to the execution discharge or satisfaction of a decree shall be determined by the Court *executing the decree* and not by a *separate suit*

As regards the first question it is quite true that if *B* brought a suit for an injunction restraining *A* from executing the decree the Court trying the suit would *recognize* the adjustment though it had not been certified But the Court cannot try the suit at all for such a suit is barred under s 47 the principal question in the suit being whether *A* should be restrained from *executing the decree* This being a question relating to execution cannot be tried in a separate suit (b) Hence the answer to the first question is in the negative

(c) *Haji Abdullalim v Khaja Fakhri Aruth* (1887) 11 Bom 613 B

(e) *Su mirao v Ja him th* (1891) 15 Bom 419  
*Aalyan v Aswita* (1891) 13 AL 333  
*Ghanasham v Asashram* (189) 18 Bom 559  
*Iwar Chandra v H v Chand* (1893) 18 Cal 18 The operation of sub-r (3) is not excluded because a party proceeds by way of suit instead of proceeding by an application as required by s 47

*Morav Hasan* (1919) 43 Bom 40  
 48 I C 155  
 (b) *Arjun v Matuk Lal* (1894) 21 Cal 437  
*Banswala v Bapanna* (189) 15 Mad 307  
*Dona Lundhu v Hari* (1904) 31 Cal 450  
*Kam Labhaya v Mukandamal* (1907) 3 Lab 319 6 I C 593 (1907) A L 423 [F B]



2

The answer to the second question is also in the negative and for the same reasons. The suit being one to set aside the sale in execution the principal question would be whether the proceedings in execution should be set aside and this question is also one relating to execution within the meaning of s 47 and the suit would therefore be barred under that section (c). It is therefore immaterial whether the purchaser at the sale in execution is a stranger or the decree holder himself. There are two cases (d) both prior in date to the Allahabad decision cited above in which the property was purchased by a stranger and the suit was to set aside the sale on the ground that the decree had already been satisfied out of Court at the time the sale was held. In both these cases it was held that the person who bought the property having purchased it *bona fide* at an auction sale the sale to him could not be set aside. But the question whether the suit was barred was not raised in either of those cases. According to the Allahabad decision cited above the suit would be barred under s 47.

The third question stands upon a different footing. The suit therein referred to is one for the recovery of damages for breach of the contract represented by the adjustment. The contract represented by the adjustment was to accept Rs 1000 in full satisfaction of the decree and not to execute the decree for its full amount. If notwithstanding the payment to A of Rs 1000 in pursuance of the adjustment A causes the decree to be executed and B is compelled to pay the amount of the decree (that is Rs 2000) in execution B may sue A to recover back that amount as damages for breach of the contract not to execute the decree. Such a suit is not barred under s 47 for the principal question in the suit is not one relating to execution but to the contract its breach and the amount of damages suffered by B in consequence of the breach. The answer to the third question is therefore in the affirmative (e). The Court trying the suit will take cognizance of the adjustment and will direct A by its decree to repay Rs 2000 as and by way of damages to B though the adjustment has not been certified. It may here be noted that if after the decree is satisfied out of Court A assigns the decree to X and X then proceeds to realize the decree by execution against B B has no cause of action against X and he is not entitled to recover from X as damages the amount paid by him in execution to X even though X took the assignment with the knowledge that the decree had been satisfied (f).

The effect of non certification on the rights of parties may be summarised as follows. If the adjustment is not certified it will not be recognized by any Court executing the decree and if the decree holder applies for execution notwithstanding the adjustment the Court will direct execution to issue and the judgment debtor will not be heard to say that the decree has been adjusted. Nor can he even by instituting a regular suit for injunction obtain a stay of execution for such a suit is barred under s 47. Nor is it open to him if his property be sold in execution to bring a suit to set aside the sale for such a suit also is barred under s 47. His only remedy is to sue the decree holder for damages sustained by him by reason of the breach of the contract represented by the adjustment. He need not however wait until the decree against him is executed. His cause of action arises on the presentation of an application by the decree holder to execute the decree. Therefore where he has paid any money under the adjustment he may sue the decree holder to recover it as soon as the decree holder applies to the Court for execution (g).

(c) *Ja karan v Raghu* (1898) 5 All 54

(d) *Jell pp v R m h ad a* (189) 1 Bom 463. *Moth ra Moh n v Aikoy K mar* (1888) 15 Cal 557

(e) *Ha ma t v S bhadral* (1899) 3 Bom 394. *rar g/ ra v S bhadra* (189) 5 Mad 59. [B] *Pe noi mb* 1 Day (1899) 13 M d 409. *Kra / asam v Ja gu* (189) 0 Mad 369. *P romanand v Khepo* (1884) 10 Cal 3. *Gendo v Vithal Ku mar* (1908) 30 All 464. *Krishna v Satir*

*m thu* (1919) 4 Mad 338. 50 I C 541. *M h b 41 v M h mmad* (19-8) 50 All 111. 104 I C 419. (-7) A.A. 710. *Chay* *P m v M ung Tha D n* (19 9) 7 Rang 310. (-9) A R 69. *M a Shre Pa v* *M g van M go* (19-8) 6 Rang 573. (-25) A R 316.

(f) *Kri h a v Sarilmutha* (1919) 4 M d 338. 50 I C 584.

(g) *Medas Kol a* in the matter of (190) 20 Mad 645.

**Suit by judgment debtor based upon uncertified adjustment**—The three kinds of suit referred to above deserve careful consideration for they are typical of the modes in which the question of an uncertified adjustment frequently arises. But an uncertified adjustment may result in a conveyance as in the following case—A obtains a decree against B for possession of immovable property. A then executes an ekramnama whereby in consideration of Rs 186 paid to him by B he relinquishes an eight annas share of the property in favour of B. Subsequently he sells the remaining eight annas share to B by a kabala. Both the ekramnama and kabala are duly registered but neither of them is certified to the Court. A then applies for execution of the decree and obtains possession of the property. B sues A upon the two documents for a declaration of his right to the property and for recovery of possession thereof. Is the suit barred under s 47? It has been held that it is not barred and that B is entitled to a decree. The suit is not one for an injunction and it cannot therefore be said to be directed to interfere with the execution of the decree. In fact the decree has already been executed. Nor is the suit one for setting aside a sale in execution for there has been no sale. The suit is one for the recovery of property conveyed to B by two documents both of which are duly registered. The documents no doubt constitute an adjustment of the decree but as already explained in sub r (3) do not bar a suit upon an uncertified adjustment (h).

The law on the point may be stated in one sentence. An uncertified payment or adjustment may be recognized by any Court *except a court executing the decree* and a suit based upon such payment or adjustment is maintainable *unless it is barred by the provisions of s 47*.

**Suit by decree holder upon an uncertified adjustment**—This is the converse case. A obtains a decree against B for Rs 315 and costs. B pays A Rs 200 and induces A to give up the cost and accept a bond for the balance to be paid at the end of eight months. Neither the payment nor adjustment is certified to the Court. This does not preclude A from suing on the bond for as stated above sub r (3) only prohibits a Court *executing a decree* from recognizing an uncertified payment or adjustment (i). Since the repeal of s 207A of the Code of 1892 it would not matter that the bond provided for payment of a sum in excess of the balance (j).

**Money payable under a decree**—A decree directing the sale of mortgaged properties in default of payment is a decree for the payment of money whether there is a direction to pay personally or not (k). Income received by a mortgagee decree holder from the mortgaged property in his possession and for which he has to account and give credit for the surplus is not money payable under a decree within the meaning of this rule (l).

The Madras High Court has held that a decree which gives the judgment-debtor an option of paying money in order to secure a conveyance is not a decree under which money is payable within the meaning of this section (m).

**"Decree of any kind"**—The words of any kind in sub-rule (1) did not occur in sec 208 of the Code of 1857 or of 1882. They were inserted by the Code of 1908. Under the Codes of 18 and 1882 it was held by the High Court of Calcutta that sec 208 applied to the adjustment of any decree whatever may be the nature of the relief granted by the decree. In the Calcutta case the decree was one for possession

(h) *Isar Chandra v. Ha Is Chandra* (1898) 3 Cal 18.

(i) *Srinivas v. Kashinath* (1891) 15 Bom 419.  
(j) *Allyn v. Amlin* (1891) 13 All 339.  
(k) *Harman v. Ashmole* (189) 16 Bom 189.  
(l) *Taram v. Amlin* (1901) 25 Bom 25.  
(m) *Lal v. Gya* (1903) 25 All 31.  
(n) *J. v. Amlin* (1941) 1 M d 34.  
as explained in *Bank v. Kora* (1903)

(o) M d 19 6.  
(p) *See Heera v. Feroz* (1895) 2 Bom 193.  
(q) *Dharma v. G. J. J.* (1903) 27 Bom 96.  
(r) *Vidya v. G. J. J.* (1903) 27 Bom 96.  
(s) *Mad 473*.  
(t) *Ilal v. Syed Mub* (1916) 39 Mad 106.  
(u) *Mad 331 C 65*.  
(v) *Varadachari v. I. G. Gami* (19 6) 42 Mad. 716.  
(w) *I C 731 (6) A.M. 719*.

of immovable property (n) On the other hand it was held by the Madras High Court that the section referred only to decrees under which money was payable and did not apply to other decrees *e.g.* decrees for possession of immovable property (o) It was in this state of authorities that the words of any kind were inserted in sub-rule (l) The High Court of Calcutta claims that these words were added to give effect to its rulings and to supersede the Madras rulings (p) The Bombay High Court also holds that the rule applies to the adjustment of any decree as for instance a decree for partition (q) The High Court of Madras holds that the only effect of the addition of the words of any kind is that the decree is not required to be one exclusively for the payment of money as held by that Court under the Code of 1882 but that it may be a complex decree providing partly for the payment of money and partly for any other relief or reliefs (r) delivery of possession of immovable property in other words one of the reliefs granted by the decree must be for the payment of money and unless this is so the adjustment does not require to be certified under this rule The Madras High Court lays stress on the word the before the word decree and says that the words the decree could only refer to what precedes namely a decree under which money is payable (r) Thus if a decree provides for the payment of money as well as for partition of immovable property the adjustment must be certified as required by this rule (s) but not if it is exclusively for partition

**Adjustment** —A composition scheme between a judgment debtor and his creditors including the decree holder is an adjustment within the meaning of this rule and may be certified as such (t) An oral agreement not to proceed against the judgment debtor beyond a certain limit is an agreement varying the terms of the decree and is therefore an adjustment which cannot be proved if not certified (u)

**Where the decree is adjusted in part** —A obtains a decree against B and C A then enters into an agreement with B by which B is discharged from liability under the decree The agreement constitutes an adjustment of a part of the decree within the meaning of this rule (v)

**Application for final decree** —An application for a final decree in a suit on a mortgage is not an application for execution Therefore the Court to which an application is made for a final decree is not a Court executing the decree Hence such Court may recognize payments made by the mortgagor out of Court though the payments have not been certified (u)

**Mode of certifying** —Sub rule (u) says that if the decree holder fails to shew cause the Court shall certify payment The Court is not bound if the decree-holder does not appear to certify the payment without requiring proof The Court must be satisfied before it certifies payment that payment has been made (x) See notes below

**Uncertified payments and limitation**

This rule applies only to parties who stand in the relation of decree holder and judgment debtor at the date of payment or adjustment —A obtains a decree

- (n) *Baba v Webb* (1881) 6 Cal 786  
 (o) *Sarcar n v Kanara* (1899) ~ Mad 18  
 (p) *Sia k vamat v Shaitk Jal i* (28) A C 15  
 (q) *Garry v Gowrya* (19 ) 46 Bom ~ 6 61  
 I C 490 ( ~ ) A B 380  
 (r) *Abdul Latif v B thula* (1914) 15 M L T  
 34 I elu v Meenakshi (1913) 2 M d  
 L J 686 *Ramat k a v Balal ish a*  
 (19 0) 43 M d 416 *Naraya a ami v*  
*R ngasami* (19 6) 49 Mad 118 95 I C  
 731 (28) A M 749  
 (s) (19 0) 43 Mad 476 *supra*

- (t) *I e Kataswami v Fotul ngam* (19 5) 49 Mad  
 L J 730 91 I C 1051 ( 6) A M 184  
 (u) *P jsh of Kal k t v V nl tad* (19 ) 50  
 Mad 89 105 I C 48 ( ) A M 911  
 (v) *Mahomed J h a Bahadur v Mahomed*  
*Munawar* (1908) 31 Mad 46  
 (w) *Mangar v Bhatoo* (19 0) 5 Pat. L J 67  
 I C 47 I m j Lal v Karam a ng  
 (1917) 39 A M 53 40 I C 4 4  
 (x) *M u g Chet Pa v Na ay n Chettiar* (1908)  
 6 Rang 18 111 I C 371 ( ) A B 135

against *B* for Rs 1000 *B* being unable to pay the amount of the decree in cash transfers certain immovable property to *C* in consideration of undertaking to pay the amount of the decree to *A* *C* pays the amount of the decree to *A* out of Court Subsequently *C* obtains an assignment of the decree from *B* and applies for execution against *B* The payment of the decretal amount by *C* to *A* though not certified is a bar to execution for the payment was made not by *B* the judgment debtor but by *C* a third party and this rule applies only where a payment is made out of Court by a judgment debtor to the decree holder (y) The High Court of Allahabad has applied the rule when the money is not payable under the decree to the decree holder and has held that where by a consent decree in a suit by *A* against *B* *B* agrees to pay a certain sum of money to *C* and he makes the payment such payment if not certified cannot be recognized by the Court executing the decree (z)

**Fraud**—There is an earlier decision of the Madras High Court which lends colour to the view that where a decree is adjusted to the satisfaction of the decree holder and he agrees to certify the adjustment to the Court but omits to do so and subsequently applies to the Court for execution of the decree the judgment debtor may object to the execution and prove the adjustment in execution proceedings and the Court executing the decree may take cognizance of the payment notwithstanding the provisions of this rule the reason given being that the suppression of the adjustment from the Court is not only a fraud upon the judgment debtor but a fraud upon the Court (a) But in later cases the same High Court has said that if that be the effect of that decision it is not good law (b) In a Bombay case (c) a decree for Rs 2500 was adjusted by the judgment debtor paying and the decree holder accepting Rs 2000 in full satisfaction of the decree but the adjustment was not certified to the Court The decree holder thereafter applied for execution of the decree He omitted to state in his application as required by O 21 r 11 (e) that the decree was adjusted It was held following an earlier decision of the same Court (d) that it was a case of fraud upon the Court and the application for execution was dismissed But these cases have been overruled by a Full Bench of the same High Court and it has been held that a Court executing a decree can in no case recognize a payment or adjustment not certified as required by this rule (e) The High Court of Calcutta has consistently held that it is not competent to a Court executing a decree to enquire into the fact of a payment or adjustment which has not been certified as required by this rule even if fraud is imputed to the decree holder (f) The same view has been taken by the Chief Court of the Punjab (g) by the High Court of Patna (h) and by the Chief Court of Oadh (i)

The law allows the judgment debtor 90 days to apply to have the payment or adjustment certified [Limitation Act Sch I art 14] If he does not make the application and the decree holder applies for execution within that period he may in answer to the application for execution apply to have the payment or adjustment certified but this must be within 90 days And it has been held that objections filed by a judgment debtor to the decree holder's application for execution may be treated as

- (y) *P. ma. v. n. v. Sree v. a.* (1896) 19 Ma 1 30 *Lo. m. v. L. a. m. a.* (191) 3 Mad 659 1 I C 65 *per S. n. a.* *Ayyar v. B. j. b. a. v. Ma. E.* (19) 31 C I W N 9 1104 I C 4 ( ) A C 694 *C. l. r. per Abdul Kalam J. in Mad 69 a. pra.*
- (z) *Ma. l. o. v. M. t. Ha. Jan.* (19) 3 45 All 471 1 C 47 ( ) A A 1
- (a) *P. n. a. v. a. a. y. (189) 13 d 3 a*
- (b) *J. e. l. v. l. e. l. a. (1899) 13 d 1 409*  
*( ) p. p. l. l. y. a. (1900) 9 Mad 31*  
*I. e. p. a. v. I. a. y. a. (190) 1 Ma 1*  
*I. J. 57 I. m. t. r. d. e. v. C. I. m. (1913) 30*  
*Mad 35 1 I C 56*
- (c) *Ha. v. B. a. w. a.* (1916) 40 Bom 333 33 I C 3

- (d) *T. r. m. b. a. v. H. a. r.* (1910) 34 Bom 55 1 I C 910 *per Hutton J.*
- (e) *M. e. h. v. a. v. M. e. h. m. e. d. u. s. a. n.* (19) 49 Bom 544 9 I C 64 ( ) A B 309 *C. e. a. v. 1. e. a. v. t. (193) 1 Iom L R 4 93*  
*1 C 410 ( ) A B 3*
- (f) *B. o. o. v. a. v. J. m. t. (1911) 16 C W N 9 3 15 I C 63*  
*J. o. g. e. n. d. a. v. t. r. u. t. o. s. h. (1916) 4 Cal L J 46 3 I C 35*
- (g) *P. m. v. P. a. m. v. I. e. h. a. v. a. n. g. h.* (1919) P R no 13 p 349 53 I C 443
- (h) *I. m. m. d. i. v. P. m. d. b. a.* (190) 5 Pat. L. J 55 1 C 690
- (i) *P. m. v. a. a. v. a. a. l. g. a. r. H. u. s. a.* (1922) Luck 10 104 I C 105 ( ) A O 193 I B.

2 an application to certify the payment or adjustment provided the objections are filed within 90 days of the adjustment (j) But the judgment debtor is not entitled to an extension of time even if fraud is established on the part of the decree holder Such extension he can claim only under s 18 of the Limitation Act and that section provides only for the case where an applicant has by means of fraud been kept from the knowledge of his right to make the application it does not provide for the case where he has by means of fraud been kept from the exercise of his right to make the application (l)

**Uncertified payment and limitation**—Sub r (3) of this rule provides that an uncertified payment shall not be recognized by any Court executing the decree The third paragraph of the old section provided that an uncertified payment or adjustment shall not be recognized as a payment or adjustment of the decree by any Court executing the decree It was accordingly held under that section that there was nothing to prevent an uncertified payment from operating as a part payment within the meaning of s 20 of the Limitation Act so as to extend the period of limitation for applying for execution under that Act (?) The words as a payment or adjustment of the decree have been omitted in sub r (3) Therefore under the present rule the Court cannot recognize an uncertified payment or adjustment for any purpose whatever It follows that an uncertified payment can no longer operate as a part payment so as to extend the period of limitation for an application for the execution of a decree (m) This may be explained by an illustration. A obtains a decree against B in January 1921 for Rs 4 000 B pays A out of Court Rs 2 000 in January 1923 but the payment is not certified A applies for execution of the decree for the balance in January 1925 that is more than three years after the date of the decree but within three years from the date of payment under the decree Under the old section the payment though not certified operated as a fresh starting point for limitation and the application was therefore not barred Under the present rule the payment not being certified cannot be recognized by the Court even for the purpose of limitation and the application must be rejected as barred by limitation

There was at one time a conflict of decision as to the meaning of certify and as to how payments made out of Court should be certified The High Courts of Calcutta (n) Madras (o) Bombay (p) and Rangoon (q) have held that where interest on the decretal amount has been paid by the judgment debtor out of Court or where part payment has been made of the decretal amount by the judgment debtor out of Court the decree holder may apply to certify the payment by an application made expressly for that purpose either prior or subsequent to the application for execution or he may certify the payment by a declaration in an application for execution of the decree that he has received such payment [O 21 r 11 (e)] The Allahabad High Court in a series of decisions (r) maintained that the payment or adjustment must be certified in a separate proceeding distinct from and prior to the application for execution but in the

- (f) *Budrudeen v Gul m* (1911) 36 Mad 35 360  
121 C 55 *Mishra v a Mehmedun*  
(1905) 49 Bom 548 5 2 503 951 C 68  
(-3) A B 309 *R dha Kant v Al s nmat*  
*Pa d is* (1901) 6 Pat L J 337 631 C  
535 (21) 4 P 13
- (k) *Bino Gora v Ja mu* (1911) 16 C W 7  
9 3 9 8 7 131 C 63
- (l) *Hurri Pershad v Vard Singh* (1894) 21 Cal  
547 *Tuldrum v B dya* (189 ) 1 Bom  
1 - *Rajeeva v Hars* (1896) 19 Mad  
167 *Rohan Singh v Maia Din* (1904) 6  
All 36
- (m) *Bh v Lal v Cheda Lal* (1914) 12 All L J  
8 41 C -15 *Bisera v Ambika*  
*Charan* (1918) 45 Cal 630 41 C 47  
*Eare Mohan v Foghunath* (1908) 50 All  
259, 1071 C 40 (-3) A A 55
- (n) *Eusuff eman v Sanchia L l* (1916) 43 Cal  
07 341 C 606 [payment of interest]

- Bah v Arjanmal* (1911) 6 Cal W N  
5 9 631 C 80 (-1) 4 C 30 *Madan v*  
*Harulal* (1911) 6 Cal W N 534 641 C  
2 (21) A C 643
- (o) *Manlami v Sethurami* (1918) 41 Mad.  
5 411 C 01
- (p) *Po durang v Jaggia* (1921) 45 Bom 61 59  
1 C 309 (-1) A B 411
- (q) *Maing L u S n v Mau g Po Th n* (1904)  
2 Rang 303 841 C 4 3 (-3) A R 6  
*Ma g Th n v Ma Mi* (1904) 5 Rang 833  
1101 C 1 3 (-28) A R 6
- (r) *Coluckhand v Bhila* (1914) 1 All L J 547,  
31 C 53 *Bh j n Lal v Ch da Lal*  
(1914) 1 All L J 8 5 41 C 15  
*Chatter s gh v Am r S ng* (1916) 23  
All 04 301 C 590 *Banj vail v f na*  
*L l* (1904) 46 All 635 831 C 73 (-1)  
A A 06

recent Full Bench case of *Joti Prasad v Srichand* (s) it has fallen into line with the other High Courts

In some cases the decree holder's certification has been treated as an application to take a step in aid of execution and as affording a fresh starting point of limitation under Article 182 (a) so that the application must be made within three years of payment (t) It is submitted that this is not correct. The payment must be made within three years of the decree or of the last starting point of limitation to be effectual under section 20 of the Limitation Act (u) But it may be certified at any subsequent time by the decree holder (t)

**Uncertified adjustment and estoppel**—Since an uncertified adjustment cannot be recognized by the Court executing the decree it cannot operate as an estoppel against the decree holder. A obtains a decree against B. The decree is adjusted but the adjustment is not certified to the Court. A receives payments under the adjustment and then applies for execution of the decree. The adjustment being uncertified the fact that A has received payments under the adjustment does not estop him from applying for execution (u)

**Restitution of uncertified payment on reversal of decree in appeal**—If a decree is reversed in appeal the judgment debtor is entitled to recover back all payments made by him under the decree though the payments have not been certified. The decree being reversed in appeal the payment whether certified or not is one made without consideration and the judgment debtor is entitled to a refund by an application to the Court of first instance (x) See s 144

**Surety**—A surety under sec 145 for the performance of a decree is bound so long as the judgment debtor is bound and is not discharged by a payment which has not been certified (y)

**Joint decree holders**—See notes to O 21 r 16. Payment by judgment debtor out of Court to one of several holders of a joint decree

**Minor**—An adjustment of a decree made by a guardian without obtaining the permission of the Court as required by O 32 r 7 cannot be certified under this rule ( )

**Assignment of decree**—The transferee of a decree cannot execute a decree without first making an application under r 16 below to the Court which passed the decree. When such an application is made it is made to the Court as a Court which passed the decree and not as a Court executing the decree within the meaning of sub r (3). It is therefore open to the judgment debtor to object under rule 16 that the decree having been satisfied there was nothing to assign (a) But apparently if an order for execution is made in favour of the transferee after notice to the judgment debtor he cannot afterwards plead an uncertified payment for under rule 16 execution in favour of a transferee is subject to the same conditions as if the application were made by the decree holder (b)

(s) (19 8) 26 All L J 966 31 I C 3 ( 8)  
A A 691 B

(t) *Joti Prasad v Gay* (1914) 46 Cal 451 C  
903 M g L 88 v Ma g L 88 The m  
(19 4) 2 Rang 393 84 I C 473 ( 5) A R  
8

(r) *Majid v Harulal* (19 1) 6 C I W 531  
642 C (21) A C 643 Amar v gh v  
I m Dei (19 5) 47 All 8 89 I C 415  
( 5) A A 50

(r) *Joti Prasad v Srichand* s pra *Prakash v Allahabad Bank* (19 ) 1 Luck  
4 v 98 I C 353 ( ) A O

(w) *Trimdak v H vi* (1910) 34 Bom 55 I C  
940 *Joye drah v Preetih* (1914) 19 Cal

L J 16 1 I C 96

(x) *Prasad v Lashu* (188 ) 11 Bom 4

(y) *T b Peddy v Der Peddy* (19 6) 49 Mad  
8 94 I C 5 ( 6) A M 64

(t) *A unachellam v I m dh* (1906) 29 Mad  
309 I t Akk v y v Do a nam (19 4)  
4 Mad L J 494 2 I C 58 ( 3) A M  
20 (payment to Manager of Joint Hindu  
family)

(a) *P gh nath v G garam* (19 3) 4 Bom 643  
51 C 893 (23) A B 404 C paya v  
Araknappa (19 4) 26 Bom L B 491  
69 I C 43 (4) A B 394

(b) *Br Jobash v Ma sh* (19 ) 31 Cal W  
9 1 104 I C 4 ( ) A C 621



of the uncertified payment may be admitted by a criminal Court (l) It must however be noted that a mere application for execution not followed by execution does not constitute an offence under s 210 of the Penal Code for it is of the essence of the offence under that section that the decree must have been caused to be executed (m)

### Courts executing Decrees

**3 [New]** Where immovable property forms one estate or tenure situate within the local limits of the jurisdiction of two or more Courts, any one of such Courts may attach and sell the entire estate or tenure

Land situate in more than one jurisdiction

Land situate in more than one jurisdiction—This rule is new It gives effect to a ruling of the Calcutta High Court in the undermentioned case (n) The rule when amplified may be stated thus where immovable property attached in execution of a decree forms one estate of which a part is situate within the local limits of the jurisdiction of the Court executing the decree and the rest beyond such limits the Court executing the decree has the power to attach and sell the whole estate though only a part thereof is situate within the local limits of its jurisdiction

**4 [S 223 5th para]** Where a decree has been passed in a suit of which the value is set forth in the plaint did not exceed two thousand rupees and which, as regards its subject-matter, is not excepted by the law for the time being in force from the cognizance of either a Presidency or a Provincial Court of Small Causes and the Court which passed it wishes it to be executed in Calcutta, Madras, Bombay or Rangoon, such Court may send to the Court of Small Causes in Calcutta, Madras, Bombay or Rangoon, as the case may be, the copies and certificates mentioned in rule 6, and such Court of Small Causes shall thereupon execute the decree as if it had been passed by itself

**5 [S 223, 6th para]** Where the Court to which a decree is to be sent for execution is situate within the same district as the Court which passed such decree, such Court shall send the same directly to the former Court But, where the Court to which the decree is to be sent for execution is situate in a different district, the Court which passed it shall send it to the District Court of the district in which the decree is to be executed

Mode of transfer

(l) *Queen Empress v. J. P. J.* (1846) 10 Bom. 488  
*M. d. b. C. v. J. P. J.* (1846) 10 Bom. 488  
*J. P. J. v. J. P. J.* (1846) 10 Bom. 488  
*J. P. J. v. J. P. J.* (1846) 10 Bom. 488  
 9 Mad 101 *Q. v. Empress v. M. R. v.*  
 (m) *Man (1846) 4 M. 1 3 5*  
*Man (1846) 4 M. 1 3 5*  
 9 1  
 (n) *Man (1846) 4 M. 1 3 5*  
 9 1  
 (o) *Man (1846) 4 M. 1 3 5*  
 9 1



Procedure where Court desires that its own decrees shall be executed by another Court

6 [S 224] The Court sending a decree for execution shall send—

- (a) a copy of the decree,
- (b) a certificate setting forth that satisfaction of the decree has not been obtained by execution within the jurisdiction of the Court by which it was passed or where the decree has been executed in part, the extent to which satisfaction has been obtained and what part of the decree remains unsatisfied, and
- (c) a copy of any order for the execution of the decree, or, if no such order has been made, a certificate to that effect

Clause (b)—The omission to transmit to the Court executing the decree the certificate referred to in cl (b) is not a material irregularity within the meaning of r 90 of this Order. Hence it is not a good ground for setting aside a sale in execution (a)

7 [S 225] The Court to which a decree is so sent shall cause such copies and certificates to be filed, without any further proof of the decree or order for execution, or of the copies thereof, unless the Court, for any special reasons to be recorded under the hand of the Judge requires such proof

Proof of jurisdiction—The old section contained the words or of the jurisdiction of the Court which passed it after the words or of the copies thereof. This gave rise to a conflict of opinion whether a Court to which a decree was sent for execution had the power to inquire whether the Court that passed the decree had jurisdiction to pass it and to refuse execution if it found that the decree was passed without jurisdiction. It was held in some cases that the Court had the power (r) and in others that it had not (g). The effect of the omission of these words is that a Court to which a decree is transferred for execution has now no power to question the jurisdiction of the Court which passed the decree under execution (r). It has been recently held by a Full Bench of the Calcutta High Court that where a decree presented for execution was made by a Court which on the face of it had no jurisdiction to pass it the executing Court is entitled to refuse to execute it on the ground that it was made without jurisdiction (s). It is not clear whether the decision was intended to apply to a case where a decree passed by one Court is transferred for execution to another Court

- (a) *Abhinav v. M. A. S.* (1897) 3 Mad 10  
 (p) *H. J. Muta v. Purma* 1 (1891) 15 Bom 216  
 1919 19 *Blagnappa v. P. A. Anath* (1904) 28 B M S 2  
 See also *Leake v. Da. ul* (1868) 10 W R F R 10 11  
 (g) *Chopani v. Truman* (1883) 7 Bom 481  
*Kamrshet v. Pama* (1884) 10 Bom 65

- (r) *H. R. v. Nara. Rao* (1914) 39 Bom 194 3  
 I C 13 *Sh. op. t. P. v. H. Rat. (Hawd)*  
 (1919) 1 R No 2 p 6 46 I C 419  
*Z. m. d. v. of E. R. v. P. v. am. v. Chaud. mbar m*  
 (1909) 43 M 1 6 5 63 643 641 ( 4 1  
 (s) *Gora Ch. d. v. Prof. Ua* (1906) 53 Cal 106  
 89 I C 645 ( 51 A C 70

Court receiving copies of decree etc. to file same without proof

**8 [S 226]** Where such copies are so filed, the decree or order may, if the Court to which it is sent is the District Court, be executed by such Court or be transferred for execution to any subordinate Court of competent jurisdiction

Execution of decree or order by Court to which it is sent

**Subordinate Court**—If a Munsiff in district X sends a decree passed by him for execution direct to a Munsiff in district Y the latter has no jurisdiction to execute the decree. The proper course is for the Munsiff in district X to send the decree to the District Court of district Y and the latter Court may then under this rule transfer the decree for execution to the Munsiff in that district (t)

**9 [S 227]** Where the Court to which the decree is sent for execution is a High Court, the decree shall be executed by such Court in the same manner as if it had been passed by such Court in the exercise of its ordinary original civil jurisdiction

Execution by High Court of decree transferred by other Court

### *Application for Execution*

**10 [S 230, 1st para]** When the holder of a decree desires to execute it, he shall apply to the Court which passed the decree or to the Officer (if any) appointed in this behalf, or if the decree has been sent under the provisions hereinbefore contained to another Court then to such Court or to the proper officer thereof

Application for execution

**Who may apply for execution**—The person appearing on the face of the decree as the decree holder is entitled to execution unless it be shown by some other person under O 21 r 16 that he has taken the place of the decree holder (u)

**Court by which decree may be executed**—See s 38

**Court which passed the decree**—See s 37 as to the definition of Court which passed a decree and notes thereto

**What decrees may be executed**—See notes to s 36

**If the decree has been sent to another Court**—Where the decree of a District Court has been sent to the Court of a Munsiff for execution and has not been returned to the District Court the proper Court within the meaning of the Limitation Act 1908 art 152 (v) in which to apply for execution of the decree is the Court of the Munsiff (z)

**11 [Ss 236 235]** (1) Where a decree is for the payment of money the Court may, on the oral application of the decree holder at

Oral application

(t) *Per D I M A J* (1899) 1 C 1 61  
(z) *J la v K r m A* (1931) 18 Cal 679  
N I r e v J *Andromidas* (1909) 31

*F m L R S v I S I C 671* (1909) A 1  
( ) *M A J A f l o d i v A r m a J u* (1916)  
43 L A 35 33 M A 1 610 33 I C 6

11 the time of the passing of the decree, order immediate execution thereof by the arrest of the judgment debtor, prior to the preparation of a warrant if he is within the precincts of the Court

(2) Save as otherwise provided by sub rule (1), every application for the execution of a decree shall be in writing, signed and verified by the applicant or by some other person proved to the satisfaction of the Court to be acquainted with the facts of the case, and shall contain in a tabular form the following particulars, namely —

Written application

- (a) the number of the suit,
- (b) the names of the parties,
- (c) the date of the decree,
- (d) whether any appeal has been preferred from the decree,
- (e) whether any, and (if any) what, payment or other adjustment of the matter in controversy has been made between the parties subsequently to the decree,
- (f) whether any, and (if any) what, previous applications have been made for the execution of the decree, the dates of such applications and their results,
- (g) the amount with interest (if any) due upon the decree or other relief granted thereby, together with particulars of any cross decree, whether passed before or after the date of the decree sought to be executed,
- (h) the amount of the costs (if any) awarded,
- (i) the name of the person against whom execution of the decree is sought, and
- (j) the mode in which the assistance of the Court is required, whether—
  - (1) by the delivery of any property specifically decreed,
  - (ii) by the attachment and sale, or by the sale without attachment, of any property,

- (iii) by the arrest and detention in prison of any person,
- (iv) by the appointment of a receiver,
- (v) otherwise, as the nature of the relief granted may require

(3) The Court to which an application is made under sub rule (2) may require the applicant to produce a certified copy of the decree

Sub rule (1) corresponds with s 206 of the Code of 1882 and sub rule (2) with s 230

Difference between old section 256 and sub rule (1)—Section 206 of the Code of 1882 was as follows —

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Power to direct immediate execution of money not exceeding Rs 1 000 | not exceed the sum of one thousand rupees the Court may when passing the decree on the oral application of the decree holder order immediate execution thereof by the issue of a warrant directed either against the person of the judgment debtor if he is within the local limits of the jurisdiction of the Court or against his movable property within the same limits |
|---|---|

Sub rule (1) differs from s 206 in the following particulars —

- 1 Under s 206 immediate execution could only be issued if the amount of the decree did not exceed Rs 1 000 Under the present rule there is no limit to the amount of the decree But the decree must be one for the payment of money
- 2 As a general rule a decree holder seeking to arrest the judgment debtor must present an application *in writing* to the Court and the Court may then direct a warrant to issue for the arrest of the judgment debtor who as a rule cannot be arrested without a warrant S 206 of the Code of 1882 dispensed with a written application and enabled the Court to issue a warrant for the arrest of the judgment debtor on an *oral* application Sub rule (1) goes further and empowers the Court to order immediate arrest of the judgment debtor *prior to the preparation of a warrant if he is within the precincts of the Court*
- 3 Execution can no longer issue against the movable property of the judgment debtor on an *oral* application as it could under s 206

Privilege from arrest—The privilege from arrest under civil process conferred by s 130 of this Code does not extend to a judgment debtor against whom an order has been made for immediate arrest under this sub rule See s 130 sub s (3)

Alterations in sub rule (2)—Sub rule (2) corresponds with s 230 of the Code of 1882 except in the following particulars —

- 1 In cl (g) the words *together with particulars of any cross decree whether passed before or after the date of the decrees ought to be executed* are ~~new~~
- 2 In cl (j) sub-cl (ii) the words *or by the sale without attachment* are ~~new~~
- 3 CL (j) sub-cl. (iv) is new

The application shall be verified—An application for execution may be verified by any person acquainted with the facts of the case. It may therefore be verified by a person who holds a general power of attorney from the decree holder notwithstanding that the decree holder may be residing within the jurisdiction of the Court (u). Where the application is made by a person other than the decree holder all that is necessary is that the Court should be satisfied that such person is acquainted with the facts of the case. It is not necessary that it should be verified *after* the application for permission to verify it has been made nor is it necessary that the verification should be made in the presence of the Court (x).

The application shall state the date of the decree—The date of the decree means the date on which the judgment was pronounced (y). See O 20 r 7.

The application shall specify the mode in which the assistance of the Court is required—Where an application did not specify the mode in which the assistance of the Court was required, it was rejected (z). See r 17 below.

Sub rule (3)—This sub rule is new. The Court may under this sub rule require the applicant to produce a certified copy of the decree. Such copy however is not a necessary annexure to an application for execution. An application therefore which is not accompanied by a copy of the decree cannot be said to be an application not in accordance with law within the meaning of art 182 ( ) of sch I of the Limitation Act (a).

Amendment of application—See r 17 below.

**12 [s 236]** Where an application is made for the attachment of any movable property belonging to a judgment debtor but not in his possession, the decree holder shall annex to the application an inventory of the property to be attached, containing a reasonably accurate description of the same.

Application for attachment of movable property not in judgment-debtor's possession

Failure to annex inventory—Where no such inventory as is required by this rule is annexed to the application for execution the application cannot be said to be one in accordance with law within the meaning of art 182 of the Limitation Act 1908 (b). When the decree is executed under s 52 against the legal representative of a deceased person no inventory is necessary (c).

**13 [s 237]** Where an application is made for the attachment of any immovable property belonging to a judgment debtor, it shall contain at the foot—

Application for attachment of immovable property to contain certain particulars

(a) a description of such property sufficient to identify the same and, in case such property can be identified by boundaries or numbers in a record of settlement or survey, a specification of such boundaries or numbers, and

(w) *B k v L d t t o r u* (1904) 6 All 14  
(x) *Ah and v Um d* (1913) 3 Cal W N 687  
80 I C 513 (4) A C 811  
(y) *Colam v Galy* (1905) 5 Cal 109  
(z) *Sh Karamch d v Chel Jh* (1902) 19 Bom 34

( ) *P gh a d - J dan v gh* (1913) 40 All 99 43 I C 914  
(b) *Abul Jafar KA v Jha Ia* (1915) 3 All 5 21 C 49  
(c) *Bh dush t v B desahed* (1906) 4 Bom L I 13 83 I C 911 (") A B 5

- (b) a specification of the judgment debtor's share or interest in such property to the best of the belief of the applicant, and so far as he has been able to ascertain the same

Clause (a) —In cl (a) the words and in case such property can be identified or numbers are new

**14 [S 238]** Where an application is made for the attachment of any land which is registered in the office of the Collector, the Court may require the applicant to produce a certified extract from the register of such office, specifying the persons registered as proprietors of, or as possessing any transferable interest in, the land, or its revenue, or as liable to pay revenue for the land and the shares of the registered proprietors

Power to require certified extract from Collector's register in certain cases

**Alterations in the law**—Under the old section in the case of an application for the attachment of land registered in the Collector's Office it was necessary that the application should be accompanied by a certified extract from the register of such office. Under the present rule the Court *may at its option* require the applicant to produce such extract. The object is to save the applicant the costs of procuring such extract.

**15 [S 231]** (1) Where a decree has been passed jointly in favour of more persons than one, any one or more of such persons may, unless the decree imposes any condition to the contrary, apply for the execution of the whole decree for the benefit of them all, or where any of them has died, for the benefit of the survivors and the legal representatives of the deceased

Application for execution by joint decree holder

(2) Where the Court sees sufficient cause for allowing the decree to be executed on an application made under this rule, it shall make such order as it deems necessary for protecting the interests of the persons who have not joined in the application

**Alterations in the rule**—This rule corresponds with s 231 of the Code of 1887 except in the following particulars—

- 1 The words or his or their representatives which occurred in s. 231 after the words one or more of such persons have been omitted in view of the provisions of s 146. See notes below under the head Any one or more of such persons
- 2 The words unless the decree imposes any condition to the contrary occurring in sub-rule (1) are new. See notes below under the same words.

5 What is a joint decree—A decree jointly passed in favour of more persons than one is a joint decree. *A* and *B* obtain a decree against *C* for Rs. 5,000 this is a joint decree. It is not the less a joint decree because the shares of *A* and *B* in the decretal amount have been determined by the decree. Thus if it is determined by the decree that the share of *A* is Rs. 2,000 and the share of *B* is Rs. 3,000 the decree is still a joint decree. But though the decree in such a case is a joint decree the interest of *A* and *B* being determined by the decree either of them may apply for execution to the extent of his interest (d).

Application by one of several decree holders for execution of the whole decree—Ordinarily all the decree holders in a joint decree must join in an application for execution of the decree. The present rule provides for the case in which all decree holders are unable or are unwilling to join in the application and enables one or more of the decree holders to apply for execution of the whole decree for the benefit of them all. Where an application is made under this rule by some only of several joint decree holders the Court may in its discretion grant or refuse the application (e). Similarly it is in the discretion of the Court whether or not to give notice to the other decree holders or to the judgment debtor before making an order for execution under this rule it is not obligatory upon the Court to do so (f). If the application is allowed the Court will under sub r (2) make such order as it deems necessary for protecting the interests of the other decree holders and of the judgment debtor (g).

Unless the decree imposes any condition to the contrary—The provisions of this rule do not apply where by the terms of the decree execution has been made dependent on all the decree holders joining in the application (h).

Application by one of several decree holders for execution in respect of his share of the decree—The application under this rule by one of several holders of a joint decree must be for the execution of the whole decree and further it must also be for the benefit of the other decree holders as well as himself. A joint decree cannot be executed by one of several joint holders in respect of what the applicant considers to be his share in the decree (i). Thus if a decree is passed for *A* and *B* for Rs. 5,000 the decree is joint and neither *A* nor *B* can apply for execution of his proportionate share of the decree. But one of several holders of a joint decree may apply for execution of the decree to the extent of his interest therein if the extent of such interest is determined by the decree. Thus if in a suit for possession of land by *A* and *B* against *C* the Court has declared each of the plaintiffs to be entitled to a moiety of the land the Court may allow either plaintiff to execute the decree to the extent of his one half share though the decree is a joint decree (j).

The rule set forth above that one of several holders of a joint decree is not entitled to execution in respect of his share of the decree but that he must apply for execution of the whole decree applies only in those cases where the whole decree has remained unsatisfied. That rule does not apply where a joint decree has been satisfied in part before the date of the application for execution. In such a case execution cannot issue for the whole decree but only for so much thereof as has remained unsatisfied. This subject is considered in the next following paragraph.

(d) *Hurish Chunder v. Kalisunders* (1883) 9 Cal 48 101 A 4

(e) *Shah Ahmed v. Shahada* (18 0) C L R 53

(f) *Du g. Das v. Dewraj* (1906) 33 Cal 306

(g) *Ta asu dars v. Echari I* (1868) 1 B L R A C 9

(h) *Fa a d v. Abd Allah* (1854) 6 All 69

(i) *Collector of Shahjahanpur v. Surjan* (1852) 4

All B arn Dis v. Mahara i (1853) 5 All 6 3 Dal cha d v. Pas sh rior

(1891) 15 Bom 1 Muta sami v

Nat a (189) 18 Mad 464 Jf 2 v. The

M d p r Zam ad ry Co Ltd (1919)

4 Lat L J 575 53 J C 603 (over)

Shanki v. Anwar J g (1907) 1 k

9 97 I C 806 (26) A C 605

(j) *Hurish Chander v. Kalisunders* (1883) 9 Cal 48 101 A 4

An application for execution by a joint decree holder with regard to a certain portion of the decree giving up the rest the other decree holders being parties to the application and standing by is not illegal as contravening the provisions of this rule but there cannot be any subsequent execution for the balance of the same decree (k)

Payment by judgment debtor out of Court to one of several holders of a joint decree—If obtains a decree against C for Rs 5000 C may pay the amount of the decree into Court (r 1) and the Court will then pay the amount to A on his application. If C does not adopt that course and pays the amount to A out of Court (r 1) C must see that if the decree holder certifies the payment to the Court. If A fails to certify the payment C may apply to the Court to record the payment as certified. If C also fails to do so the Court executing the decree will not recognise the payment and will order execution (r 2) if A notwithstanding payment to him of the amount of the decree out of Court applies for execution of the decree against C.

But if there are two or more decree holders and the payment is made by the judgment debtor to one of them the question arises whether the other decree holders have the right to execute the decree? The following illustrations supply the answer—

I (1) A and B obtain a decree against C for Rs 5000 C pays B his (B's) share of the decretal amount out of Court and the payment is certified to the Court. A then applies under this rule for execution of the whole decree. A cannot execute for more than his own share as the decree has been satisfied as to B's share (l).

(2) If in the above case the payment is not certified to the Court but B admits the payment A will be limited to his share in execution (m). But if B does not admit the payment the Court will allow execution to issue for the whole decree.

II A and B obtain a decree against C for Rs 5000 C pays the whole amount of the decree to B out of Court and the payment is certified to the Court. A then applies for execution of the decree to the extent of his own share. Is A entitled to execute the decree to the extent of his share in spite of the fact that B has certified satisfaction of the whole decree? It has been held that he is for one of several joint decree holders is not competent to grant full discharge of the decree out of Court or to certify to the Court complete satisfaction of more than his own share of the decree without the concurrence of the other decree holders (n). But A has another remedy besides execution against C and that is a suit against B to recover his share from him for B has by his certificate admitted receipt of the whole amount of the decree (o).

Any one or more of such persons.—This expression includes persons claiming under such person. A transferee of a decree within the meaning of r 16 below is such a person (p).

Amendment.—An application for execution of a joint decree by one only of the decree holders should state that the application is made on behalf of all the decree holders. If the application contains no such statement it should be rejected. Leave to amend cannot be granted for while O 21 r 17 allows a defect with reference to rr 11 to 14 to be amended it makes no mention of this rule (q).

- (k) *Goffe In v. Mats Lal* (1929) 56 Cal 1 (-3)  
 (l) *Tarruk v. Dittendra* (1933) 9 Cal 831  
 (m) *Sull v. S. al yammal* (199) 11 Mad 347  
 (n) *Tamma S. gh v. La Jhm* (1904) 46 All 313  
 313 *Moti Lam v. H* (1904) 6 All 334  
 334 *La A. a v. Ch. i. Bhu* (1906) 5 All 25  
 25 *Im do Beg v. Mukhtar Beg* (1933) 4

- All 401  
 11 *Ashli Ali v. Dora Ram* (194) 47  
 Mad L J 492 8 I C 543 (-5) All 730  
 (o) *S. m. u. da sm v. Krishna Swamy* (1906) 9  
 M d 13  
 (p) *De r B. K. v. F. i. k* (1922) 8 Cal. 0  
 (q) *M. K. v. T. H. M. W. n. p. u. Z. m. d. ry. Co. Ld*  
 (1919) 4 Pat L J 55 53 I C 803



**Appeal**—An order determining any question mentioned or referred to in s. 47 is a decree (s. 2) and is therefore appealable under s. 96. The questions referred to in s. 47 are questions arising between a decree holder on the one hand and the judgment debtor on the other and relating to the execution, discharge or satisfaction of the decree. This is illustrated by the following cases—

(1) *A* and *B* obtain a decree against *C*. *A* alone applies for execution of the whole decree. *C* (the judgment debtor) contends that *A* alone should not be allowed to execute the whole decree. Here the question being one between the decree holder on the one hand and the judgment debtor on the other, any order made upon the application is appealable as a decree. If  $\S$  4 a application is allowed *C* may appeal from the order and if the application is disallowed *A* may appeal from the order (r).

(2) But if the objection to execution was raised not by *C* the judgment debtor but by *B* the other decree holder the question being between the decree holders inter se no appeal will lie from an order either granting or refusing the application (s).

**Limitation**—See Limitation Act Sch. I art. 18<sup>o</sup> Explan. 1

**16 [S. 232]** Where a decree or, if a decree has been passed jointly in favour of two or more persons, the interest of any decree holder in the decree, is transferred by assignment in writing or by operation of law, the transferee may apply for execution of the decree to the Court which passed it, and the decree may be executed in the same manner and subject to the same conditions as if the application were made by such decree holder.

Application for execution by transferee of decree

Provided that, where the decree, or such interest as aforesaid, has been transferred by assignment, notice of such application shall be given to the transferor and the judgment debtor, and the decree shall not be executed until the Court has heard their objections (if any) to its execution.

Provided also that, where a decree for the payment of money against two or more persons has been transferred to one of them, it shall not be executed against the others.

**Alterations in the law**—

1. The words "or if a decree has been passed jointly in favour of two or more persons the interest of any decree holder in the decree" have been added into the first paragraph to make it clear that the rule is not confined in its application to a transfer of the whole decree but extends to a transferee of the interest of any holder of a joint decree. This was in fact the interpretation put upon the old section (t).
2. The word "if that Court thinks fit" which occurred in the old section in the first paragraph before the words "the decree may be executed" have been omitted. See notes below. Right to execution does not depend upon discretion of Court.

(r) *Lakshmi v. Jo* 2 (1904) 17 Mad 304  
(s) *Latanlal v. Bai G. I.* 6 (1899) 3 Bom 623

(t) *M. P. Sanyal v. Balraj Sanyal* (1906) 11 Mad 306

**Decree**—The expression decree in the first paragraph and the first proviso of this rule is not confined to a money decree. It includes a mortgage decree (u). The second proviso is confined to money decrees.

**Rule of procedure**—This rule regulates procedure and does not affect substantive rights. The transferee of a decree cannot execute it until he has obtained an order under this rule, but the transfer operates from the date of the transfer and the transferee is entitled without obtaining an order under this rule to object to an attachment of the decree made subsequent to the transfer (v). If a liquidator has transferred a decree before the company is dissolved, he may execute a written assignment for the purpose of this rule after dissolution and after he has ceased to be liquidator (w).

**Application for execution by transferee of decree**—No order should be made under this rule for the execution of a decree on the application of a transferee of the decree unless—

- I the decree has been transferred by a *signment in writing* or by *operation of law* [an oral assignment is not sufficient (x)]
- II the application for execution is made to the Court which *passed the decree* and
- III where the decree has been transferred by assignment *notice of the application* has been given to the transferor and the judgment debtor.

The rule does not require an independent application by the transferee for recognition as transferee. All that the rule enjoins is that a transferee seeking execution should give notice of the application for execution to the transferor and the judgment debtor (y). See notes below.

Transfer of decree against a company in liquidation. On the other hand until an order for execution is made in favour of the transferee he has not acquired the status of decree holder. See sec 2 (3).

**I Who may apply for execution under this rule**—The following persons and no others may apply for execution under this rule ( ) —

- (a) The transferee of a decree under an assignment in writing. [A transferee under an oral assignment has no *locus standi* to apply for execution under this rule (a)].
- (b) The transferee of a decree by *operation of law* e.g. the legal representative of a deceased decree holder or the Official Assignee in the case of an insolvent decree holder or the purchaser of a decree at a court sale in execution of a decree against the decree holder (r 53) (b). A transfer of property by A to B which is the subject matter of a suit by A against C does not amount to a transfer by operation of law of a decree subsequently obtained by A against C so as to entitle B to apply for execution under this rule (c). A deed of transfer of property which is the subject matter of a suit may involve a transfer of the decree passed on the very day on which the deed is executed but the transfer in that case is not by operation of law but by an assignment in writing (d). A transfer by operation of law means a

(u) See *Sec 171* (1900) 4 All 544  
 41 C 743 See also *Judt v I*  
 11 J (1904) 10 All 50  
 (v) *To J A J* (1904) 5 Fam 59  
 103 J C 83 (4) A R *Sail g J v*  
*Iaphu th* (1900) 53 Ma 16 31 C 99  
 (w) *J h are v J rry* (1905) 51  
 M d 641 109 J C 563 ( ) A M 48  
 (x) *J t f a v th v P y* Dec J b (1916) 43  
 Cal 930 922 431 A 104 11 341 C 69  
 (y) *P a a v d a v* 6 a (1904) 14 Mad

L J 393 4 *malat v Pam e* (1904)  
 18 Mad L J 4 5  
 (z) *1st v Mah t v* (1904) 6 Pom L R 333  
 335 80 J C 49 (4) A B 46  
 ( ) *Par ta v D gan bar* (1901) 1 Pcm 0  
 (b) See *C Su dar v Hem th der* (1909) 16  
 Cal 3  
 ( ) *M p p e z m d a v C L d v E l a*  
 m (1904) 51 Cal 03 40 J C 61 (1904)  
 A C 661  
 (d) *A t P om th* (1900) 5 C 1 W N  
 63 5 J C 6



*Explanation III*—A person who is entitled under a decree to an assignment of a previous decree obtained by *A* against *B* but who has not obtained such assignment is not a transferee of the previous decree so as to entitle him to apply for execution of it. But he will be entitled to apply if he has obtained an assignment before the date of the application (m)

*Explanation II*—A person to whom the holder of a decree for possession of immovable property sells a portion of the property is not a transferee of the decree within the meaning of this rule and he is not therefore entitled to execute the decree. A transfer of property is not the same thing as a transfer of a decree (n)

*Explanation I*—A transferee of a decree awarding maintenance is entitled to execution under this section. The reason is that though a right to future maintenance cannot be transferred having regard to the provisions of s. 6 cl. (d) of the Transfer of Property Act 1882 there is no objection to a transfer of such right when it is awarded by a decree. The transferee therefore of such a decree is entitled to recover by execution maintenance that has fallen due. He cannot of course attach maintenance before it has fallen due (o). See s. 60 sub s. (1) cl. (n) and notes thereto on p. 201 above.

*Benamidar*—*D* obtains a decree against *B*. *C* purchases the decree from *A* in the name of *D*. Here *C* is the real transferee and *D* is benamidar or ostensible transferee. Is *D* entitled to take out execution of the decree? Yes according to the High Court of Allahabad (p). No according to the High Court of Calcutta but if he has succeeded in taking out execution (as where it is not brought to the notice of the Court that he is a benamidar) the application for execution made by him will save a subsequent application by *C* from the bar of limitation (q).

Where the alleged transferee of a decree is found to be the benamidar of a judgment debtor the Court is bound by the second proviso to this rule to refuse to allow the decree to be executed against the other judgment debtors in favour of the alleged transferee (r).

It has been held in some cases that the mere fact that an order for execution has been made on the application of a benamidar does not preclude the real transferee from applying under this rule to continue the execution proceedings himself but the real transferee will be bound by proceedings in execution up to that date (s). The High Court of Madras has held that where a decree has been transferred by assignment in writing the transferee alone can apply for execution under this rule though he may be a mere benamidar and that the real transferee is not entitled to apply under this rule (t). But in a latter case in which the real transferee his benamidar the ostensible transferee and the original decree holder or transferor were all dead and there was a contest between their legal representatives the Madras High Court said that rule 16 was not exhaustive and that the Court had power to inquire who was the real owner entitled to execution (u).

**II Application for execution by a transferee should be made to the Court which passed the decree**—A transferee of a decree must apply for execution

(m) *P. du v. S. I.* (1935) Bom. L. R. 1109

90 I. C. 561 (5) A. B. 42

(n) *H. Raj. P. v. Yuthaj. Aw. v. r.* (1907) 97

All. W. N. 40 I. L. J. 144 (1904)

6 Bom. L. R. 333 80 I. C. 49 (4) A. B.

46 C. C. v. H. m. i. (1906) 8

Bom. L. R. 61 96 I. C. 833 (6) A. B.

408

(o) *Ad. th. H. f. r. Al.* (1911) 39 I. L. J. 136

1 C. C. 86 C. C. h. w. v. P. doors v.

1 C. C. 444

(p) *Kamla Prasad v. Indom.* (1915) 3 All. 414

91 I. C. 593

(q) *Abd. l. v. Chukhan.* (1899) 5 C. L. R. 53

*Gour Sundar v. Hem Ch. der.* (1899) 16

Cal. 355 *B. l. v. h. v. Ledmat.* (1893)

90 Cal. 353 305

(r) *A. abal. lla v. A. bat. lla.* (1915) 3 I. C.

906

(s) *M. aham v. Talayya.* (1894) 1 Mad. 358

*Abdul v. Ch. lla.* (1895) 5 C. L. J. 53

(t) *P. l. appa. Subr. m. a.* (1935) 44 Mad.

553 80 I. C. 409 (5) A. M. 01 follow

ed. *C. rdal v. C. baksh.* (1907) 8 Lah.

35 100 I. C. 545 (7) A. L. 110

(u) *B. de. Krist. m. v. Suruda.* (1907) 53 Mad.

L. J. 963 105 I. C. 405 ( ) A. M. 903

16 to the Court which passed the decree though the decree has been sent for execution to another Court (t) The Court to which a decree has been transmitted for execution has no jurisdiction to make an order for execution on the application of a transferee of the decree If such an order is made it is illegal and it must be set aside in appeal (u) As to the definition of Court which passed the decree see s 37 and notes thereto

III Notice shall be given to the transferor and the judgment debtor—The notice which is required by the first proviso is not notice of the assignment but notice of the application for execution of the decree (x) The provisions of the rule as to notice are mandatory and if execution is issued without notice the proceedings in execution are void (y) The object of the notice is to enable the transferor and the judgment debtor to raise such objections as regards the assignment as may be available to them *eg* that the consideration money was not fully paid or that the transferee is a *benamidar* for some of the judgment debtors (z) The object of issuing notices to the transferor and the judgment debtor is to determine once and for all and in the presence of all parties concerned the validity of the assignment (a) It cannot be said that notice is necessary each time the assignee comes in to get the decree executed (a) *for after the first order in his favour he has acquired the status of a decree holder* The transferee cannot accept the assignment and at the same time plead fraud to escape paying the consideration for the assignment (b) If the property of the judgment debtor is attached without hearing his objections the attachment is illegal even if the Court subsequently hears his objections and confirms the attachment after such hearing (c) Where the judgment debtor is dead the notice required by this rule should be given to his legal representative (d) Where no notice is given as required by this rule it is in the discretion of the Court to grant time to the transferee to enable him to serve the notice (e) The Patna High Court has held that the notice required by this rule need not be in writing (f)

Where on an application by the transferee of a decree to have his name substituted as decree holder no objection is taken by the judgment debtor as to the validity of the transfer the judgment debtor will be precluded from questioning the validity of the transfer on an application by the transferee for execution of the decree (g) Similarly where no objection is taken by the judgment debtor that no notice was given to the transferor he will be precluded from raising that objection at a subsequent stage of the execution proceedings (h)

There is nothing to preclude a transferee of a decree from applying under s 39 to the Court which passed the decree to send the decree for execution to another Court (i) But the notice required by this rule must be issued by the Court which passed the decree and not by the Court to which the decree is sent for execution (j)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| (v) <i>Framji v Patansha</i> (18 ) 9 B H C 49<br><i>Kali v Baki Bakh</i> (1830) All 43  | (b) <i>Haridatta v Nagahia</i> (19—) 4 Lah L J 39<br>91 C 548 ( ) A L 396   |
| (w) <i>Amar Chandra v Gurus Jorou</i> o (1900) 7<br>Cal 488 <i>Tameshar v Th Lu Prasad</i><br>(1903) All 443  | (c) <i>Kasum Qoolam v Dayabhat</i> (191 ) 36 B m<br>54 1 I C 517  |
| (x) <i>Musimmat Gulab v Syed</i> (19 1) 6 Pat L J<br>358 6 I C 30 (21) A P 180 <i>Musammot</i><br><i>Bhupantay v Dev n Zamir</i> (19 1) 3 Pat<br>596 8 I C 66 (4) 4 I 56  | (d) <i>Kh Trodhas v Horma sha</i> (184 ) 11 I m   |
| (y) <i>Gulr v Daya Ram</i> (1887) 9 All 46 <i>Musa</i><br><i>mat Gulab v Syed</i> (19—1) 6 Pat L J<br>358 6 I C 30 (21) A L 140 <i>Yat n</i><br><i>Da v Lachhman</i> (19 1) Lah 20<br>63 I C 884 (21) A L 143 <i>Umasom</i><br><i>v J tan H wa</i> (19 ) 54 Cal 6 4 I<br>I C 193 (2) A C 81 | (e) <i>Mahar Ja S r Pame hr v v Harsher</i> (17 )<br>51 at I J 390 5 I C 50   |
| (z) <i>Sh o Pr and v J E Lali</i> (19 5) 4 Pat 10<br>1 66 I C 564 (25) A L 449  | (f) <i>Mu s m at Bh guanta v Deva</i> 2 = r<br>(19 4) 31 at 596 5 I C 66 (1) A P<br>6   |
| (a) <i>Br jiba v Ma L</i> (19 7) 31 Cal W<br>9 1 104 I C 4 ( ) A C 691  | (g) <i>Taf S gh v Jaga L I</i> (1916) 34 All<br>351 C 234 <i>Swarka Das v Jf t m m</i><br>(19 ) 4 All 86 20 I L ( ) A A<br>11 |
|   | (h) <i>Bajl l v E Jf Alk non</i> (19—0) 5 Pat<br>L J 633 5 I C 0  |
|   | (i) <i>Chathath v Said divide</i> (1903) 6 M 1  |
|   | (j) <i>Va do L l v CA Herput</i> (1907) 9 Cal 3   |

The High Court of Calcutta has held that the mere issue of a notice under this rule does not operate as a revivor within the meaning of arts 182 and 183 of the Limitation Act (k) but the High Courts of Allahabad and Madras have held that it does. According to these Courts a mere application by the transferee for substituting his name for that of the decree holder operates as a revivor of the decree and gives a fresh starting point of limitation for executing the decree (l). And the Madras Court has held that an application by the transferee to bring the representative of the deceased judgment debtor on the record to serve him with notice under this rule has the same effect (m).

Execution does not depend upon discretion of Court—In the old section the words were *and if that Court thinks fit* the decree may be executed &c. It was accordingly held under that section that the Court had a discretion to grant or refuse an application for execution made by a transferee (n). The words *if that Court thinks fit* have been omitted in this rule. Therefore if the conditions specified in this rule are satisfied a transferee of a decree is entitled to execution as of right like the original decree holder.

Transfer of decree for the payment of money against two or more persons to one of them—This subject may be considered under the following two heads—

- 1 Where the whole decree has been transferred
- 2 Where the decree is a joint one and part only of the decree has been transferred

*First as regards transfer of the whole decree*—Where a decree for the payment of money has been transferred by assignment or by operation of law to one of several judgment debtors the decree is wholly extinguished. The transferee cannot execute the decree against the other judgment debtor but his remedy against them is by a regular suit for contribution as if the decree had been satisfied by him. The object of the second proviso to the rule is not to deprive the judgment debtor transferee of all relief but to impose upon him the duty of proceeding by what was considered a more appropriate procedure that is a suit for contribution (o). The provision of this rule cannot be evaded by the judgment debtor who satisfies the decree taking a transfer of the decree in the name of a *benamidar* (p).

#### Illustrations

(a) A obtains a decree against B and C for Rs 5000. B satisfies the decree by paying Rs 5000 to A. In such a case B is bound to pay to C his (C's) share of the judgment debt. If C fails to contribute his share B's remedy is by way of suit against C to recover the amount. [This illustration is merely introductory.]

(b) A obtains a decree against B and C for Rs 5000. B purchases the decree from A. Here B's position is exactly the same as in (a) that is to say the decree must be taken as having been satisfied by B. B cannot therefore execute the decree against C and his only remedy is to bring a suit against C for contribution. *Saroop Chunder v. Troylokhonath* (1866) 9 W. P. 230.

(c) A obtains a decree against B and C for Rs 5000. A dies and on his death the decree passes to B as his heir. The position is the same as in (b). *Banarasi v. Maharan* (1887) 5 All. 27.

(k) *Mohar Das v. Fuleh Chand* (1903) 30 C. L. 99.

(l) *P. N. S. v. Tota S. v. J. S.* (190) 99 All. 301. *Amala v. Pama* (1908) 18 Mad. 1. *J. v. Moh. v. J. v. J.* (1904) 50 All. 61. 109 I. C. 41.

(m) *Maharaj v. Anup* (190) 30 Mad.

(n) *Megh v. y. v. F. d. h.* (1900) 4 B. I. P. 4. 100. *Pa. v. D. v. D. v. D.* (191) 15 L. 30.

(o) *A. v. v. v. v. v.* (1904) 3 B. 191. 19.

(p) *P. v. v. v. v. v.* (191) 49 M. 1. 96. I. C. 93.

16 (d) A obtains a decree against B and C for Rs 5000. B pays the amount of the decree to A. At B's request A transfers the decree to F. F being merely a *beneficiary* for B is not entitled to execute the decree against C. It is competent to C in such a case to show that B and not F paid the amount of the decree to A and such payments may be proved even if it has not been certified under O 21 r 2 *Ponnusami v Lachmanan* (1912) 30 Mad 653 12 I C 657 *Ramaya v Krishnamurti* (1917) 40 Mad. 296 3 I C 952 *Raghunath v Gangaram* (1923) 47 Bom 643 75 I C 893 (23) A B 401, *Ganpaya v Krishnappa* (1924) 26 Bom I P 491 80 I C 473 (24) A B 391 *Sadogopa v Bellama* (1922) 43 Mad. L J 761 72 I C 861 (22) A M 510

*Next as regards transfer of a portion of a joint decree*—Where a decree has been passed jointly in favour of two or more persons and the interest of any decree holder in such decree has been transferred by assignment or by operation of law to one of several judgment debtors the decree is extinguished to the extent of the interest so transferred, and execution can only issue for the rest of the decree.

#### Illustration

A and B obtain a decree against C and D for Rs 5000. A's share of the decree is Rs 2000. A dies and on his death his interest in the decree passes to C as his heir. The decree is extinguished to the extent of Rs 2000 and neither B (as decree holder) nor C (as transferee of A's interest in the decree) can execute the decree against D for more than Rs 3000. *Pogore v Tukurooldeen* (1876) 20 W P 343 *Banarsi v Mahirani* (1883) 10 All 27

**Decree for the payment of money**—The expression decree for the payment of money in the second proviso to the rule does not include mortgage decrees (q). Such a decree is not a decree for the payment of money until a personal decree is passed against the mortgagor (r).

It has been held by the High Court of Bombay that the expression decree for the payment of money against two or more persons means a personal decree for the payment of money against two or more defendants. Hence the proviso does not apply where the decree is not against the defendants personally. A obtains a decree against B as the legal representative of X and against C as the legal representative of Y for Rs 5000 to be paid out of the estate of X and Y. A dies leaving B as his heir and on his death the decree passes to him by operation of law. The decree not being a personal decree against B and C B is entitled as transferee of A's decree to have the decree executed against the estate of Y (s). The High Court of Madras has dissentied from this view. According to that Court the fact that one of the defendants is directed by the decree to pay the amount of the decree out of the family property in his hands does not make the decree any the less a decree for payment of money against him (t).

Again the expression decree for the payment of money against two or more persons means a decree against two or more persons jointly. Hence the rule laid down in the second proviso does not apply where the decree is not passed against the defendants jointly. In a suit by A against B and C A obtains a decree against B for Rs 90 and against C for Rs 30. A then assigns the decree to C. The decree not being a joint decree C may execute the decree passed against B for Rs 90 (u).

**Award**—The Calcutta High Court has held that a transferee of an award filed in Court under the provisions of the Arbitration Act 1899 is entitled to apply for execution under this rule (v). See notes to r 29 below.

- (q) *Lalithani S. Jh v M. S. C. rt of W. d* (1911) 18 Cal. L J 657 2 I C 0  
*Jayarathna v Jamarandhra* (1904) 47 M 1 614 8 I C 441 (1) A M 901  
*Ch. dani v Subbaray* (1906) 40 Mad. 931 (35) A M 623  
 (r) *Chudmala v Librayar* (1906) 43 Mad. 508 93 I C 9 (6) A M 63

- (s) *I. Nacha d v Gundratol* (1901) 31 Bom 304  
 (t) *S. d. gopa v S. Damm I* (1922) 43 Mad. L J 61 I C 861 (27) A M 510  
 (u) *Ana t. Vay ppa* (1902) 30 Bom 195  
 (v) *Gl. d. ton. Wylie & Co v Jansab* (1907) Cal W N 606 77 I C 864 (24) A C 11

**Transfer pending execution**—The Patna High Court has held that if a decree holder applies for execution and pending execution assigns his interest in the decree an application by the transferee for execution is not a fresh application for execution but one to continue the pending execution proceedings and no notice under this rule is necessary (u). But quære whether the judgment debtor is not entitled to object to the validity of the assignment. It has already been stated that the legal representative of a decree holder cannot be substituted on the record of the execution proceeding but must make an application for execution under rule 16 (x). Under the Code of 1882 the definition of decree holder included a person to whom a decree is transferred whether by assignment or by operation of law and it was possible to hold that he could come in immediately to carry on a pending proceeding (y). Under the present Code the position is different and the transferee does not acquire the status of a decree holder until an order for execution is made in his favour [sec 2 (3)]. The dictum in *Akhoy v Surendra* ( ) that the heirs could have applied immediately to carry on proceedings is perhaps an echo of decisions under the old Code. In *Mulhu Chettiar v Lodd Goundas* (a) section 146 was referred to. But as that section begins with the words save as otherwise provided it is excluded by O 21 r 16. It is submitted that the conclusion arrived at in *Palaniappa v Valliammai* (b) is correct and that the transferee in a pending execution if he applies at all must apply for execution and not for substitution.

**Appeal**—An order determining any question between the judgment debtor and the representative of the decree holder (s 47) is a decree (s 2) and is therefore appealable as such (s 90). A transferee of a decree is a representative of the decree holder within the meaning of s 47. Therefore an order refusing to recognize the transferee of a decree or dismissing his application for execution on the objection of the judgment debtor is a decree and appealable as such (c).

**Suit by transferee**—A transferee of a decree whose application is rejected under this rule on the ground that the transfer is not valid is not precluded from instituting a regular suit for a declaration of the validity of the transfer. Such a suit is not barred by the provisions of s 47 (d).

**Equities enforceable against original decree holder**—See s 40 and notes thereto.

**Transfer of decree against a company in liquidation**—Where a decree against a company in liquidation is transferred pending the winding up proceedings and the liquidator refuses to recognize the transferee the transferee may apply to the executing Court under s 47 (3) to be substituted for the original decree holder to enable him to prove his claim before the liquidator. S 171 of the Indian Companies Act 1913 is no bar to the granting of such an application (e).

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>(x) <i>Musamm at G. lab v Syed</i> (19 1) 6 Pat L J 358 6 I C 30 ( ) A P 100<br/> <i>Mu mimat Bhag ta v Dewan Z mir</i><br/>                     (19 4) 31 at 595 3 I C 66 ( ) A P<br/>                     576 <i>Molan Singh v Jag</i> (S) ph (19 8)<br/>                     50 AU 6 1 103 I C 41 ( ) A A 9</p> <p>(z) <i>Kassam Gool m v Dayobhas</i> (191 ) 36 B m<br/>                     18 1 I C 4 <i>Akhoy v Sure dra</i><br/>                     (19 6) 30 Cal W N 3 96 I C<br/>                     3 8 ( ) A C 9 7 <i>B j th v Lam</i><br/> <i>Ph ar</i> (19 ) 40 AU 509 104 I C<br/>                     116 ( ) A A 16 k B i l j pa v<br/>                     i li ma (19 ) 50 Ma l 1 99 I C 6<br/>                     ( ) A M 184 <i>M ta Ma'ommed v</i><br/> <i>S j i l M rza</i> (19 8) 5 Luck 1 6 10<br/>                     I C 611 ( ) A A 0</p> <p>(y) <i>Ma mola v I la I</i> (1910) 14 Cal W N<br/>                     5 3 I C 3 3 <i>Dw rba ksh v Fat k</i><br/>                     (1 33) 6 Cal 50 <i>A lya Bha v</i><br/> <i>Gaan Aamal</i> (18. 0) 5 Bom 9</p> | <p>(z) (19 6) 30 Cal W N 3 96 I C 3 8 ( )<br/>                     A C 9</p> <p>(a) (19 1) 41 Bld 919 60 I C 337 1)<br/>                     A M 599 k B</p> <p>(b) (19 7) 50 Mad 1 99 I C 6 ( ) A M<br/>                     164</p> <p>(c) <i>B dr v a n v Jai K hen</i> (1894) 10 All<br/>                     453 <i>Tamashar v Th lvr</i> (1903) 25 All<br/>                     3 <i>G ga Das v Laksh</i> (1900) 7 Cal<br/>                     6 0 <i>S bouthar m l v Ch dambaram</i><br/>                     (190 ) 3 Mad 323 <i>Ho d it v a pal a</i><br/>                     (19 ) 4 Lab L J 1 91 C 546 ( )<br/>                     A L 398 <i>o al o I B h d r v J</i><br/> <i>sa ja</i> (19 4) 31 at 344 3 I C 49<br/>                     ( ) A P 16 with A and B each<br/>                     claiming to be the r nsferee of a decree<br/>                     appl d for ex utio</p> <p>(d) <i>P am pat v A l l l</i> (1903) 6 M d<br/>                     64</p> <p>(e) <i>K l The I B l f f f z</i> (1919) 4<br/>                     42 43 50 I C 115</p> |
|---|---|



**Transfer of de re pending attachment**—The attachment of a decree for the payment of money does not prevent a valid transfer of the decree and the transferee is entitled to be substituted in place of the transferor and to apply under this rule for execution (f)

17 [S 215] (1) On receiving an application for the execution of a decree as provided by rule 11, sub rule (2), the Court shall ascertain whether such of the requirements of rules 11 to 14 as may be applicable to the case have been complied with and, if they have not been complied with, the Court may reject the application, or may allow the defect to be remedied then and there or within a time to be fixed by it.

(2) Where an application is amended under the provisions of sub rule (1), it shall be deemed to have been an application in accordance with law and presented on the date when it was first presented.

(3) Every amendment made under this rule shall be signed or initialed by the Judge

(4) When the application is admitted, the Court shall enter in the proper register a note of the application and the date on which it was made, and shall, subject to the provisions hereinafter contained, order execution of the decree according to the nature of the application.

Provided that in the case of a decree for the payment of money, the value of the property attached shall, as nearly as may be correspond with the amount due under the decree

Changes in the law—This rule corresponds with s. 240 of the Code of 1894 except in the following particulars—

- 1 The words "may allow the defect to be remedied" in sub rule (1) have been substituted for the word "may allow it [application] to be remedied" a less, more comprehensive and covering the case of omission to produce a copy of the decree as now required by r 11 (2)
- 2 Sub rule (2) is new. See notes below. Sub rule (3) limitation.

Sub rule (1) - This rule lays down the procedure to be adopted by the Courts on receiving an application for execution. Sub r (1) empowers the Court to reject if application or allow an amendment. The Court should in each case exercise its discretion and where an amendment ought to be allowed it should allow the amendment. Thus where an application is not signed it should not reject the application, but allow it to be amended. (b) The amendment may be allowed even after the application

(f) H      ram v K d    1 14 (19-8)    Pat    d  
1131 C 6 3 (    ) A P 1  
(g) F    loc v    1 1 f (1    ) 10 Cal    41

[illegible]

for execution is registered provided the execution of the decree has not at the date of the application for amendment become barred by limitation (i) But the High Court of Madras has held that where an application for amendment is made after the expiration of 12 years provided by s 48 the Court has a discretion either to accept or to reject it (j)

**Sub rule (2) limitation**—Article 182 of the Limitation Act provides *inter alia* that the first application for execution must be made within three years from the date of the decree. If the decree has not been executed and it is necessary to make further application each successive application must be made within three years from the date of the last application. But the last application in each case must have been one in accordance with law otherwise it will not be a fresh starting point for limitation. An application which does not comply with the requirements of rules 11 to 14 of this order is not one in accordance with law (l). Sub rule (2) is therefore important with reference to limitation for if an application is defective with reference to rules 11 to 14 and is returned for amendment within a fixed time it will when so amended be an application in accordance with law as from the date when it was first presented. Under the old section it was held that where an order was made for amending an application for execution and the amendment was made the application should be deemed to have been presented not on the date when it was first presented but on the date when it was amended. The result was that if the amendment was not made until after the expiration of the period of limitation on the application was time barred though the amendment was made within the time fixed by the Court (i). Those decisions are no longer law. Compare s 140. On the other hand substantial compliance with rules 11 to 14 is all that is necessary and if the application does so comply with the rules it will be in accordance with law and will be effectual to stay the progress of limitation whether the Court admits or rejects or returns it for amendment (m). Sub r (2) applies only if the application is returned for amendment for non-compliance with the provisions of rr 11 to 14 and the application is subsequently amended. Sub r (2) does not in terms apply to cases where an application is returned for amendment for some other reason (n).

#### Illustration

The last day for presenting an application for execution is 31st July 1920. The decree holder presents the application on that day. The application does not comply with the requirements of O 21 r 11 (2). The Court may under this rule return the application for amendment and fix a date within which it should be amended. If the application is amended within the time fixed by the Court it will be deemed to have been presented on 31st July 1920. Further it will be deemed to have been an application in accordance with law within the meaning of art 182 of the Limitation Act 1908 so as to give a fresh starting point of limitation.

Where on an application for execution presented by an agent it is objected that the agent is not duly authorized and the agent thereupon files a power of attorney the Court should not dismiss the application but treat it as having been filed on the date on which the power of attorney was filed (o).

- (i) *Ca. d. n. Sr. S. Shyam* (1918) Cal 1 J 398 44 C 53 I Bah I r v 101 m Bah I r (1933) 1 t 33 11 C 41 (3) A 1 61 Cha rui v Bah (1933) 1 t 787 79 74 C 144 (3) A 1 02
- (j) *Ye. r. v. Iaf. Jalagadli* (1933) 4 Mad 1 J 61 61 C 0 (3) A 3 367 C 1a v 4ub (19) 49 Mad 1 J 69 0 I 4 109 (3) A 3 60
- (k) *App. v. Trolodya* (1930) 1 Cal 631 632
- (l) *Pal Sah v J. K. Korr* (1906) 3 Cal 1 3

- (m) *G. pal Sah v J. K. Korr* (1906) 3 Cal 1 17
- Rajya aha v. I. K. Korr* (1907) 6 Mad 101 100 31 14 v M s amm t 4 raj (1910) 14 C 1 W v 451 51 C 50
- (n) *P. a. her v. D. ad* (1906) 3 Cal 664 98 1 C 166 (1906) 4 C 10 3bd I K rim v Lak hu ner m (1904) 3 Mad L W 45 11 C 35 (3) A 3 440
- (o) See *Bhagrat v. Dura* (1903) 1 t 809 811 41 C 14 (3) A 1 23
- (p) *G. ya Pam v. D. a. Nakh* (1911) Punj Rec 114 p 404 13 I C 56

**Transfer of decree pending attachment.**—The attachment of a decree for the payment of money does not prevent a valid transfer of the decree and the transferee is entitled to be substituted in place of the transferor and to apply under this rule for execution (f)

**17 [S 215]** (1) On receiving an application for the execution of a decree as provided by rule 11, sub rule (2), the Court shall ascertain whether such of the requirements of rules 11 to 14 as may be applicable to the case have been complied with and, if they have not been complied with the Court may reject the application, or may allow the defect to be remedied then and there or within a time to be fixed by it

Procedure on receiving application for execution of decree

(2) Where an application is amended under the provisions of sub rule (1), it shall be deemed to have been an application in accordance with law and presented on the date when it was first presented

(3) Every amendment made under this rule shall be signed or initialed by the Judge

(4) When the application is admitted, the Court shall enter in the proper register a note of the application and the date on which it was made, and shall, subject to the provisions hereinafter contained, order execution of the decree according to the nature of the application

Provided that in the case of a decree for the payment of money, the value of the property attached shall, as nearly as may be, correspond with the amount due under the decree

**Changes in the law**—This rule corresponds with s 215 of the Code of 1908 except in the following particulars—

- 1 The words may allow the defect to be remedied in sub rule (1) have been substituted for the word may allow it [application] to be remedied as being more comprehensive and covering the case of omission to produce a copy of the decree as now required by r 11 (3)
- 2 Sub rule (2) is new. See notes below. Sub rule ( ) limitation

**Sub rule (1)**—This rule lays down the procedure to be adopted by the Courts on receiving an application for execution. Sub r (1) empowers the Court to reject the application or allow an amendment. The Court should in each case exercise its discretion and where an amendment ought to be allowed it should allow the amendment (g). Thus where an application is not signed it should not reject the application but allow it to be amended (h). The amendment may be allowed even after the application

(f) *H v M & K J N 15 (1923) Est 9* (h) *C v A & B & C & D & E & F (1920) Lab 1 J 104 S 1 C 16 (1921) 1 J 111 & 141 (1922) A P 430* [1] rest wrong by calculation

## AMENDMENT OF APPLICATION

for execution is registered provided the execution of the decree has not been barred by limitation (1). In *Prasanna Kumar v. State of Madras* (2), the Court of Madras has held that where an application for amendment is made after the expiration of 12 years provided by s. 48, the Court has a discretion to reject it (3).

18 18 [S 246] (1) Where applications are made to a Court for the execution of cross decrees in separate suits for the payment of two sums of money passed between the same parties and capable of execution at the same time by such Court, then—

- (a) if the two sums are equal, satisfaction shall be entered upon both decrees, and
- (b) if the two sums are unequal, execution may be taken out only by the holder of the decree for the larger sum and for so much only as remains after deducting the smaller sum, and satisfaction for the smaller sum shall be entered on the decree for the larger sum as well as satisfaction on the decree for the smaller sum

(2) This rule shall be deemed to apply where either party is an assignee of one of the decrees and as well in respect of judgment debts due by the original assignor as in respect of judgment debts due by the assignee himself

(3) This rule shall not be deemed to apply unless—

- (a) the decree holder in one of the suits in which the decrees have been made is the judgment debtor in the other and each party fills the same character in both suits, and

(b) the sums due under the decrees are definite

(4) The holder of a decree passed against several persons jointly and severally may treat it as a cross decree in relation to a decree passed against him singly in favour of one or more of such persons

#### Illustrations

(a) A holds a decree against B for Rs 1000. B holds a decree against A for the payment of Rs 1000 in case A fails to deliver certain goods at a future day. B cannot treat his decree as a cross decree under this rule.

(b) A and B co-plaintiffs obtain a decree for Rs 1000 against C and C obtains a decree for Rs 1000 against B. C cannot treat his decree as a cross decree under this rule.

(c) A obtains a decree against B for Rs 1000. C who is a trustee for B obtains a decree on behalf of B against A for Rs 1000. A cannot treat C's decree as a cross-decree under this rule.

(d) *A B C D* and *E* are jointly and severally liable for Rs 1 000 under a decree obtained by *F*. *A* obtains a decree for Rs 100 against *F* singly and applies for execution to the Court in which the joint decree is being executed. *F* may treat his joint decree as a cross decree under this rule.

### Changes in the law —

- 1 The words "where applications are made to a Court for the execution of cross decree" in sub rule (1) are new. They give effect to certain decisions noted below under the head "Application of the rule".
- 2 The words "separate suits" in sub rule (1) are new. They have been added to show that for the purposes of execution a counter claim is not a separate suit (*p*).
- 3 Sub rule (4) and the illustration thereto that is all (d) are both new. This sub rule gives effect to the decisions noted under the head "Sub rule (4)".

**Application of the rule**—The meaning of sub rule (1) may be explained by the following illustration. *A* holds a decree against *B* for Rs 5 000. *B* holds a decree against *A* for Rs 3 000. *A* and *B* each applies for execution of his decree to Court *X* which has jurisdiction to execute both decrees. The decrees being cross decrees they will be set off against each other. Hence *B*, who is the holder of the decree for the smaller amount, will not be allowed to take out execution of his decree. Execution will only be allowed of *A*'s decree to the extent of Rs 2 000 being the difference between the amount of his and *B*'s decree. If the decree held by *B* was also for Rs 5 000 no other party should be allowed to take out execution and satisfaction should be entered upon both decrees.

This rule does not apply unless—

- (1) the cross decrees are for the payment of two sums of money
- (2) the decrees have been obtained in separate suits [see notes above under the head "Alterations in the rule"]
- (3) both the decrees are capable of execution at the same time [ill (1)] and by the same Court and
- (4) the decree holder in one of the suits in which the decrees have been passed is the judgment debtor in the other and each party fills the same character in both the suits [ills (b) and (c)].

If the cross decrees fulfil the above conditions it is also necessary that both decrees should be before the executing Court for execution and that applications should have been made for execution of both decrees. If either decree holder omits to apply for execution of his decree the other decree holder may take out execution of his decree for its full amount (*q*). Note the words with which the rule begins.

**Cross decrees in separate suits**—An order for payment of *me no profits* made under s 141 is a decree by virtue of s 2 (*p*). Hence it has been held that there is no distinction for the purposes of this rule between a decree in a suit and a decree in a proceeding under s 141. *A* obtains a decree against *B*. In execution of the decree *B*'s property is sold and it is purchased by *A*. The decree is reversed in appeal and *A* is directed to deliver possession of the property to *B* and to pay to *B* Rs 712 for *me no profits*. *B* applies for execution against *A* in respect of Rs 714. *A* claims to set off another decree obtained by him against *B*. The set off may be allowed under this rule (*r*).

(*r*) *St mor v Campbell & Co* [1901] 1 Q B 314 31 per Fisher M R.  
(*q*) *Chajm IL v Dharam* (1897) 4 All 491.  
*Ired Mohl v I m A & Co* (1901) 1 Cal 194 131 & 106 110 *fo my*

*v Dharam* (1909) 30 Mad 336 1 I 4.  
(*r*) *Advanta The Chit song Co Ltd* (1903) 28 Cal W N 94 841 C 1 (1903) A C 10.

**8 Cross decrees for the payment of two sums of money**—*1 s e B* or a mortgage and obtains a decree for Rs 1 800 to be realized by sale of the mortgaged property *B* obtains a decree against *A* for Rs 2 000 Here *A*'s decree though it is one for sale in enforcement of a mortgage and not strictly for the payment of money may be set off against *B*'s decree by virtue of the provisions of r 20 of this order (a).

Where execution is taken out for the smaller sum—This rule provides that where application are made for the execution of cross decrees one for a larger amount and the other for a smaller amount execution should be taken out only for the difference This means that the decree for the smaller amount cannot be executed at all and no separate execution should issue of that decree (1) It is to be noted however that if the Court in contravention of the provisions of this rule allows execution to issue of the decree for the smaller sum and a sale is made in such execution the sale is not void the reason being that a purchaser under a sale in execution is not bound to inquire whether the judgment debtor had a cross judgment of a higher amount (a).

**Same character in both suits**—The provisions of this rule do not apply unless the decree holder in one suit is the judgment debtor in the other and each party fills the same character in both suits *A* holds a money decree against *B* *B* holds a decree for sale passed in a suit brought by him as mortgagee against *C* the mortgagor and against *A* a purchaser of a portion of the mortgaged property from *C* *A* applies for execution of his decree against *B* *B* is not entitled to set off his decree against *A*'s decree The reason is that *A* does not fill the same character in both the suits The decree held by *A* is in his favour personally which he may execute against *B* by the arrest of his person or the attachment of his property This cannot be said of *B*'s decree against *A* for *B* is not ordered by the decree personally to pay any sum of money but is only given an option to pay if he wishes to save the property in which he is interested (a) If in the case put above *C* the mortgagor was the holder of the money decree against *B* instead of *A* and *C* applied for execution against *B* *B* (the mortgagee) could have set off his decree against *C* (a) But a firm name is only a description of the individual partner and so a decree against a firm can be set off against a decree against a partner (x).

**Assignment of decree**—If *A* who has obtained a decree against *B* attaches in execution of his decree a decree held by *B* against *C* *A* is an assignee of *B*'s decree within the meaning of this rule (y) [See O 21 r 53 (3)] It has been held by the High Court of Calcutta that a decree obtained against the assignor in a suit pending at the date of the assignment may be set off against the decree assigned if the assignee had notice of such suit (1) *A* obtains a decree against *B* for Rs 5 000 *B* then sues *A* for Rs 4 000 Pending *B*'s suit *C* obtains a transfer of *A*'s decree with notice of the suit A decree is then passed for *B* in his suit against *A* *C* applies for execution against *B* of the whole decree for Rs 5 000 He is not entitled to execute for more than Rs 2 000 as the transfer was taken with notice of *B*'s suit See notes to s 49.

**Sub rule (4)**—This sub rule gives effect to the decisions in the undermentioned cases where it was held that the holder of a decree passed jointly and severally against several judgment debtors one of whom holds a decree against such decree holder may treat his joint decree as a cross decree (a) See ill (1) to the sub rule.

- (1) *See Krishna v. Lakshminarayana* (1906) 23 Mad 314.  
 (2) *S. S. N. J.* (1903) 96 Mad 42.  
 (3) *Pera Mahi v. Ram Athan* (1895) 16 Cal 14 15 1 & 106.  
 (4) *Alao v. Kar v. Chaw Lal* (1916) 38 All 669 56 1 & 914.  
 (5) *Nawab J. v. Pan (a) d* (1911) 23 All 10 81 1 & 835.  
 (6) *Adm. v. G. v. S. H. v. S. H.* (1907)

- J. Rom. v. H. 296 101 1 & 319 (2)*  
*A. B. v. E.*  
 (y) *Adwa v. The Chittagong Co. Ltd* (1922) 24 Cal W N 94 81 1 & 4 (3).  
*A. C. 309.*  
 (z) *Krishna v. Ma v. Koda v. Ma* (1922) 14 Cal 819.  
 (a) *Hu v. Doyal v. Dna Doyal* (1923) 9 Cal 473.  
*Ram S. v. Sh. v. Dula Ram* (1927) 14 All 239.

**19 [S 247]** Where application is made to a Court for the execution of a decree under which two parties are entitled to recover sums of money from each other, then,—

- (a) if the two sums are equal, satisfaction for both shall be entered upon the decree, and,
- (b) if the two sums are unequal, execution may be taken out only by the party entitled to the larger sum and for so much only as remains after deducting the smaller sum, and satisfaction for the smaller sum shall be entered upon the decree

**Object of the rule**—The object of this rule is to prevent each side executing a decree in respect of sums due whether for costs or otherwise under the same decree (b)

**Application of the rule**—This rule is not limited in its application to cases in which the remedy of each party against the other is of precisely the same nature. A mortgagor sues B the mortgagee for redemption. A decree is passed in the suit ordering that upon A paying to B Rs 1000 (mortgage debt) on a day fixed by the Court B should reconvey the mortgaged property to A and that if such payment is not made within the time fixed by the Court the property should be sold. At the same time A is awarded costs Rs 100 to be paid by B. Here both the sums being payable under the same decree the provisions of the present rule apply though B's remedy if A failed to pay the mortgage debt would be by sale of the mortgaged property and A's remedy if B failed to pay the costs would be against B personally. Hence A being entitled to the smaller amount (Rs 100) cannot take out execution against B (c) B being entitled to the larger amount (Rs 1000) is alone entitled to take out execution. But he cannot take out execution for more than Rs 900 which is the same thing as saying that he must reconvey the property to A if A paid Rs 900 and he cannot insist on payment of the full sum of Rs 1000 as a condition of reconveyance (d). The point to be noted is that in the case of cross claims under the same decree execution may be taken out only by the party entitled to the larger sum. The party entitled to the smaller sum is not entitled to take out execution. It follows from this that if A is entitled to recover from B net profits amounting to Rs 445 under a decree and B is entitled to recover from A under the same decree costs amounting to Rs 850. A being entitled to the smaller sum cannot take out execution against B though B's claim to execute his decree for costs is barred by limitation (e). It may also be noted that if the party entitled to the larger sum executed the decree for the full amount without deducting the smaller sum the party entitled to the smaller sum may be awarded a refund of that sum under s 151 of the Code (f).

**20 [Aen]** The provisions contained in rules 18 and 19 shall apply to decrees for sale in enforcement of a mortgage or charge

Cross-decrees and cross claims in mortgage suits

**Object of the rule**—This rule is new. It is inserted in order to make it clear that the provisions as to cross decrees and cross claims apply to mortgage decrees. The

- (b) *Bhagwan v T. Jan* (1904) 16 All 395 at 397  
*Venkataswamy v. Pr. Wia* (1933) 44  
*Mad L J 590* ~ 1 C 865 (3) 4 W 638
- (c) *S. Iyengar v. Gopal* (1900) 23 M 111
- (d) *Bhagwan v. T. Jan* (1904) 16 All 395 *Ish*

- (e) *Copal* (1884) 6 All 351
- (f) *Madappa v. Jaki* (1916) 40 Bom 60 30 I C 604
- (f) *Ananda v. Ati* (1919) 4 Cal W 465 561 C 3



rule shows impliedly that the expression decree for the payment of money and other similar expressions in the Code do not include a decree for sale in enforcement of a mortgage or charge. See in particular s. 34 s. 73 and O 21 r 53.

It has been held by the High Court of Allahabad that a simple decree for recovery of money can be set off against a decree for recovery of money by enforcement of a mortgage or charge (g). See notes to r 18 above. Cross decrees for the payment etc.

**21 [S 230 2nd para]** The Court may, in its discretion, refuse execution at the same time against the person and property of the judgment-debtor

Simultaneous execution

Simultaneous execution against person and property—An order refusing execution at the same time against the person and property of the judgment-debtor amounts to a decree under s. 2 cl (2) read with s. 47 and it is therefore appealable (h).

But though the Court has a discretion to refuse simultaneous execution it cannot decline to order execution against the person of the judgment debtor on the ground that the decree holder should proceed in the first place against his property (i).

Notice to show cause against execution in certain cases

**22 [S 248] (1)** Where an application for execution is made—

- (a) more than one year after the date of the decree, or
- (b) against the legal representative of a party to the decree,

the Court executing the decree shall issue a notice to the person against whom execution is applied for requiring him to show cause on a date to be fixed why the decree should not be executed against him.

Provided that no such notice shall be necessary in consequence of more than one year having elapsed between the date of the decree and the application for execution if the application is made within one year from the date of the last order against the party against whom execution is applied for, made on any previous application for execution, or in consequence of the application being made against the legal representative of the judgment-debtor, if upon a previous application for execution against the same person the Court has ordered execution to issue against him.

(2) Nothing in the foregoing sub rule shall be deemed to preclude the Court from issuing any process in execution of a decree without issuing the notice thereby prescribed if, for

(g) *N. G. Mal v. Ram Chand* (1910) 33 All. 40  
81 C. 83

(h) *Chama v. A. Lallu* (1893) 7 Bom. 301

(i) *Hazrat v. Hakim* (1904) 6 L.A. 518  
93 I. C. 1 (1905) A. L. 110

reasons to be recorded, it considers that the issue of such notice O 21  
would cause unreasonable delay or would defeat the ends of  
justice

**Changes in the law**—Sub rule (2) is new. See note below. Sub rule (2)

The Court shall issue a notice--It is not enough merely to take out a notice. The notice must be served upon the judgment debtor or upon his legal representative (j)

Omission to give notice — This rule provides that except where notice is dispensed with under sub r (2) the Court executing the decree shall issue a notice to the person against whom execution is applied for if the application for execution is made more than one year after the date of the decree or if it is made against the legal representative of the judgment debtor. This gives rise to the question whether the omission to give notice as required by this rule renders a sale in execution of the decree absolutely void for want of jurisdiction or whether the omission is a mere irregularity so as to render the sale merely voidable that is valid until it is set aside. In *Gopal Chunder v Gunamoni Das* (1) the High Court of Calcutta held that a notice under this rule is necessary in order that the Court should obtain jurisdiction to sell the property by way of execution and that the omission to give notice is by itself sufficient to render the sale void. This decision was approved by the Privy Council in *Raghunath Das v Sunder Das* (2). In *Raghunath Das* case the judgment debtor became insolvent pending the attachment. No notice was given to the Official Assignee as required by cl (b) of sub r (1) and it was held that the sale was a nullity. Since the notice under this rule affords the very foundation of the jurisdiction it follows that where execution is issued without previously issuing a notice required under sub rule (1) and property belonging to the judgment debtor is sold in execution the sale is a nullity whether the property is purchased by the decree holder [O 21 r 2] (m) or by a third party (n). It makes no difference whether the property sold is movable or immovable (o). The Patna High Court has held that where a notice has been issued and the judgment debtor though not served with the notice appears and contests the execution the object of the rule is achieved and the Court has jurisdiction to hold the sale (p).

**Notice to wrong person as legal representative**—The principle laid down in *Raghunath Das* & case applies where no notice is given. But what if notice is given and served upon a person who proves not to be the legal representative. The leading case upon the subject is *Malkarjun v. Varbars* (9). A decree was passed against a person who afterwards died, and in executing the decree against his estate a person was served as his legal representative with notice under this rule. The person served objected

- (f) G 1as 4 Bln a iplo 2 Zem nda 1 Co Ld  
(19 1) 1 A C 409 Cal W N 97 64 I C 476
- (I) (1803) 0 Cal 3 B [no notice to le...  
r presentat]
- (U) (1914) 41 A 521 4 C 17 1 I C 304  
Sh 4 M Mandol 5 St alk (1917) 44 Cal  
9 1 35 I C 403 I m Ink r v Shu  
I am (1918) 7 Cal L J 3 5 46 I C 1  
Fani Bh n v e d a alk (19 ) 3  
Cal L J 9 1 61 I C ( ) A C 46  
I j g pal v I m I ch r (19 4) 47  
M d 4 80 I C ( ) A C 431 (I B)  
dis-entling from the v s expressed in his  
ora athan v Nor az i di om (19 ) 45  
M d 8 70 I C 61 ( ) A M 93 a d  
Mo aguem v C i mba m (19 1) 47  
M d 63 73 I C 46 ( ) A M 130 Ch da  
Pro ad v Must m a (19 ) 49 All  
830 10 I C 39 ( ) A C 74  
Moth v M ret J Ind (19 3) 55 Cal  
94 10 I C 63 ( ) A C 603 J mda

- Fannamal (19 9) 7 Ring 110 117 I C  
 4 (-9) A R 151  
 (m) *I am auri Dasses v Doo pa Dass* (1891)  
 6 C 1 103 [no notice to legal representative]  
 C uida v Bhova p & Z m dary Co  
 Ltd (19 1) Cal W N 9 64 I C 4 6  
 (-1) A C 609  
 ( ) *I m - mura v Lak t Han m* (1881)  
 3 All 4 4 [no notice to legal represe  
 tation] Copal Ch der v ( am i Dasi  
 (1893) 6 Cal 370 [no notice to legal  
 representative] Sahdeo v Ch m (1894)  
 1 Cal 19 *Ie ash m v Ialm tu d*  
 (1903) 3 Lam 57 [here more than a  
 ye r old and no notice to judgment  
 creditors]  
 ( ) *S adeo v Ch aum* (1891) 1 Cal 19 [where  
 the property sold was in plant]  
 (n) *P Iamal v I* (-19-) 7 Pat (u) 217 I C  
 64 (-9) A 1 9  
 (v) (1901) 5 Lam 357 7 I A 216 mapp from  
*Amra v S damerra* (1 9 ) 21 Com 4 4

22 that he was not the legal representative of the deceased. The executing Court decided and as it turned out subsequently decided erroneously that he was to be treated as such representative [see s 47]. After that the execution proceedings went on with the result that certain property belonging to the deceased judgment debtor was sold and purchased by a third party. The question arose whether the sale was void as made without jurisdiction or whether it was merely voidable. Their Lordships of the Privy Council held that a notice having been served in fact though upon a wrong person, the Court had jurisdiction to sell the property and the sale was not void. Their Lordships further held that the omission to give notice to the right person constituted a serious irregularity and that the sale was therefore voidable that is to say it was valid until it was set aside under O 21 r 90 or by independent suit brought within a year as provided by art 12 cl (a) of the Limitation Act. Their Lordships said: He (the person served) contended that he was not the right person but the Court having received his protest decided that he was the right person and so proceeded with the execution. In doing so the Court was exercising its jurisdiction. It made a sad mistake it is true but a Court has jurisdiction to decide wrong as well as right (r). But if the decree holder knows who the legal representative of the deceased judgment debtor is and deliberately serves the notice upon a wrong person as his legal representative and there is no adjudication by the executing Court as to who the legal representative is the sale has been held to be absolutely void (s).

More than one year after the date of the decree.—The term decree in sub r (1) cl (a) means the decree capable of execution. Thus where an appeal is preferred from a decree and the appeal is dismissed for default under O 41 r 11 the decree of the lower Court is the decree capable of execution and the period of one year is to be calculated from the date of that decree (t). See notes to s 38. What decree may be executed. Even where the decretal amount is made payable by instalment the period of one year must be calculated from the date of the decree and not from the date of default (u).

More than one notice.—In one case the High Court of Patna held that once the original decree has been put into execution after notice as provided by this rule no fresh notice need be served for every subsequent application for execution made more than a year from the date of the last order for execution (v) but this case was overruled by a Special Bench of the same High Court where it was held that the rule applies to every application for execution and not merely to the first application and that in every case where an application for execution is made more than a year after the last order made against the judgment debtor in any previous application a fresh notice must be served (w).

The High Court of Madras has held that where property is attached on an application for execution no notice need be given to the judgment debtor of the application for sale though the latter application is made more than a year after the previous application for execution (x).

Irregular service of notice.—Irregularity in the service of notice as distinguished from non service is a material irregularity within the meaning of O 21 r 90 (y).

(1) *Ib* p 317. See also *171a Ajmal v Daim* (190) 32 Cal 96 pp 314 315 3 I A 3.

(2) *Shankar v Dattatray* (191) 45 Bom 1186 63 I C 218 (1) A B 343 [suit by auction purchaser for possession—Bhah J held that the sale was void—Ma Lord CJ held that the sale was voidable but that the purchaser was not entitled to possession].

(3) *Shyan Mandal v Satnath* (1917) 44 Cal

94 39 I C 493.

(4) *Kora Lal v Dhuja Lal and Bank* (1917) 5 Lah I J 51 I C 816 (1) A L 341.

(5) *Mishra v Dhot* (1913) 1 Pat 215 71 I C 831 (3) A P 243.

(6) *Adiya P v P. Pam Narayan* (1914) 5 Pat 187 I C 531 (1) A P 474.

(7) *Satnam Singh v Gopal Krihnanda* (1907) 43 Mad 57 53 I C 57.

(8) *Das v Jai* (1916) 14 I J 319 61 I C 8 (1) A P 145.

Death of judgment debtor pending execution by transferee Court—See O 2 notes to s 50

Court executing the decree —It may either be the Court which passed the decree or the Court to which the decree is sent for execution

Sub rule (2) —This sub rule is new It enables the Court to issue execution without issuing a notice as provided by sub rule (1) in cases where the issue of a notice may involve an unreasonable delay or defeat the ends of justice Where the Court dispenses with notice under sub rule (1) it should record its reasons (2) In a recent Madras case it was said that the omission to record the reasons is a mere irregularity (a)

Limitation to set aside sale for want of notice —An application to set aside a sale which is void *eg* for want of notice under this rule is governed by art 181 and not art 166 of Sch I of the Limitation Act (b)

Appeal —An application to set aside a sale held without notice as required by sub r (1) falls within s 47 and hence a second appeal lies (c)

Decree against two or more persons jointly —Art 182 of the Limitation Act 1908 applies to decrees of Courts other than Chartered High Courts Under Explanation 1 to that article when a decree has been passed jointly against more person than one an application for execution of the decree if made against any one or more of them shall take effect against them all Therefore an order of revivor of a joint decree made under this rule against one or more of the judgment debtors will operate against the other judgment debtors though no notice has been given to them No such Explanation is appended to art 183 which applies to decrees of Chartered High Courts Therefore if a joint decree is passed by a Chartered High Court an order of revivor of such decree made against one of several judgment debtors does not operate against other judgment debtors to whom no notice is given under this rule (d)

Notice under this rule and limitation —One of the starting points for limitation under art 182 of the Limitation Act 1908 for the execution of decrees of Courts other than Chartered High Courts is the date of issue of notice under this rule The High Court of Calcutta has held that the date of issue of notice means the date when the notice is actually issued and not the date when the Court passes the order for issuing the notice (e) On the other hand the High Courts of Bombay and Allahabad have held that the date of issue of notice means the date when the Court passes the order for issuing the notice and not the date on which the notice is actually issued (f) According to the High Court of Bombay if no notice has been issued a mere order for issuing a notice will not give a fresh starting point for limitation (g) It is not however, necessary that the notice should have been actually served (h)

Art 183 of the Limitation Act which applies to decrees of Chartered High Courts provides *inter alia* that a decree of such Court can be enforced within twelve years from its date unless the decree has been *revived* The High Court of Calcutta has held that an order for execution operates as a revivor within the meaning of this article (i) but mere issue and service of a notice under this rule does not (j)

- (a) *Ma mtha Nath v La dm* (19-3) 5 Cal 96  
105 I C 6 (4) A C 60  
(a) *Pai gopal v Law n j char r* (19-3) 47  
M d 48 91 80 I C 9 (21) A M  
431  
(b) (19-1) 47 M 1 288 80 I C 9 (4) A M  
431 (1 B) *supra* *Seah gya v No tag*  
(19-0) 43 Mad 315 36 I C 60 *I m*  
*h n k r v (h i) am* (1918) 7 Cal L J  
9 46 I C 1  
(c) (19-1) 4 Mad 44 30 91 80 I C 9  
(4) A M 431 s p a  
(d) *Kri Anai gya v jend a* (1917) 49 M d 11  
40 I C 608

- (1) *Kada esur v Moh m Chand a* (19-1) 6  
CW N 66  
(f) *Gori d v Dada* (1904) 3 For 416 *Jumai*  
*v Abd I* (1903) 50 All 536  
(g) *H r v Lam ba* (1899) J I m 3 Note  
the w ds has been issued in a t t  
of the Limitation Act  
(h) *Damod v v aji* (1903) 27 Lam c  
(i) *Suja M of r Das* (189) 24 Cal 11  
(j) *Monowar D v F a A A ad (1900) 2*  
*99 Chatterp v S I (1917) 4*  
*6 I L J 159 8 I C 61*

**23 [S 249]** (1) Where the person to whom notice is issued under the last preceding rule does not appear or does not show cause to the satisfaction of the Court why the decree should not be executed, the Court shall order the decree to be executed

(2) Where such person offers any objection to the execution of the decree, the Court shall consider such objection and make such order as it thinks fit

**24 [Ss 250 251]** (1) When the preliminary measures (if any) required by the foregoing rules have been taken, the Court shall, unless it sees cause to the contrary, issue its process for the execution of the decree

(2) Every such process shall bear date, the day on which it is issued, and shall be signed by the Judge or such officer as the Court may appoint in this behalf, and shall be sealed with the seal of the Court and delivered to the proper officer to be executed

(3) In every such process a day shall be specified on or before which it shall be executed

Unless it sees cause to the contrary—See notes to O 21 r 37 under the heading Whether an executing Court has discretion to refuse or suspend attachment of judgment debtor's property

**Delegation of authority to execute**—The officer to whom a warrant is delivered for execution under this rule may deliver it to his subordinate for execution. It is not necessary that the proper officer should himself execute all warrant sent to him (1). But a warrant addressed to the *peon* of a Court cannot be executed by a *Naik* (2)

**Arrest without warrant**—Where an officer of the Court arrests a judgment debtor without having the warrant in his possession at the time of arrest the arrest is illegal (3)

**Shall be sealed**—The provisions of this rule being mandatory, the omission of the Court's seal on the warrant renders the attachment illegal (4)

**Specification of day on or before which warrant should be executed**—The warrant should specify the date on or before which it is to be executed. Persistence to the execution of a warrant which does not specify such date is not illegal (5). Moreover a warrant cannot be executed after the expiration of the date specified in the warrant

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>(k) <i>Abdul Karam v. B. H. (1884) 6 All 38</i><br/> <i>Dh. m. Ch. d. v. Q. C. Empress (189)</i><br/> <i>Cal 598 Sheel rog. I v. Bishop Narain</i><br/> <i>(189) Cal 59</i><br/> <i>d) M. J. I. g. F. Emperor (1916) 1 Pat L J</i><br/> <i>50 36 I C 8</i><br/> <i>( ) Empress v. Amar Nath (1883) 3 All 318</i></p> | <p>( ) <i>Adar Bux v. As. g. Emperor (1918) 3 Pat</i><br/> <i>I J 636 49 I C 371 B. I. Gope v</i><br/> <i>I g. Emperor (1916) 5 Pat 216 97 I C</i><br/> <i>146 ( ) A. I. 3</i><br/> <i>(o) Moh. v. I. g. Emperor (1916) 1 Pat L J</i><br/> <i>550 36 I C 8 I</i></p> |
|---|--|

## STAY OF EXECUTION

for its execution (p) If the warrant is extended the date to which it is extended be specified on the warrant If this is not done the warrant is not a good warrant and its execution after the date originally specified in it does not amount to an offence under s. 146 of the Indian Penal Code (g)

### 25 [S 343] (1) The officer entrusted with the

*Endorsement on process*

execution of the process shall endorse thereon the day on and the manner in which it was executed and if the latest day specified in the process for the return thereof has been exceeded the reason for the delay, or, if it was not executed the reason why it was not executed, and shall return the process with such endorsement to the Court

(2) Where the endorsement is to the effect that the officer is unable to execute the process the Court shall examine him touching his alleged inability and may if it thinks fit summon and examine witnesses as to such inability, and record the result

### *Stay of execution*

### 26 [Ss 239 240] (1) The Court to which a decree

*When Court may stay execution*

has been sent for execution shall upon sufficient cause being shown stay the execution of such decree for a reasonable time to enable the judgment debtor to apply to the Court by which the decree was passed or to any Court having appellate jurisdiction in respect of the decree or the execution thereof for an order to stay execution or for any other order relating to the decree or execution which might have been made by such Court of first instance or appellate Court if execution had been thereupon thereby or if application for execution had been made to the Court to which the decree was sent for execution

(2) Where the property or person of the judgment debtor has been seized under execution the Court which issues the execution may order the restitution of such property or the discharge of such person pending the result of the application for a stay of execution

### (3) Before making an order to stay execution or to

*Power to require security or impose conditions upon the judgment debtor as it thinks fit*

order the restitution of property or the discharge of the judgment debtor the Court may require such security from or impose such conditions upon the judgment debtor as it thinks fit

Stay of execution — See notes under the same local s. 4

**Alterations in the rule**—The words or for the recovery of a wife which occurred in the corresponding sec 209 of the Code of 1832 after the words share in a specific movable have been omitted for there can be no decree under the law for the recovery of a wife as a wife cannot be treated as a chattel to be delivered over to the husband Where any third person prevents the wife from returning to her husband the latter may obtain an injunction against him which may be enforced in case of disobedience either by the imprisonment of the defendant or by the attachment of his property or by both under r 32

**Decree for specific movable property**—Where a decree directs recovery of specific movable property and for payment of the price thereof if the property be not delivered the decree holder is not entitled to execute the money part of the decree before applying for delivery of the property (a) As to the cases in which a decree may be passed for the delivery of specific movable property see Specific Relief Act I of 1877 s 11

**Rule when not applicable**—It has been held by the High Court of Calcutta that this rule does not apply where the property sought to be attached is not in the possession of the judgment debtor (b)

### 32 [S 260 R S C, O 42, r 30] (1) Where the party

Decree for specific performance for restitution of conjugal right or for an injunction

against whom a decree for the specific performance of a contract, or for restitution of conjugal rights, or for an injunction, has been passed, has had an opportunity of obeying the decree and has wilfully failed to obey it, the decree may be enforced *in the case of a decree for restitution of conjugal rights by the attachment of his property or, in the case of a decree for the specific performance of a contract or for an injunction (c) by his detention in the civil prison, or by the attachment of his property or by both*

(2) Where the party against whom a decree for specific performance or for an injunction has been passed is a corporation the decree may be enforced by the attachment of the property of the corporation or, with the leave of the Court, by the detention in the civil prison of the directors or other principal officers thereof, or by both attachment and detention

(3) Where any attachment under sub rule (1) or sub rule (2) has remained in force for one year if the judgment debtor has not obeyed the decree and the decree holder has applied to have the attached property sold, such property may be sold, and out of the proceeds the Court may award to the decree holder such compensation as he thinks fit, and shall pay the balance (if any) to the judgment debtor on his application

(a) Bal ak da v B ng l N gpur Ra l a j Co Ltd (10-A) 5 Cal 6 103 I C 740 (17) A C 6

(b) P l v Chu d D t (1896) 1 C W N 0  
(c) The it l l ized wor ls were add d by Act 9 of 19 3

(4) Where the judgment debtor has obeyed the decree and paid all costs of executing the same which he is bound to pay, or where, at the end of the one year from the date of the attachment no application to have the property sold has been made, or if made has been refused, the attachment shall cease

(5) Where a decree for the specific performance of a contract or for an injunction has not been obeyed, the Court may, in lieu of or in addition to all or any of the processes aforesaid, direct that the act required to be done may be done so far as practicable by the decree holder or some other person appointed by the Court at the cost of the judgment debtor, and upon the act being done the expenses incurred may be ascertained in such manner as the Court may direct and may be recovered as if they were included in the decree

*Illustration*

A person of little substance erects a building which renders uninhabitable a family mansion belonging to B. A in spite of his detention in prison and the attachment of his property declines to obey a decree obtained against him by B and directing him to remove the building. The Court is of opinion that no sum realizable by the sale of A's property would adequately compensate B for the depreciation in the value of his mansion. B may apply to the Court to remove the building and may recover the cost of such removal from A in the execution proceeding.

**Alterations in the rule**—Sub rules (2) and (5) are new. See notes below under the head Sub rule (5).

The words "or for an order requiring the performance of or abstinence from any other particular act" which occurred in s. 260 of the Code of 1857 have been omitted and in lieu thereof the words "or for an injunction" have been substituted. See notes below under the head Sub rule (1) decree for injunction.

**Specific performance**—As to specific performance of contract see Specific Relief Act I of 1877 ss. 12-30.

**Injunction**—As to perpetual injunctions see Specific Relief Act I of 1877 ss. 34-37.

**Restitution of conjugal rights**—The words italicized in sub rule (1) were added by Act 29 of 1913. Having regard to those words a decree for restitution of conjugal rights can no longer be enforced by detention in the civil prison whether it be against a husband or a wife. As to decree against a husband see also r. 33 below.

**Sub rule (1) decree for injunction**—Sub rule (1) applies to both prohibitory and mandatory injunctions. (1) Where an injunction has been granted on each successive breach of it the decree may be enforced under this rule by an application made within three years of such breach under art. 181 of the Limitation Act (i.e. a separate suit to enforce the injunction is barred by the provisions of s. 47 (f)). If the decree is enforced by the imprisonment of the defendant the period of imprisonment should not at any one time exceed six months. See s. 55.

(d) *S. H. P. v. S. H. P.* 18 (1919) 46 Cal 103

10 45 I C 264

(e) *I. E. I. v. I. E. I.* 11 (1906) 9 Mad

311 S. Ch. I. v. I. v. 11 (1919) 46

Cal 103 45 I C 264 B. v. P. 11 (1901) 3 All 465 R

Ch. I. v. S. H. P. 11 (1906) 4 All 300

(f) *S. H. P. v. S. H. P.* 11 (1919) 46 Cal

4 I C 264



Where a woman who had been directed by a decree to refrain from preventing her daughter returning to her husband, *permitted* the daughter who was of age to reside in her house it was held that such conduct did not constitute a breach of the direction under the decree so as to render it punishable under this rule (g)

It was held under the old section that an order directing a defendant to render accounts within a specified time was an order requiring the performance of a particular act within the meaning of that section and that disobedience to the order was punishable under that section (h) The words performance of or abstention from any other particular act which occurred in the old section were held to have a very wide general meaning and they have been omitted from this rule and for it the word injunction has been substituted. Hence disobedience to an order directing a party to render accounts can no longer be punished under this rule as such an order cannot be said to be an injunction within the meaning of this rule (i)

**Opportunity of obeying the decree**—All that the Court has to see before directing execution to issue under this rule is whether the party bound by the decree has had an opportunity of obeying the decree or injunction and has wilfully failed to obey it. If the party has had the opportunity and has *wilfully* failed to obey the decree the Court may order execution to issue under this rule without giving him any further opportunity and it is not obligatory upon the Court in such a case to serve a notice upon the party calling upon him to obey the decree or injunction (j)

Where an application is made under this rule but the party bound by the decree has had no opportunity of obeying the decree the application will be dismissed. But the dismissal of the application is no bar to another application made after an opportunity has been afforded to the party of obeying the decree. Thus if a decree is made directing the defendant to deliver certain articles necessary for the performance of the duties of priest in a temple to the plaintiff the plaintiff is not entitled to execute the decree under this rule unless it is proved that he went to the temple after notice to the defendant to receive the articles from him (and thereby afforded an opportunity to the defendant to comply with the decree) and that the defendant failed to deliver the articles. If such an opportunity has not been afforded the plaintiff's application will be dismissed but its dismissal will be no bar to a subsequent application after such opportunity has been afforded (k)

**Party against whom a decree for injunction has been passed**—See notes to s 50 Decree for injunction.

**Sub rule (5)**—This sub rule is new. It corresponds to O 42 r 30 of the English Rules. In the absence of any provision in the old section similar to the one contained in this sub rule it was held that where a decree directed the defendant to remove an obstruction such as pulling down a wall or opening a path way and the defendant failed to obey the decree it was not competent to the Court to depute any of its officers to remove the obstruction as that was not one of the modes of execution sanctioned under that section (l). Under the present rule the Court may direct the act to be done so far as practicable by the decree holder or some other person appointed by the Court (m). But the Court has no power under this rule to order the police to see that its decree is carried out. Thus where a decree is passed declaring the plaintiff's right to perform certain ceremonies in a temple and restraining the defendant from obstructing

(g) *Aj an Kuar v Suraj Prasad* (18 ) 1 All 501

(h) *Degamb r v Kally Nath* (1881) 7 Cal. 654  
*Jagunath v Gopalji* (190 ) 27 All 3 4

(i) *Arj n v King Emperor* (1918) 3 Pat L J 106 41 I C 37

(j) *Durga Das v Decraj* (1906) 33 Cal 306

(k) *Kasho s Bun v Dwarka ath* (1894) 1 Cal 84 11 A 89

(l) *Bhoob n Jf Bun v Nabin Chunder* (18 ) 18 W R 79  
*Protap Chunder v Je ru* (189 ) 8 Cal 174  
*Sakari v Bai Parvat* (190 ) 6 Bom 83 86 87  
*Durga Das v Deraaj* (1906) 33 Cal 306 309 311

(m) *Sachin Pr s d v Amarnath* (1919) 46 Cal. 103 10 45 I C 864

the plaintiffs from performing the ceremonies the Court has no power under this rule to order the police to see that the plaintiffs performed the ceremonies without interference on the part of the defendants (n)

The expression the act required to be done means what has to be done to enforce the injunction (o). Hence if a defendant is directed by a decree to demolish a certain wall and the wall is demolished he cannot in execution proceedings be directed to remove a new wall built after the date of the decree in a different place. The plaintiff's remedy in respect of the new wall is to file a fresh suit against the defendant (p). In a recent Calcutta case (q) Pichardson J. expressed the opinion that sub r (5) applied to prohibitory as well as mandatory injunctions.

**33 [Ncu]** (1) Notwithstanding anything in rule 32, the Court, either at the time of passing a decree against a husband for the restitution of conjugal rights or at any time afterwards,

Discretion of Court in executing decrees for restitution of conjugal rights

may order that the decree shall be executed in the manner provided in this rule

(2) Where the Court has made an order under sub-rule (1), it may order that, in the event of the decree not being obeyed within such period as may be fixed in this behalf, the judgment debtor shall make to the decree holder such periodical payments as may be just, and, if it thinks fit, require that the judgment debtor shall, to its satisfaction, secure to the decree holder such periodical payments

(3) The Court may from time to time vary or modify any order made under sub rule (2) for the periodical payment of money, either by altering the times of payment or by increasing or diminishing the amount, or may temporarily suspend the same as to the whole or any part of the money so ordered to be paid, and again revive the same, either wholly or in part as it may think just

(4) Any money ordered to be paid under this rule may be recovered as though it were payable under a decree for the payment of money

Compare the Matrimonial Causes Act 1884 (47 and 48 Vict. c. 68)

**Amendment of the rule**—The italicized words in sub rule (1) were added by Act 29 of 1923. The words and the decree holder is the wife which occurred in sub rule (2) after the words under sub rule (1) were omitted by the same Act. The effect of this omission is that the present rule applies to a decree for restitution of conjugal rights passed against a husband. The words shall be executed in the manner provided in this rule in sub r (1) have been substituted for the words shall not be executed by

(n) *Gowram Gonda Lalaya Coom mi Mahan* (1918) 40 All. 618, 45 I. C. 6

(o) *Sa A Pra naya Amarnath* (1919) 46 Cal. 103 108 45 I. C. 864

(p) *Molhu v Swada* S. 7A (195) 7 Lah. L. J. 0, 84 I. C. 585 (5) A. L. 533

(q) *Sach Prasad v Amarnath* (1919) 46 Cal. 103 10 45 I. C. 864

detention in prison See as to the latter words the undermentioned case (r) See r 32 above and note the alterations made in that rule by the same Act

**34** [Ss 261, 232] (1) Where a decree is for the execution of a document or for the endorsement of a negotiable instrument and the judgment debtor neglects or refuses to obey the decree, the decree holder may prepare a draft of the document or endorsement in accordance with the terms of the decree and deliver the same to the Court

(2) The Court shall thereupon cause the draft to be served on the judgment-debtor together with a notice requiring his objections (if any) to be made within such time as the Court fixes in this behalf

(3) Where the judgment debtor objects to the draft, his objections shall be stated in writing within such time, and the Court shall make such order approving or altering the draft, as it thinks fit

(4) The decree holder shall deliver to the Court a copy of the draft with such alterations (if any) as the Court may have directed upon the proper stamp paper if a stamp is required by the law for the time being in force, and the Judge or such officer as may be appointed in this behalf shall execute the documents so delivered

(5) The execution of a document or the endorsement of a negotiable instrument under this rule may be in the following form, namely —

C D Judge of the Court of  
(or as the case may be), for A B, in a suit by E F against A B "

and shall have the same effect as the execution of the document or the endorsement of the negotiable instrument by the party ordered to execute or endorse the same

(6) The Court, or such officer as it may appoint in this behalf, shall cause the document to be registered if its registration is required by the law for the time being in force or the decree holder desires to have it registered, and may make such order as it thinks fit as to the payment of the expenses of the registration

**Sub rule (1) decree for execution of a document**—Where the document to be executed relates to some property the property must be the subject matter of the suit. If it is not a regular suit must be brought to enforce execution of the document ( )

**Sub rule (6) registration**—This sub rule is new. It gives effect to a decision of the Allahabad High Court that if a document requires registration it must be registered though executed by the Court (4). At the same time provision is made for the registration of documents though their registration is optional if the decree holder desires to have them registered.

**Appeal** An appeal lies from an order under this rule on an objection to the draft of a document or of an endorsement [O 43 r 1 cl (i)]

**35 [S 263] (1)** Where a decree is for the delivery of any immovable property, possession thereof shall be delivered to the party to whom it has been adjudged, or to such person as he may appoint to receive delivery on his behalf, and if necessary, by removing any person bound by the decree who refuses to vacate the property.

Decree for immovable property

to whom it has been adjudged, or to such person as he may appoint to receive delivery on his behalf, and if necessary, by removing any person bound by the decree who refuses to vacate the property.

(2) Where a decree is for the joint possession of immovable property, such possession shall be delivered by affixing a copy of the warrant in some conspicuous place on the property and proclaiming by beat of drum, or other customary mode, at some convenient place, the substance of the decree.

(3) Where possession of any building or enclosure is to be delivered and the person in possession being bound by the decree, does not afford free access, the Court, through its officers, may, after giving reasonable warning and facility to any woman not appearing in public according to the customs of the country to withdraw, remove or open any lock or bolt or break open any door or do any other act necessary for putting the decree holder in possession.

**Alterations in the rule**—Sub rules (2) and (3) are new. See notes below.

**Sub rule (2)**—A plaintiff who is entitled to possession jointly with other persons may be granted a decree for joint possession whether the plaintiff was originally in possession and was subsequently dispossessed (u) or whether he had never been in possession (r). But the Court has a discretion in the matter (w) and joint possession was refused when the defendant had been 21 years in separate possession with the acquiescence of the plaintiff (x). Sub rule (2) which is new has been inserted to remove the difficulty experienced in executing decrees obtained for joint possession of immovable property as against co-sharers and persons holding undivided shares.

(a) See also s. 174 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, C.W.N.

(b) K. K. Lal v. A. I. D. H. (1904) 4 All 33.

(c) J. K. v. I. K. (1904) 6 All 34.

(d) J. K. v. I. K. (1911) 31 All 10.

131 (1) A. K. v. H. K. (1911) 31 All 10.

44 All 1 631 (1) A. K. v. H. K. (1911) 31 All 10.

1. A. K. v. I. K. (1911) 44 All.

5 631 (1) A. K. v. H. K. (1911) 31 All 10.

(w) B. K. v. C. K. (1911) 31 All 10.

C. K. v. I. K. (1911) 31 All 10.

(x) H. K. v. I. K. (1911) 31 All 10.

6 All 1 J. K. v. I. K. (1911) 31 All 10.

detention in prison See as to the latter words the undermentioned case (r) See r 32 above and note the alterations made in that rule by the same Act

**34** [Ss 261, 232] (1) Where a decree is for the execution of a document or for the endorsement of a negotiable instrument and the judgment debtor neglects or refuses to obey the decree, the decree holder may prepare a draft of the document or endorsement in accordance with the terms of the decree and deliver the same to the Court

(2) The Court shall thereupon cause the draft to be served on the judgment-debtor together with a notice requiring his objections (if any) to be made within such time as the Court fixes in this behalf

(3) Where the judgment debtor objects to the draft, his objections shall be stated in writing within such time, and the Court shall make such order approving or altering the draft as it thinks fit

(4) The decree holder shall deliver to the Court a copy of the draft with such alterations (if any) as the Court may have directed upon the proper stamp paper if a stamp is required by the law for the time being in force, and the Judge or such officer as may be appointed in this behalf shall execute the documents so delivered

(5) The execution of a document or the endorsement of a negotiable instrument under this rule may be in the following form namely —

‘ C D Judge of the Court of  
(or as the case may be), for A B, in a suit by E F against A B ’

and shall have the same effect as the execution of the document or the endorsement of the negotiable instrument by the party ordered to execute or endorse the same

(6) The Court, or such officer, as it may appoint in this behalf, shall cause the document to be registered if its registration is required by the law for the time being in force or the decree holder desires to have it registered, and may make such order as it thinks fit as to the payment of the expenses of the registration

Sub rule (1) decree for execution of a document—Where the document to be executed relates to some property the property must be the subject matter of the suit. If it is not a regular suit must be brought to enforce execution of the document (\*)

Sub rule (6) registration—This sub rule is new. It gives effect to a decision of the Allahabad High Court that if a document requires registration it must be registered though executed by the Court (†). At the same time provision is made for the registration of documents though their registration is optional if the decree holder desires to have them registered.

Appeal—An appeal lies from an order under this rule on an objection to the draft of a document or of an endorsement [O 43 : 1 (1) (i)]

**35 [S 263] (1)** Where a decree is for the delivery of any immovable property, possession thereof shall be delivered to the party to whom it has been adjudged, or to such person as he may appoint to receive delivery on his behalf, and, if necessary, by removing any person bound by the decree who refuses to vacate the property.

(2) Where a decree is for the joint possession of immovable property, such possession shall be delivered by affixing a copy of the warrant in some conspicuous place on the property and proclaiming by beat of drum, or other customary mode, at some convenient place, the substance of the decree.

(3) Where possession of any building or enclosure is to be delivered and the person in possession, being bound by the decree does not afford free access the Court, through its officers, may, after giving reasonable warning and facility to any woman not appearing in public according to the customs of the country to withdraw, remove or open any lock or bolt or break open any door or do any other act necessary for putting the decree holder in possession.

Alterations in the rule—Sub rules (2) and (3) are new. See notes below.

Sub rule (2)—A plaintiff who is entitled to possession jointly with other persons may be granted a decree for joint possession whether the plaintiff was originally in possession and was subsequently dispossessed (u) or whether he had never been in possession (†). But the Court has a discretion in the matter (u) and joint possession was refused where the defendant had been 24 years in separate possession with the acquiescence of the plaintiff (x). Sub rule (2) which is new has been inserted to remove the difficulty experienced in executing decrees obtained for joint possession of immovable property as against co-sharers and persons holding undivided shares.

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| (4) S. 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677, 678, 679, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 696, 697, 698, 699, 700, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 747, 748, 749, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 767, 768, 769, 770, 771, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 784, 785, 786, 787, 788, 789, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 798, 799, 800, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 809, 810, 811, 812, 813, 814, 815, 816, 817, 818, 819, 820, 821, 822, 823, 824, 825, 826, 827, 828, 829, 830, 831, 832, 833, 834, 835, 836, 837, 838, 839, 840, 841, 842, 843, 844, 845, 846, 847, 848, 849, 850, 851, 852, 853, 854, 855, 856, 857, 858, 859, 860, 861, 862, 863, 864, 865, 866, 867, 868, 869, 870, 871, 872, 873, 874, 875, 876, 877, 878, 879, 880, 881, 882, 883, 884, 885, 886, 887, 888, 889, 890, 891, 892, 893, 894, 895, 896, 897, 898, 899, 900, 901, 902, 903, 904, 905, 906, 907, 908, 909, 910, 911, 912, 913, 914, 915, 916, 917, 918, 919, 920, 921, 922, 923, 924, 925, 926, 927, 928, 929, 930, 931, 932, 933, 934, 935, 936, 937, 938, 939, 940, 941, 942, 943, 944, 945, 946, 947, 948, 949, 950, 951, 952, 953, 954, 955, 956, 957, 958, 959, 960, 961, 962, 963, 964, 965, 966, 967, 968, 969, 970, 971, 972, 973, 974, 975, 976, 977, 978, 979, 980, 981, 982, 983, 984, 985, 986, 987, 988, 989, 990, 991, 992, 993, 994, 995, 996, 997, 998, 999, 1000. | (u) B. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677, 678, 679, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 696, 697, 698, 699, 700, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 747, 748, 749, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 767, 768, 769, 770, 771, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 784, 785, 786, 787, 788, 789, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 798, 799, 800, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 809, 810, 811, 812, 813, 814, 815, 816, 817, 818, 819, 820, 821, 822, 823, 824, 825, 826, 827, 828, 829, 830, 831, 832, 833, 834, 835, 836, 837, 838, 839, 840, 841, 842, 843, 844, 845, 846, 847, 848, 849, 850, 851, 852, 853, 854, 855, 856, 857, 858, 859, 860, 861, 862, 863, 864, 865, 866, 867, 868, 869, 870, 871, 872, 873, 874, 875, 876, 877, 878, 879, 880, 881, 882, 883, 884, 885, 886, 887, 888, 889, 890, 891, 892, 893, 894, 895, 896, 897, 898, 899, 900, 901, 902, 903, 904, 905, 906, 907, 908, 909, 910, 911, 912, 913, 914, 915, 916, 917, 918, 919, 920, 921, 922, 923, 924, 925, 926, 927, 928, 929, 930, 931, 932, 933, 934, 935, 936, 937, 938, 939, 940, 941, 942, 943, 944, 945, 946, 947, 948, 949, 950, 951, 952, 953, 954, 955, 956, 957, 958, 959, 960, 961, 962, 963, 964, 965, 966, 967, 968, 969, 970, 971, 972, 973, 974, 975, 976, 977, 978, 979, 980, 981, 982, 983, 984, 985, 986, 987, 988, 989, 990, 991, 992, 993, 994, 995, 996, 997, 998, 999, 1000. | (x) H. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501 |
|--|---|--|

5 Resistance to delivery of possession to decree holder—Where the holder of a decree for the possession of immovable property is resisted or obstructed by any person in obtaining possession of the property the procedure to be followed is that prescribed by rr 97 103 of this order

Actual and formal possession—The possession referred to in sub rules (1) and (3) is *has* or *actual* possession while that referred to in sub r (2) and r 36 below is *formal* or *symbolical* possession. *Formal* or *symbolical* possession is delivered by affixing a copy of the warrant in some conspicuous place on the property and proclaiming by beat of drum or other customary mode at some convenient place the substance of the decree.

Rules 35 and 36 refer to cases where a suit is brought for possession of immovable property and a decree is passed in the suit for the delivery of the property to the decree holder. Rules 95 and 96 refer to cases where immovable property belonging to a judgment debtor is sold in execution of a decree passed against him and possession of the property is sought by the auction purchaser. In both cases the possession may be either actual or symbolical. If the immovable property of which possession is directed by the decree to be delivered to the decree holder is in the possession of the judgment debtor *actual possession* must be delivered to the decree holder under r 35 (1). Where it is in the possession of a tenant or other person entitled to occupy the same only *symbolical possession* can be delivered, and that is to be done under r 36. Likewise where immovable property is sold in execution of a decree and possession is sought by the auction purchaser *actual possession* must be delivered to him under r 95 if the property is in the possession of the judgment debtor. But if the property is in the possession of a tenant or other person entitled to occupy the same only *symbolical possession* can be delivered and that is to be done under r 96.

There are thus three cases in which the law allows symbolical possession to be given namely the cases contemplated by sub rule (2) of the present rule by r 36 and by r 96 of this Order. *Symbolical* possession given in such cases operates as *actual* possession against the judgment debtor but not against third persons who were not parties to the decree (y). In other words *symbolical* possession is no possession at all as against third parties. This distinction is of great importance in the law of limitation. The rule to be deduced from the cases on the subject is that where in execution of a decree *symbolical* possession is delivered of immovable property to the person entitled to possession thereof and such person subsequently institutes a suit for *actual* possession, the *symbolical* possession is to be treated as *actual* possession where the suit is *again* *the judgment-debtor or his representatives* and the period of 12 years allowed for such a suit is to be calculated not from the date of sale but from the date of the subsequent dis-possession [ill (2)]. But where a suit for *actual* possession is instituted *against a third party claiming to be in possession of the property adversely to the judgment-debtor* no account is taken of the *symbolical* possession of the plaintiff in determining the period of limitation and the period of 12 years is to be calculated, not from the date on which *symbolical* possession was delivered to the plaintiff but from the date on which the possession of such third party became adverse as against the judgment-debtor [ill (1)].

#### Illustrations

(1) *P* obtains a decree against *D*. In execution of the decree certain property alleged to belong to *D* is sold, and is purchased by *A*. *A* applies for possession, and is placed in *symbolical* possession of the property. *C* has been in possession of the

(y) *Praja S. Gh v. D. Nar. Lal* (1884) 10 Cal. 993. *J. Gopal dhar v. P. M. Chander* (1940) 5 Cal. 484. *Jugabundhu v. Purna d.* (1941) 16 Cal. 330. *Padma Krishna v. I. M. E. Lad* (1911) 20 Ind. L. J. 431 C.

263 (P. C.) *Mahaderappa v. E. M. A.* (1922) 46 Bom. 10. *66 I. C. 0* (22) A. B. 3. *I. G. A. S. v. Sri. Ravi* (1922) 42 Mad. L. J. 6-6. *660-661* 90 I. C. 103 (6) A. M. 4--

property adversely to *D* for 10 years prior to the date on which *A* is placed in *symbolical* possession. *C* continues to be in possession of the property as before. After three years *C* sues *C* for possession. The defence is that *C* has been in adverse possession for more than twelve years and the suit is therefore barred under art. 144 of the Limitation Act. *C* contends that his *symbolical* possession operated to break the continuity of the adverse possession of *C* and that the period of twelve years allowed by art. 144 for a suit for possession should be calculated from the date on which *symbolical* possession was delivered to him. The suit is barred for *A*'s possession being merely *symbolical* did not operate at all as possession as against *C* who was not a party to the suit and it could not therefore break the continuity of *C*'s possession (2). In other words delivery of *symbolical* possession to *A* did not amount to a *dispossession* of *C*.

(2) *A* obtains a decree against *B* for possession of certain immovable property the property being in the occupancy of *B*'s tenants. *Symbolical* possession is delivered to *A* under r. 36. Subsequently *B* dispossesses *A* by receiving the rents and profits. *A* thereupon sues *B* for actual possession. The period of limitation for such a suit is twelve years from the date of dispossession (a). The same principles apply where a person is placed in *symbolical* possession under sub rule (2) of this rule in cases where the decree is one for joint possession and also where he is placed in *symbolical* possession under r. 96 of this Order (b).

*Note*—It will be observed that in all (2) the suit is against the judgment debtor and in all (1) it is against a third person who was not a party to the suit. *Symbolical* possession operates as actual possession against the judgment debtor that being the only means by which as between the parties the order of the Court can be effectively carried out. But it does not operate as actual possession against third persons who were not parties to the suit and the reason for this is very plain. A suit might be brought and a decree obtained by a person who has neither title nor possession against another person who has neither title nor possession and if the delivery of *symbolical* possession in such a suit were to constitute actual possession as against the true owner who had been in actual possession for many years and who was no party to the suit it would operate most unjustly (c).

It has already been stated that where a judgment debtor himself is in possession actual possession must be delivered to the person entitled to possession under sub r. (1) of this rule or under r. 95 as the case may be. If *symbolical* possession is delivered in a case where actual possession ought to have been delivered the question arises whether it will operate as actual possession against the judgment debtor. It has been held by the High Court of Calcutta that it does. The delivery of *symbolical* possession even erroneously is not a nullity and it operates as actual possession against the judgment debtor and his representatives for it is said that after all it is possession obtained through an officer of the Court and by process of law and the judgment debtor must be taken to be a party to the proceeding relating to the taking of possession. From this point of view a suit for actual possession may be brought at any time within 12 years from the date on which *symbolical* possession is given (d). On the other hand a Full Bench of the Bombay High Court has held that *symbolical* possession given in circumstances in which actual possession ought to have been given is a nullity and the period of limitation for a suit for actual possession is 12 years from the date of sale. The reason given by the High

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>(a) <i>Ha Jira v Shirm</i> (1890) 19 Bom. 60<br/> <i>Ru Jalsngh v Buarra Lal</i> (1884) 10 Cal 933</p> <p>(a) <i>Juggobundhu v Rm Chudr</i> (1880) 5 Cal 584 (F B) <i>Ali Hus v Mohammad</i> (188) 3 Luck 130 10 IC 81 (-8) 4 O 8<br/> <i>Ja g Bahadur v Hanuman</i> (1911) 43 Ali 50 63 IC 1 (-21) 4 A 9<br/> <i>Ali Husin v Afal Husin</i> (198) 3</p> | <p>Luck. 130 10 IC 81 (23) 4 O 8</p> <p>(b) <i>Jayyobu dhu v Pm m</i> and (1882) 16 Cal 630 (F B)</p> <p>(c) <i>Ru Jalsngh v Binaru Lal</i> (1884) 10 Cal 993 99</p> <p>(d) <i>Lale vur v P gun</i> (1881) Cal 415 II 1<br/> <i>M A v Bw ral</i> (182) 41 Cal 1<br/> <i>Bh lu Breg v J f d a Nath</i> (191) 1<br/> <i>C W v A</i> IC 1035 (-3) A C 1-5</p> |
|---|--|



Court of Bombay is that symbolical possession is not actual possession nor is it equivalent to actual possession except where the Code expressly or by implication provides that it shall have that effect and there is no section of the Code which provides that where symbolical possession is given in a case in which actual possession ought to have been given such possession should be treated as equivalent to actual possession (e) The High Court of Allahabad has taken the same view as the Bombay High Court (f) In an earlier case (g) the Madras High Court took the same view as the High Court of Calcutta but in later cases it has followed the Bombay ruling (h)

### Illustrations

In execution of a decree obtained by A against B certain property belonging to B is sold and it is purchased by C in the year 1895 B is in possession of the property at the date of sale C applies for possession but instead of actual possession being delivered to him under r 95 symbolical possession is given to him in the year 1901 C subsequently sues B for actual possession in the year 1908 that is more than 12 years after the date of sale but within 12 years from the date of delivery of symbolical possession According to the Bombay and Allahabad High Courts the suit is barred by limitation according to the Calcutta High Court it is not

It has been held by a Full Bench of the Oudh Court that where a sale is of an undivided share in a property delivery of possession by means of beat of drum is a valid and effective delivery of possession within O 21 r 95 and that it is sufficient to give to the auction purchaser a fresh start for limitation Stuart C J observed that the distinction between actual and symbolical possession had little to do in such case and that the real question was whether the delivery was effective in the circumstance of each particular case *Gulab Khan v Atullah* (1928) 3 Luck 406 110 IC 70 (28) A O 31 In the Full Bench Bombay case referred to above the sale was also of an undivided share but the question whether that circumstance made any difference was not before the Court All that the Bombay case decided was that when in a case where actual possession ought to have been delivered mere symbolical possession is delivered the delivery of symbolical possession does not give to the purchaser a fresh start for limitation

Sub rule (2) affixing copy of warrant—Where in a case falling within sub r (2) of the present rule or rule 36 below or r 96 below no copy of the warrant is affixed but the substance of the decree is proclaimed by beat of drum in the presence of the judgment debtor the possession so delivered is good symbolical possession and carried with it all the incidents of such possession as against the judgment debtor if he had notice of the proceedings (i) but not if he had no such notice (j)

## 36 [S 264] Where a decree is for the delivery of any immovable property in the occupancy of a tenant or other person entitled to occupy the same and not bound by the

Decree for delivery of immovable property which is in the occupancy of a tenant or other person entitled to occupy the same and not bound by the

any immovable property in the occupancy of a tenant or other person entitled to occupy the same and not bound by the

(e) *Mah v J* (191) 36 B 1 33 14  
 1 ( 44 (2 B) d M d Mahadrap  
 v 11 d (19) 46 B 10 1 66 ( 1  
 30 ( 1 ) A B 41 Laksh v Mar  
 (189) 16 1 m Shrestha v pr  
 (1919) 43 B 10 10 1 ( 1 ( 1  
 th A 16 (19) 41 B 1 B 43  
 65 ( 1 91 ( 1 ) B 1  
 (f) *J v B A I v B* (191) 43 A  
 1 63 1 C 21 ( 1 ) A A 9  
 (j) *C v B A I v B* (190) 1 M 1 L J 94  
 (h) *C v B A I v B* (191) 43  
 1 C 873 A v v B A 1 ( 19 )  
 49 31 1 L J 303 801 C 439 ( 1 ) A M

1140  
 (i) *J v B A I v B* (190) 2 L J 10  
 43 1 C 19 If runn d gh v M illa  
 J m (19 9) 11 L J 146 118 1 C  
 391 ( 1 ) A 1 543  
 (j) *A B I v B* (191) 1 P 1 R no 0  
 1 74 391 C 7 3 Harri m v gh v M illa  
 J m (19 1) 11 L J 116 118 1 C 391  
 ( 9 ) 1 45 4 m J m h n v J a  
 (19 1) 3 L J 1 13 5 5 1 C 1  
 ( 1 ) A L 16 [no symbolical] seal  
 of tal d at all und r d r r r r r r  
 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1  
 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1

decree to relinquish such occupancy, the Court shall order delivery to be made by affixing a copy of the warrant in some conspicuous place on the property, and proclaiming to the occupant by beat of drum or other customary mode, at some convenient place, the substance of the decree in regard to the property

Symbolical possession—See notes to r 3, above

Other person entitled to occupy the same —A person disturbing the possession of another without any right legitimately derived from any competent person to do so is not a person entitled to occupy the property within the meaning of this rule (1) He is no more than a trespasser

### *Arrest and detention in the civil prison*

37 [S 243 B] (1) Notwithstanding anything in these rules, where an application is for the execution of a decree for the payment of money by the arrest and detention in the civil prison of a judgment debtor who is

liable to be arrested in pursuance of the application, the Court may instead of issuing a warrant for his arrest, issue a notice calling upon him to appear before the Court on a day to be specified in the notice and show cause why he should not be committed to the civil prison

(2) Where appearance is not made in obedience to the notice, the Court shall if the decree holder so requires, issue a warrant for the arrest of the judgment debtor

Discretionary power to issue notice under this rule—When a decree is for the payment of money and execution is applied for against the person of the judgment debtor the Court may issue a notice to the judgment debtor calling upon him to show cause why he should not be committed to the civil prison in execution of the decree. As to the procedure to be followed when the judgment debtor appears in pursuance of the notice see r 40 below

Whether an executing Court has discretion to refuse or suspend attachment of judgment debtor's property—A Court executing a decree may in its discretion under r 40 below disallow an application for the arrest or imprisonment of a judgment debtor. But there is no rule which empowers the Court in express terms where an application is made for attachment of the judgment debtor's property to give time to the judgment debtor to pay the judgment debt and for that purpose to stay execution. O 21 r 24 (1) provides that when the preliminary measures required by the foregoing rules have been taken the Court shall unless it sees cause to the contrary issue its process for the execution of the decree. In a Calcutta case under s 250 of the Code of 1882 it was held that when an application is made for attachment of the property of a judgment debtor the Court has no power to refuse or stay execution except in the cases

expressly provided for by the Code (l) As to the words unless it sees cause to the contrary it was held that they referred only to the express provisions contained in the Code itself such as s 246 (now r 18 above) s 243 (now r 29 above) etc but that they did not give any discretion to the Court to refuse or stay execution In a later case under the present Code it was held that the Court has inherent power under s 101 to defer the issue or operation of its own process and that it may in a proper case grant time to the judgment debtor In that case the Subordinate Judge gave five days time to the judgment debtor and it was held by Mukerjee J that the time was rightly granted in the circumstances of the case Graham J did not express any definite opinion as to the validity of the order but said that there might be circumstances in which the Court would have discretion to grant reasonable time e.g. in the case of illness of the judgment debtor (m) Assuming that the Court has an inherent power to allow time to a judgment debtor it should not it is submitted be exercised in a case where the judgment debtor is unable to pay the judgment debt immediately and says that he would be able to do so if time was allowed to him

Privilege from arrest—See s 135 sub section (2)

**38 [S 337]** Every warrant for the arrest of a judgment debtor shall direct the officer entrusted with its execution to bring him before the Court with all convenient speed, unless the amount which he has been ordered to pay together with the interest thereon and the costs (if any) to which he is liable, be sooner paid

**39 [Ss 339 340]** (1) No judgment debtor shall be arrested in execution of a decree, unless and until the decree holder pays into Court such sum as the Judge thinks sufficient for the subsistence of the judgment debtor from the time of his arrest until he can be brought before the Court

(2) Where a judgment debtor is committed to the civil prison in execution of a decree, the Court shall fix for his subsistence such monthly allowance as he may be entitled to according to the scales fixed under section 57 or, where no such scales have been fixed, as it considers sufficient with reference to the class to which he belongs

(3) The monthly allowance fixed by the Court shall be supplied by the party on whose application the judgment debtor has been arrested by monthly payments in advance before the first day of each month

(4) The first payments shall be made to the proper officer of the Court for such portion of the current month as remains

(l) I Jan CA decy 1st coll A (1894) 10 Cal | (m) C 1st N v F F D A w (1894) 31 C W  
N 63 601-661 C 25-661,665 102 I C 513  
C 7 A C 681

unexpired before the judgment debtor is committed to the civil prison, and the subsequent payments (if any) shall be made to the officer in charge of the civil prison

(5) Sums disbursed by the decree-holder for the subsistence of the judgment debtor in the civil prison shall be deemed to be costs in the suit

Provided that the judgment debtor shall not be detained in the civil prison or arrested on account of any sum so disbursed

40 [S 37A] (1) Where a judgment debtor appears before the Court in obedience to a notice issued under rule 37, or is brought before the Court after being arrested in execution of a decree for the payment

Proceedings on application of judgment debtor in obedience to notice to appear after arrest

of money, and it appears to the Court that the judgment-debtor is unable from poverty or other sufficient cause to pay the amount of the decree or, if that amount is payable by instalments, the amount of any instalment thereof, the Court may, upon such terms (if any) as it thinks fit make an order disallowing the application for his arrest and detention, or directing his release, as the case may be

(2) Before making an order under sub rule (1), the Court may take into consideration any allegation of the decree holder touching any of the following matters, namely —

- (a) the decree being for a sum for which the judgment-debtor was bound in any fiduciary capacity to account
- (b) the transfer, concealment or removal by the judgment debtor of any part of his property after the date of the institution of the suit in which the decree was passed, or the commission by him after that date of any other act of bad faith in relation to his property, with the object or effect of obstructing or delaying the decree holder in the execution of the decree,
- (c) any undue preference given by the judgment debtor to any of his other creditors,

(d) refusal or neglect on the part of the judgment-debtor to pay the amount of the decree or some part thereof when he has, or since the date of the decree has had, the means of paying it,

(e) the likelihood of the judgment debtor absconding or leaving the jurisdiction of the Court with the object or effect of obstructing or delaying the decree holder in the execution of the decree

(3) While any of the matters mentioned in sub rule (2) are being considered, the Court may, in its discretion, order the judgment debtor to be detained in the civil prison, or leave him in the custody of an officer of the Court, or release him on his furnishing security, to the satisfaction of the Court, for his appearance when required by the Court

(4) A judgment debtor released under this rule may be re-arrested

(5) Where the Court does not make an order under sub rule (1), it shall cause the judgment debtor to be arrested if he has not already been arrested and, subject to the other provisions of this Code, commit him to the civil prison

**Sub rule (1) Unable to pay**—Where a decree is passed against A, B and C and the Court is satisfied that A is unable to pay and that B and C each possess property which may be realized by the decree holder in execution of the decree the Court may reject an application made by the decree holder for the arrest of A

**Sub rule (3)**—The security should not be personal security (o)

**Appeal**—An order rejecting an application for the arrest of a judgment debtor falls within s 47 and is appealable as a decree (p)

### *Attachment of Property*

**41** [Cf S 267] Where a decree is for the payment of money the decree holder may apply to the Court for an order that—

(a) the judgment debtor, or

(b) in the case of a corporation, any officer thereof or

(c) any other person

be orally examined as to whether any or what debts are owing to the judgment debtor and whether the judgment debtor has any and what other property or means of satisfying the

(a) *Lala D. J. v. M. S. M. J. (1910) 4 Lah. 1* | (p) *I. C. 66 (1) A. C. 6*  
 (a) *Dhar v. K. S. P. (1911) 4 Cal. 111* | *(1911) 4 Lah. 1* J. 66 91 1 1 (20)

decree and the Court may make an order for the attendance and examination of such judgment debtor, or officer or other person and for the production of any books or documents

**Object of the rule**—The object of this rule is to obtain discovery for purposes of execution to avoid unnecessary trouble in obtaining satisfaction of money decrees. It is a useful rule but orders for discovery may operate harshly against the party directed to give discovery and must not be lightly made (g)

**Any and what other property**—This refers to property which is liable to attachment and sale under the decree against the judgment debtor. Property of a judgment debtor which he has mortgaged is *prima facie* liable to be seized in execution of a decree against him and the fact that he has mortgaged it will not prevent its being attached and sold in execution of the decree subject to the mortgage debt (see s 73). If the mortgagee claims that he is in possession as mortgagee he may be examined under this rule (r). See note to r 62 below.

**What property may not be attached**—See s 60

**42 [S 255]** Where a decree directs an inquiry as to rent or mesne profits or any other matter, the property of the judgment debtor may, before the amount due from him has been ascertained, be attached, as in the case of an ordinary decree for the payment of money

Attachment in case of  
decree for rent or mesne  
profit or other matter  
amount of which to be  
ascertained by inquiry

an ordinary decree for the payment of money

**Attachment under a preliminary decree**—In a suit by A against B for the recovery of possession of immovable property and for mesne profits a preliminary decree is passed against B for the delivery of the property to A and an inquiry is directed as to the mesne profits due by B to A. B delivers possession of the property to A. Subsequently while the inquiry as to mesne profits is still pending A applies for attachment of certain property belonging to B. The attachment may be allowed under this rule (s). Sec O 20 r 12

**43 [S 269]** Where the property to be attached is movable property, other than agricultural produce, in the possession of the judgment debtor the attachment shall be made by actual seizure, and the attaching officer shall keep the property in his own custody or in the custody of one of his subordinates, and shall be responsible for the due custody thereof

Attachment of movable  
property other than agricul-  
tural produce in posses-  
sion of judgment debtor

movable property, other than agricultural  
produce, in the possession of the judg-  
ment debtor the attachment shall be made  
by actual seizure, and the attaching officer  
shall keep the property in his own custody or in the custody  
of one of his subordinates, and shall be responsible for the  
due custody thereof

Provided that, when the property seized is subject to speedy and natural decay, or when the expense of keeping it in custody is likely to exceed its value, the attaching officer may sell it at once

|   |   |
|---|---|
| (g) Not applicable of the first part of the rule                | (s) Not applicable of the first part of the rule                |
| (r) If the property is in the possession of the judgment debtor | (s) If the property is in the possession of the judgment debtor |
| dh Mol n v G kul Dos (1868) 10                                  | 8 W R 9   |

**Movable property in possession of judgment debtor**—This rule provides for attachment of movable property in the possession of the judgment debtor. As to movable property not in possession of the judgment debtor see r 46 below.

**Attachment by actual seizure**—Where a warrant of attachment is executed by affixing it to the outer door of the warehouse in which goods belonging to the judgment debtor are stored, it amounts to actual seizure within the meaning of the present rule (t).

**Security bond to produce attached property**—Goods attached under this rule by an Amin are made over by him to a third person for safe custody on his passing a bond undertaking to produce them in Court. The surety fails to produce the goods when required by the Court. Is the decree holder entitled to proceed against the surety under s 140 (c)? No according to the Madras High Court there being no order of the Court as contemplated by cl (c) of s 145 (u). Yes according to the Allahabad High Court (t).

**Rateable distribution**—See notes to s 73. **Assets held by a Court** Case H

**44 [New]** Where the property to be attached is agricultural produce, the attachment shall be made by affixing a copy of the warrant of attachment,—

Attachment of agricultural produce

- (a) where such produce is a growing crop, on the land on which such crop has grown, or
- (b) where such produce has been cut or gathered, on the threshing floor or place for treading out grain or the like or fodder stack on or in which it is deposited,

and another copy on the outer door or some other conspicuous part of the house in which the judgment debtor ordinarily resides or, with the leave of the Court, on the outer door or on some other conspicuous part of the house in which he carries on business or personally works for gain or in which he is known to have last resided or carried on business or personally worked for gain, and the produce shall thereupon be deemed to have passed into the possession of the Court.

**Attachment of agricultural produce**—This and the following rule provide for the attachment of agricultural produce. Both these rules are new. Growing crops are under this Code included in the category of movable property [see s 2 cl (13)]. But the procedure relating to the actual seizure of movables cannot be applied in its entirety to growing crops for considerable injury would result to both parties if such crops were allowed to be removed on attachment like other movable property. With a view to prevent such injury and to secure to both parties the fullest value from the property attached, it is enacted by the next following rule that where agricultural produce is attached the Court should make such arrangements for the custody thereof as it may deem sufficient and subject to such conditions as may be imposed by the Court the

(t) *M. H. A. Ch. & B. B. of Madras* (1904)

Mad 316

(u) *Jayaj. f. le. Jayaj. v. S. ra* (1900) 39

*M. d. I. J. 4* 60 I. C. 131

(v) *M. d. I. J. 4* 60 I. C. 131

*L. J. 4* 6 I. C. 19 (1) A. A. 0

judgment debtor should be allowed to continue to perform all acts of husbandry and if he endeavours to defeat the attachment by neglecting the crop the decree holder should be allowed to intervene and protect his interests O 21

45 [Nen] (1) Where agricultural produce is attached, the Court shall make such arrangements for the custody thereof as it may deem sufficient, and, for the purpose of enabling the Court to make such arrangements,

Provisions as to agricultural produce under attachment

every application for the attachment of a growing crop shall specify the time at which it is likely to be fit to be cut or gathered

(2) Subject to such conditions as may be imposed by the Court in this behalf either in the order of attachment or in any subsequent order, the judgment debtor may tend, cut, gather and store the produce and do any other act necessary for maturing or preserving it, and if the judgment debtor fails to do all or any of such acts the decree holder may, with the permission of the Court and subject to the like conditions, do all or any of them either by himself or by any person appointed by him in this behalf, and the costs incurred by the decree holder shall be recoverable from the judgment debtor as if they were included in, or formed part of, the decree

(3) Agricultural produce attached as a growing crop shall not be deemed to have ceased to be under attachment or to require re attachment merely because it has been severed from the soil

(4) Where an order for the attachment of a growing crops has been made at a considerable time before the crop is likely to be fit to be cut or gathered, the Court may suspend the execution of the order for such time as it thinks fit, and may, in its discretion, make a further order prohibiting the removal of the crop pending the execution of the order of attachment

(5) A growing crop which from its nature does not admit of being stored shall not be attached under this rule at any time less than twenty days before the time at which it is likely to be fit to be cut or gathered

Time at which the crop is likely to be cut or gathered—The decree holder should specify in the application for attachment the time at which the crop is likely to be cut or gathered. The object is to enable the Court to make necessary arrange-



ments for the custody of the crop [sub r (1)] If the application is presented within twenty days before the maturity of a crop not lending itself to storage it should be refused [sub r (5)] See notes to r 44 above

Attachment of debt share  
and other property not  
in possession of judgment  
debtor

#### 46 [S 268] (1) In the case of—

- (a) a debt not secured by a negotiable instrument,
- (b) a share in the capital of a corporation,
- (c) other movable property not in the possession of the judgment debtor, except property deposited in or in the custody of, any Court,

the attachment shall be made by a written order prohibiting,—

- (1) in the case of the debt, the creditor from recovering the debt and the debtor from making payment thereof until the further order of the Court,
- (ii) in the case of the share, the person in whose name the share may be standing from transferring the same or receiving any dividend thereon,
- (iii) in the case of the other movable property, except as aforesaid, the person in possession of the same from giving it over to the judgment debtor

(2) A copy of such order shall be fixed on some conspicuous part of the Court house, and another copy shall be sent in the case of the debt to the debtor in the case of the share to the proper officer of the corporation, and, in the case of the other movable property (except as aforesaid), to the person in possession of the same

(3) A debtor prohibited under clause (1) of sub rule (1) may pay the amount of his debt into Court, and such payment shall discharge him as effectually as payment to the party entitled to receive the same

**Attachment of debt.**—A debt cannot be attached unless it is *actually due* from the judgment creditor (judgment debtor's debtor) to the judgment debtor. It may be either presently payable or payable in the future by reason of a *present obligation* (iv). As stated by their Lordships of the Privy Council in the undermentioned case (x) an *existing* debt though payable at a future day may be attached. But only such debts can be attached as the judgment debtor could deal with properly and without violation of the rights of third persons (y). For instances of attachable debt see notes to s 60. Debts

(w) *T. P. v. J. & C.* (1891) 11 R. 100 B. 591 9  
*Ex parte J. & C.* (1893) 11 Q. B. 518  
*Ex parte J. & C.* (1894) 11 C. D. 34  
*Ex parte J. & C.* (1895) 11 C. D. 50  
 All. 10 1 C. 100 (1895) 11 C. D. 193

(x) *Cyprus v. J. & C.* (1891) 11 R. 100 B. 591  
 (y) *B. v. J. & C.* (1894) 11 C. D. 34  
 119 Camp. v. J. & C. (1895) 11 C. D. 415

The following are some of the more important rules relating to the attachment of debts —

1 It is not necessary for the purpose of attaching a debt that the exact amount of the debt should be stated, provided there is a debt *actually due* at the time of attachment. *B* delivers certain goods to his agent *C* for sale. The goods are sold by *C* and the sale proceeds are received by him. In execution of a decree obtained by *A* against *B* *A* may attach the sale proceeds in the hands of *C* though the exact amount due to *B* may not then have been ascertained ( )

2 The attachment of a debt does not prevent the judgment debtor from suing his debtor or from taking any other step necessary for the recovery thereof but he is not entitled to *receive payment* thereof from his debtor unless the claim in respect of which the debt is attached is first satisfied. *C* owes a debt to *B*. The debt is attached in execution of a decree obtained by *A* against *B*. This does not preclude *B* from suing *C* to recover the debt or from *prosecuting the suit* if a suit has already been instituted but he cannot receive payment of the debt from *C* unless he first satisfies *A* a decree (a) See sub rule (1) cl (i)

**Attachment of mortgage debt**—*A* executes a mortgage of immovable property to *B* to secure payment of Rs 5000 lent to him by *B*. It is provided by the mortgage bond that if *A* fails to pay the mortgage debt on the due date *B* should have the right to sue *A* personally for the debt and also to realise the debt by the sale of the mortgaged property. In such a case *B*'s interest in the mortgage bond comprises (1) the right to sue *A* personally for the mortgage debt and (2) the right to realise the debt by *sale of the mortgaged property*. If *C* obtains a decree against *B* for Rs 5000 and asks in execution of the decree to attach the mortgage debt due to *B* how is the attachment effected? Is the mortgage debt a debt not secured by a negotiable instrument within the meaning of this rule and attachable in the mode prescribed by this rule or being secured by a mortgage of immovable property is it immovable property within the meaning of rule 4 and attachable in the mode prescribed by that rule? The answer afforded by the decisions on the subject eliminating what are merely *obiter dicta* (b) is that a mortgage debt is a debt within the meaning of this rule and it is therefore to be attached in the manner prescribed by this rule. Again if the mortgage debt due to *B* is attached under this rule in execution of *C*'s decree and sold in execution and purchased by *F* what are the rights of *F*? The answer is that they are the same as those of *B* the mortgagee. *F* may sue *A* for a personal decree against him. He may also sue him for a decree for the *sale* of the mortgaged property (c). It does not make any difference that the mortgage bond gives a right to the mortgagee to enter into possession and that he is in possession at the date of the attachment (d). The cases referred to above were all cases either of a simple mortgage or of a hypothecation bond. As regards usufructuary mortgage it was held by the High Court of Bombay in a case where the bond provided that the mortgagee was to enjoy the profits in lieu of interest for ten years and that the mortgage was to be redeemed on the expiration of the term by payment of the mortgage debt that there was no debt which the mortgagee was entitled to recover at the date of the attachment and that the interest of the mortgagee could only be attached in the mode

- (2) *M H D & I of* (1894) 16 All 786  
( ) *N h & gh & s r r* (1891) 13 All 6  
*B t i & C H d o r of P t r* (189 ) 17 All  
194 1 & 31  
(b) *t p i a r & v s o f f* (1896) 9 Mad 54  
*v J r i h o m* (189 ) 10 M L J 169  
(c) *F r o m v P h C T* (1893) 15 All  
134 *D b e d r a K a m a r v P u p L I* (1895)  
1 Cal 48 *A n t h D a v S a l l e*

- (1893) 30 Cal 60 *B l l e v P a h a l*  
(189 ) 19 Bom 11 *T r o d B J a h i*  
(190 ) 6 Bom 30 *M p p a v s b*  
*m a* (189 ) 18 Mad 437 *N o t j a v*  
*T h S o t h f a* *B a l* (1914) 3 M L J  
15 131 ( ) *L a l F u s o v L I v g h*  
(19 ) All L J 840 843 841 & 840  
( ) 4 A 95  
(d) *C h H i v O h a m* (1914) M L J 39  
61 & 508

prescribed by r 4 for attachment of immovable property (c) This case was distinguished in a Madras case where the period having already expired the amount of the loan had become payable which it was said could only be attached as a d b<sup>2</sup> (f)

**Attachment of debt after delivery of cheque**—A gave a cheque to B for work done before the cheque was presented by B for payment X who had obtained a decree against B attached in A's hands the amount due by him to B Held that A having handed over the cheque to B the payment was complete and that there was no debt due by A to B which could be attached (g)

**Procedure where garnishee denies debt**—Where the garnishee denies the debt it is not the business of the Court to inquire if the debt is really due (h) and the decree holder may have it sold, or he may have a receiver appointed under s 51 with power to him to sue the garnishee to recover the debt from him (i) As to release of debt from attachment see notes to O 21 r 58 Rules 53 to 63 apply to debts also A decree holder is not entitled to recover from the garnishee more than what the judgment debtor himself could recover from the garnishee (j)

**Procedure when garnishee admits debt**—If the garnishee admits the debt the Court may order payment of the debt or so much of it as is admitted to be due into Court (k) But the Court cannot make an order on the garnishee before the debt has become payable (l) If a cross debt is due to the garnishee from the judgment debtor at the date of the attachment the garnishee is entitled to set it off against the amount due by him (l)

In a case where the debt was fraudulently sold at an undervalue with the connivance of the judgment debtor although the garnishee was willing to pay the amount into Court it was held that the remedy of the decree holders claiming rateable distribution was a suit for compensation (m)

**Procedure where garnishee resides outside jurisdiction and debt also is payable outside jurisdiction**—It is not competent to a Court under this rule to issue a prohibitory order upon a person resident outside the limits of its jurisdiction in respect of property which also is beyond such limits Thus where A obtains a decree in the Court of Bardwan against B residing in Bardwan and there is a debt due to B from C who resides in Calcutta the debt being also payable in Calcutta the proper course for A to adopt if he seeks to attach the debt is to apply to the Bardwan Court to issue a prohibitory order upon B prohibiting him from recovering the debt and also to apply to that Court to transfer the decree for execution to the Calcutta Court and, after the decree is so transferred to apply to the Calcutta Court to issue a prohibitory order upon C prohibiting C from paying the debt to B (n)

**Claims over which Courts in British India have no jurisdiction** e.g. a debt due to the judgment debtor from a non resident foreigner in respect of which no suit could be brought by the judgment debtor in a British Indian Court are not debts liable to be attached under this rule (o) But where a judgment is recovered in the High Court of Bombay against a foreign corporation which submitted to jurisdiction and a bank in Bombay owes the Corporation a debt payable in Bombay the High Court of Bombay has jurisdiction to attach the debt and direct the bank to pay the amount of the debt into Court (p)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| (e) <i>M/s I v Motibhai</i> (1911) 35 Bom 229 10 I C 81*                               | (i) <i>Jeth v D g d H</i> (1907) 9 Bom L R 416 10 <sup>th</sup> I C 418 ( ) A 11 365  |
| (f) <i>Kamams v Sri nasa</i> (1916) 32 Mad 329 31 C 34                                 | (j) <i>Tyball v Alma am</i> (1914) 33 Bom 631 25 I C 35   |
| (g) <i>Bhoyandas v Abdul Husein</i> (18 9) 3 Bom 43                                    | (k) <i>N d k Ch d v Chheda Lal</i> (1907) 9 I C 46 ( ) A A 41   |
| (h) <i>M/s D w l n v Hoe To</i> (19 6) 4 Rang 100 9 I C 24 (1908) A 11 15              | (l) <i>Begg Dunlop &amp; Co v Jaga wath</i> (191 ) 32 Cal 104 11 I C 417 <i>Bank of Bengal v Saras</i> (1919) 41 Cal L J 141 45 I C 943 |
| (i) <i>Toodas v Anto</i> (190 ) 11 Bom 445   | (m) <i>Chhambhal v Bhambhal</i> (1841) 5 Bom 49   |
| (j) <i>Imare dra v D Ra rjee &amp; Co</i> (19 1) 40 Cal L J 24 84 I C 100 ( ) A C 1015 | (n) <i>Swiss Bank Corporation v Hoehmiarks Indu trial Ba k</i> (19 3) 1 A 11 673  |

**Shares**—A deed of transfer of shares in a company which does not comply with the formalities prescribed by the Indian Companies Act and the Articles of Association of the Company is invalid as against a subsequent purchaser of the shares in execution of a decree against the shareholder (q) See rr 79 and 80 below

**Life policy**—Where a life policy is payable on proof to the satisfaction of the directors of the death of the assured the policy amount cannot be said to be a debt due by the company before such proof is given (r)

**Sub rule (3) payment into Court**—A obtains a decree against B In execution of the decree A attaches a debt due ostensibly from C to D but alleged by A to be in reality due from C to B In such a case if the Court orders the amount of the debt to be paid into Court it is incumbent upon the Court to provide by its order that the money when deposited should not be paid to the decree holder [A] until adjudication of the question as to who is entitled to the money B or D (s)

**Garnishee order—Company in liquidation**—Where a judgment is recovered against a company which is in voluntary liquidation the invariable practice of the Courts is to stay execution of the judgment unless there are very exceptional reasons for exercising its discretion otherwise Thus if A obtains a decree against a limited company and the company thereafter goes into liquidation and a debt is due by D to the company the debt forms part of the general assets of the Company and is divisible among the creditors *pari passu* and for this reason A is not entitled to a garnishee order against D (t)

**47 [New]** Where the property to be attached consists of the share or interest of the judgment debtor in movable property belonging to him and another as co owners, the attachment shall be made by a notice to the judgment debtor prohibiting him from transferring the share or interest or charging it in any way

Attachment of share in movables

**Attachment of share in movables**—This rule is new It provides for the attachment of a share or interest in movable property belonging to the judgment debtor and others in co ownership Such a share or interest is obviously incapable of actual seizure and provision has therefore been made for the issue to the judgment debtor of a notice prohibiting him from transferring his share or interest in any way

**48 [New]** (1) Where the property to be attached is the salary or allowances of a public officer or of a servant of a railway company or local authority, the Court, whether the judgment debtor or the disbursing officer is or is not within the local limits of the Court's jurisdiction, may order that the amount shall, subject to the provisions of section 60, be withheld from such salary or

Attachment of salary or allowances of public officer or servant of railway company or local authority

(q) *Nagabhi Shyam v Parnachand* a (19 ) 45 Mad 53 O I C 659 ( 3) A M 41

(r) *John v Samba ul* (19 9) 56 Mad LJ 99 ( 9) A M 317

(s) *Hari Nath v Haradas* (1916) 43 Cal 69 9 I C 530

(t) *Anglo-Eastern & India Ry Co Ltd v East & Co* [19 4] 2 K B 410

allowances either in one payment or by monthly instalments as the Court may direct, and, upon notice of the order to such officer as the Government may, by notification in the Gazette of India or in the local official Gazette, as the case may be, appoint in this behalf, the officer or other person whose duty it is to disburse such salary or allowances shall withhold and remit to the Court the amount due under the order, or the monthly instalments, as the case may be.

(2) Where the attachable proportion of such salary or allowances is already being withheld and remitted to a Court in pursuance of a previous and unsatisfied order of attachment, the officer appointed by the Government in this behalf shall forthwith return the subsequent order to the Court issuing it with a full statement of all the particulars of the existing attachment.

(3) Every order made under this rule, unless it is returned in accordance with the provisions of sub rule (2), shall, without further notice or other process, bind the Government or the Railway Company or local authority as the case may be, while the judgment debtor is within the local limits to which this Code for the time being extends and while he is beyond those limits if he is in receipt of any salary or allowances payable out of His Majesty's Indian revenues or the funds of railway company carrying on business in any part of British India or local authority in British India, and the Government or the railway company or local authority, as the case may be, shall be liable for any sum paid in contravention of this rule.

**Attachment of salary of public officer et c.**—This rule is new. It provides a special procedure for the attachment of the salary of public officer, railway servants and servants of local authorities. The rule follows upon the lines of section 141 sub-section (3) of the Army Act (44 and 45 Vict. c. 59) which it may be observed applied only to officers of the army. Under the Code of 1842 the salary of a public officer or railway servant could not be attached unless the disbursing officer was within the local limits of the jurisdiction of the Court executing the decree (v). This led to considerable inconvenience in the execution of decrees and put the decree holder in many cases to an enormous expense. The present rule substitutes a less expensive and at the same time more effective machinery for the execution of decrees against this class of judgment debtors. Under it the salary of a public officer or a railway servant of a local authority may be attached whether the judgment debtor is the disbursing officer or not and it is then the local limits of the jurisdiction of the Court executing the decree to which a decree is transferred for execution has the same power (r) as to how much of the salary of such persons may be attached see s. 60 (1) (h) and (i).

|          |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
|----------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| (1) 1904 | 1905 | 1906 | 1907 | 1908 | 1909 | 1910 | 1911 | 1912 | 1913 | 1914 | 1915 | 1916 | 1917 | 1918 | 1919 | 1920 | 1921 | 1922 | 1923 | 1924 | 1925 | 1926 | 1927 | 1928 | 1929 | 1930 | 1931 | 1932 | 1933 | 1934 | 1935 | 1936 | 1937 | 1938 | 1939 | 1940 | 1941 | 1942 | 1943 | 1944 | 1945 | 1946 | 1947 | 1948 | 1949 | 1950 | 1951 | 1952 | 1953 | 1954 | 1955 | 1956 | 1957 | 1958 | 1959 | 1960 | 1961 | 1962 | 1963 | 1964 | 1965 | 1966 | 1967 | 1968 | 1969 | 1970 | 1971 | 1972 | 1973 | 1974 | 1975 | 1976 | 1977 | 1978 | 1979 | 1980 | 1981 | 1982 | 1983 | 1984 | 1985 | 1986 | 1987 | 1988 | 1989 | 1990 | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 | 2026 | 2027 | 2028 | 2029 | 2030 | 2031 | 2032 | 2033 | 2034 | 2035 | 2036 | 2037 | 2038 | 2039 | 2040 | 2041 | 2042 | 2043 | 2044 | 2045 | 2046 | 2047 | 2048 | 2049 | 2050 | 2051 | 2052 | 2053 | 2054 | 2055 | 2056 | 2057 | 2058 | 2059 | 2060 | 2061 | 2062 | 2063 | 2064 | 2065 | 2066 | 2067 | 2068 | 2069 | 2070 | 2071 | 2072 | 2073 | 2074 | 2075 | 2076 | 2077 | 2078 | 2079 | 2080 | 2081 | 2082 | 2083 | 2084 | 2085 | 2086 | 2087 | 2088 | 2089 | 2090 | 2091 | 2092 | 2093 | 2094 | 2095 | 2096 | 2097 | 2098 | 2099 | 2100 | 2101 | 2102 | 2103 | 2104 | 2105 | 2106 | 2107 | 2108 | 2109 | 2110 | 2111 | 2112 | 2113 | 2114 | 2115 | 2116 | 2117 | 2118 | 2119 | 2120 | 2121 | 2122 | 2123 | 2124 | 2125 | 2126 | 2127 | 2128 | 2129 | 2130 | 2131 | 2132 | 2133 | 2134 | 2135 | 2136 | 2137 | 2138 | 2139 | 2140 | 2141 | 2142 | 2143 | 2144 | 2145 | 2146 | 2147 | 2148 | 2149 | 2150 | 2151 | 2152 | 2153 | 2154 | 2155 | 2156 | 2157 | 2158 | 2159 | 2160 | 2161 | 2162 | 2163 | 2164 | 2165 | 2166 | 2167 | 2168 | 2169 | 2170 | 2171 | 2172 | 2173 | 2174 | 2175 | 2176 | 2177 | 2178 | 2179 | 2180 | 2181 | 2182 | 2183 | 2184 | 2185 | 2186 | 2187 | 2188 | 2189 | 2190 | 2191 | 2192 | 2193 | 2194 | 2195 | 2196 | 2197 | 2198 | 2199 | 2200 | 2201 | 2202 | 2203 | 2204 | 2205 | 2206 | 2207 | 2208 | 2209 | 2210 | 2211 | 2212 | 2213 | 2214 | 2215 | 2216 | 2217 | 2218 | 2219 | 2220 | 2221 | 2222 | 2223 | 2224 | 2225 | 2226 | 2227 | 2228 | 2229 | 2230 | 2231 | 2232 | 2233 | 2234 | 2235 | 2236 | 2237 | 2238 | 2239 | 2240 | 2241 | 2242 | 2243 | 2244 | 2245 | 2246 | 2247 | 2248 | 2249 | 2250 | 2251 | 2252 | 2253 | 2254 | 2255 | 2256 | 2257 | 2258 | 2259 | 2260 | 2261 | 2262 | 2263 | 2264 | 2265 | 2266 | 2267 | 2268 | 2269 | 2270 | 2271 | 2272 | 2273 | 2274 | 2275 | 2276 | 2277 | 2278 | 2279 | 2280 | 2281 | 2282 | 2283 | 2284 | 2285 | 2286 | 2287 | 2288 | 2289 | 2290 | 2291 | 2292 | 2293 | 2294 | 2295 | 2296 | 2297 | 2298 | 2299 | 2300 | 2301 | 2302 | 2303 | 2304 | 2305 | 2306 | 2307 | 2308 | 2309 | 2310 | 2311 | 2312 | 2313 | 2314 | 2315 | 2316 | 2317 | 2318 | 2319 | 2320 | 2321 | 2322 | 2323 | 2324 | 2325 | 2326 | 2327 | 2328 | 2329 | 2330 | 2331 | 2332 | 2333 | 2334 | 2335 | 2336 | 2337 | 2338 | 2339 | 2340 | 2341 | 2342 | 2343 | 2344 | 2345 | 2346 | 2347 | 2348 | 2349 | 2350 | 2351 | 2352 | 2353 | 2354 | 2355 | 2356 | 2357 | 2358 | 2359 | 2360 | 2361 | 2362 | 2363 | 2364 | 2365 | 2366 | 2367 | 2368 | 2369 | 2370 | 2371 | 2372 | 2373 | 2374 | 2375 | 2376 | 2377 | 2378 | 2379 | 2380 | 2381 | 2382 | 2383 | 2384 | 2385 | 2386 | 2387 | 2388 | 2389 | 2390 | 2391 | 2392 | 2393 | 2394 | 2395 | 2396 | 2397 | 2398 | 2399 | 2400 | 2401 | 2402 | 2403 | 2404 | 2405 | 2406 | 2407 | 2408 | 2409 | 2410 | 2411 | 2412 | 2413 | 2414 | 2415 | 2416 | 2417 | 2418 | 2419 | 2420 | 2421 | 2422 | 2423 | 2424 | 2425 | 2426 | 2427 | 2428 | 2429 | 2430 | 2431 | 2432 | 2433 | 2434 | 2435 | 2436 | 2437 | 2438 | 2439 | 2440 | 2441 | 2442 | 2443 | 2444 | 2445 | 2446 | 2447 | 2448 | 2449 | 2450 | 2451 | 2452 | 2453 | 2454 | 2455 | 2456 | 2457 | 2458 | 2459 | 2460 | 2461 | 2462 | 2463 | 2464 | 2465 | 2466 | 2467 | 2468 | 2469 | 2470 | 2471 | 2472 | 2473 | 2474 | 2475 | 2476 | 2477 | 2478 | 2479 | 2480 | 2481 | 2482 | 2483 | 2484 | 2485 | 2486 | 2487 | 2488 | 2489 | 2490 | 2491 | 2492 | 2493 | 2494 | 2495 | 2496 | 2497 | 2498 | 2499 | 2500 | 2501 | 2502 | 2503 | 2504 | 2505 | 2506 | 2507 | 2508 | 2509 | 2510 | 2511 | 2512 | 2513 | 2514 | 2515 | 2516 | 2517 | 2518 | 2519 | 2520 | 2521 | 2522 | 2523 | 2524 | 2525 | 2526 | 2527 | 2528 | 2529 | 2530 | 2531 | 2532 | 2533 | 2534 | 2535 | 2536 | 2537 | 2538 | 2539 | 2540 | 2541 | 2542 | 2543 | 2544 | 2545 | 2546 | 2547 | 2548 | 2549 | 2550 | 2551 | 2552 | 2553 | 2554 | 2555 | 2556 | 2557 | 2558 | 2559 | 2560 | 2561 | 2562 | 2563 | 2564 | 2565 | 2566 | 2567 | 2568 | 2569 | 2570 | 2571 | 2572 | 2573 | 2574 | 2575 | 2576 | 2577 | 2578 | 2579 | 2580 | 2581 | 2582 | 2583 | 2584 | 2585 | 2586 | 2587 | 2588 | 2589 | 2590 | 2591 | 2592 | 2593 | 2594 | 2595 | 2596 | 2597 | 2598 | 2599 | 2600 | 2601 | 2602 | 2603 | 2604 | 2605 | 2606 | 2607 | 2608 | 2609 | 2610 | 2611 | 2612 | 2613 | 2614 | 2615 | 2616 | 2617 | 2618 | 2619 | 2620 | 2621 | 2622 | 2623 | 2624 | 2625 | 2626 | 2627 | 2628 | 2629 | 2630 | 2631 | 2632 | 2633 | 2634 | 2635 | 2636 | 2637 | 2638 | 2639 | 2640 | 2641 | 2642 | 2643 | 2644 | 2645 | 2646 | 2647 | 2648 | 2649 | 2650 | 2651 | 2652 | 2653 | 2654 | 2655 | 2656 | 2657 | 2658 | 2659 | 2660 | 2661 | 2662 | 2663 | 2664 | 2665 | 2666 | 2667 | 2668 | 2669 | 2670 | 2671 | 2672 | 2673 | 2674 | 2675 | 2676 | 2677 | 2678 | 2679 | 2680 | 2681 | 2682 | 2683 | 2684 | 2685 | 2686 | 2687 | 2688 | 2689 | 2690 | 2691 | 2692 | 2693 | 2694 | 2695 | 2696 | 2697 | 2698 | 2699 | 2700 | 2701 | 2702 | 2703 | 2704 | 2705 | 2706 | 2707 | 2708 | 2709 | 2710 | 2711 | 2712 | 2713 | 2714 | 2715 | 2716 | 2717 | 2718 | 2719 | 2720 | 2721 | 2722 | 2723 | 2724 | 2725 | 2726 | 2727 | 2728 | 2729 | 2730 | 2731 | 2732 | 2733 | 2734 | 2735 | 2736 | 2737 | 2738 | 2739 | 2740 | 2741 | 2742 | 2743 | 2744 | 2745 | 2746 | 2747 | 2748 | 2749 | 2750 | 2751 | 2752 | 2753 | 2754 | 2755 | 2756 | 2757 | 2758 | 2759 | 2760 | 2761 | 2762 | 2763 | 2764 | 2765 | 2766 | 2767 | 2768 | 2769 | 2770 | 2771 | 2772 | 2773 | 2774 | 2775 | 2776 | 2777 | 2778 | 2779 | 2780 | 2781 | 2782 | 2783 | 2784 | 2785 | 2786 | 2787 | 2788 | 2789 | 2790 | 2791 | 2792 | 2793 | 2794 | 2795 | 2796 | 2797 | 2798 | 2799 | 2800 | 2801 | 2802 | 2803 | 2804 | 2805 | 2806 | 2807 | 2808 | 2809 | 2810 | 2811 | 2812 | 2813 | 2814 | 2815 | 2816 | 2817 | 2818 | 2819 | 2820 | 2821 | 2822 | 2823 | 2824 | 2825 | 2826 | 2827 | 2828 | 2829 | 2830 | 2831 | 2832 | 2833 | 2834 | 2835 | 2836 | 2837 | 2838 | 2839 | 2840 | 2841 | 2842 | 2843 | 2844 | 2845 | 2846 | 2847 | 2848 | 2849 | 2850 | 2851 | 2852 | 2853 | 2854 | 2855 | 2856 | 2857 | 2858 | 2859 | 2860 | 2861 | 2862 | 2863 | 2864 | 2865 | 2866 | 2867 | 2868 | 2869 | 2870 | 2871 | 2872 | 2873 | 2874 | 2875 | 2876 | 2877 | 2878 | 2879 | 2880 | 2881 | 2882 | 2883 | 2884 | 2885 | 2886 | 2887 | 2888 | 2889 | 2890 | 2891 | 2892 | 2893 | 2894 | 2895 | 2896 | 2897 | 2898 | 2899 | 2900 | 2901 | 2902 | 2903 | 2904 | 2905 | 2906 | 2907 | 2908 | 2909 | 2910 | 2911 | 2912 | 2913 | 2914 | 2915 | 2916 | 2917 | 2918 | 2919 | 2920 | 2921 | 2922 | 2923 | 2924 | 2925 | 2926 | 2927 | 2928 | 2929 | 2930 | 2931 | 2932 | 2933 | 2934 | 2935 | 2936 | 2937 | 2938 | 2939 | 2940 | 2941 | 2942 | 2943 | 2944 | 2945 | 2946 | 2947 | 2948 | 2949 | 2950 | 2951 | 2952 | 2953 | 2954 | 2955 | 2956 | 2957 | 2958 | 2959 | 2960 | 2961 | 2962 | 2963 | 2964 | 2965 | 2966 | 2967 | 2968 | 2969 | 2970 | 2971 | 2972 | 2973 | 2974 | 2975 | 2976 | 2977 | 2978 | 2979 | 2980 | 2981 | 2982 | 2983 | 2984 | 2985 | 2986 | 2987 | 2988 | 2989 | 2990 | 2991 | 2992 | 2993 | 2994 | 2995 | 2996 | 2997 | 2998 | 2999 | 3000 |
|----------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|

**Sub rule (3) Liability of Government**—Sub r (3) provides that if an attachment order is not returned in accordance with the provisions of sub r (2) the Government shall be liable for such sum as should have been stopped out of the judgment debtor pay. But no order can be made against the Government unless the Government is on the record (u)

**49** [New 53 & 54 Vict, c 39 s 23 RSC, O 46, rr 1A and 1B] (1) Save as otherwise provided by this rule, property belonging to a partnership shall not be attached or sold in execution of a decree other than a decree passed against the firm or against the partners in the firm as such

(2) The Court may, on the application of the holder of a decree against a partner, make an order charging the interest of such partner in the partnership property and profits with payment of the amount due under the decree, and may, by the same or a subsequent order, appoint a receiver of the share of such partner in the profits (whether already declared or accruing) and of any other money which may be coming to him in respect of the partnership, and direct accounts and inquiries and make an order for the sale of such interest or other order as might have been directed or made if a charge had been made in favour of the decree holder by such partner, or as the circumstances of the case may require

(3) The other partner or partners shall be at liberty at any time to redeem the interest charged or, in the case of a sale being directed, to purchase the same

(4) Every application for an order under sub rule (2) shall be served on the judgment debtor and on his partners or such of them as are within British India

(5) Every application made by any partner of the judgment debtor under sub rule (3) shall be served on the decree holder and on the judgment debtor, and on such of the other partners as do not join in the application and as are within British India

(6) Service under sub rule (4) or sub rule (5) shall be deemed to be service on all the partners, and all orders made on such applications shall be similarly served

**Attachment of partnership property**—This rule is new. The first three sub rules are a reproduction of the English Partnership Act 1890 [53 and 54 Vict 9]

s 23 The last three rules correspond to O 46 rr 1A and 1B of the English Rules As to suits by and against firms see O 30 below

This rule provides that no execution can issue against any *partnership property* except on a decree passed *against the firm or against the partners in the firm as such* (x) but a judgment-creditor of a partner in a firm may apply for an order charging *that partner's interest* and for a receiver. The share of a partner in a partnership business is liable to attachment under s 60 (y). See notes to r 50 under the head Where decree has been passed against a firm

**Against the partners in the firm as such**—The words in sub r (1) do not occur in s 23 of the English Partnership Act. They have been added to show that the operation of this rule is not ousted by the mere circumstance that the decree is passed not against the firm but against the partners constituting it where the partners have been sued as such.

**Direct accounts**—It has been held in England under the Partnership Act s 23 sub s 2 of which sub r (2) is a reproduction that the discretion given to *direct accounts* should only be exercised under special circumstances as for instance with a view to a dissolution. The decision is based upon the words *if a charge* had been made in favour of the decree holder by such partner. These words it has been said should be read with s 31 sub s 1 of the English Partnership Act which provides that an assignment by a partner of his share in the partnership either *absolute or by way of charge* does not as against the other partners entitle the assignee during the continuance of the partnership to require *any accounts* of the partnership transaction but entitle the assignee only to receive the share of the profits of the assigning partner and the assignee must accept the account of profits agreed to by the partners. Relying upon these provisions Pigby L J said I think it plain that the intention of the legislature was that *under ordinary circumstances* in dealing with a case under sub 2 of s 23 [sub r (2) of this rule] the analogy of an assignment by a partner of his share should be adhered to ( )

**Charging order and insolvency**—A charging order under this rule upon a judgment debtor's interest in a partnership being a proceeding *in invitum* is not a transaction protected by s 5 of the Presidency towns Insolvency Act (a).

### 50 [New R S C O 43A r 9] (1)

Where a decree has been passed against a firm execution may be granted—

- (a) against any property of the partnership,
- (b) against any person who has appeared in his own name under rule 6 or rule 7 of Order XXX, or who has admitted on the pleadings that he is, or who has been adjudged to be, a partner,
- (c) against any person who has been individually served as a partner with a summons and has failed to appear

Execution of decree against firm

(x) The same was the law before the present Code came into force. *Karimulla v Co. errator of Forest* (18 9) 4 Bom 60.  
(y) *Jagat Chunder v Inu Chunder* (1893) 6 Cal 693

(z) *Brown Jenson & Co v Hutchins & Co* [189] 1 Q B 116

(a) *Wild v Southwood* [189] 1 Q B 31  
Provincial Insolvency Act 19 0 s 55

Provided that nothing in this sub rule shall be deemed to limit or otherwise affect the provisions of section 247 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872

(2) Where the decree holder claims to be entitled to cause the decree to be executed against any person other than such a person as is referred to in sub rule (1), clauses (b) and (c) as being a partner in the firm, he may apply to the Court which passed the decree for leave, and where the liability is not disputed, such Court may grant such leave, or where such liability is disputed, may order that the liability of such person be tried and determined in any manner in which any issue in a suit may be tried and determined

(3) Where the liability of any person has been tried and determined under sub rule (2), the order made thereon shall have the same force and be subject to the same conditions as to appeal or otherwise as if it were a decree

(4) Save as against any property of the partnership, a decree against a firm shall not release, render liable or otherwise affect any partner therein unless he has been served with a summons to appear and answer

Scope of the rule—This rule is new. It is a reproduction of O 48A r 8 of the English Rules. Execution under this rule can only be granted where a decree has been passed against a firm. A decree passed against a firm must perforce be in the firm's name. Under this rule execution may be granted against the partnership property. It may also be granted against the partners in which case the decree holder may proceed against the separate property of the partners. It must not be supposed however that where a decree has been passed against a firm execution will be granted as a matter of course against all the partners. In certain cases special leave is necessary to issue execution against a partner. It is only when execution is applied for against a person referred to in sub r (1) cl (b) and (c) that it will be granted as of course. But where execution is sought against any other person alleged to be a partner the decree holder must apply to the Court which passed the decree for leave to execute the decree against him. Thus if in a suit against a firm a person has been individually served as a partner with the writ of summons but fails to appear at the hearing and a decree is passed against the firm the decree holder is entitled to execution against him as a matter of course see cl (c) of sub r (1). But a decree holder is not entitled to execution as of course against a person who is sought to be made liable as a partner but who was not served with the summons and who did not appear at the hearing. In such a case the decree holder must apply for leave to execute the decree against such person. If such person admits the liability the Court may grant leave without further inquiry (b). But if he disputes the liability the Court may direct an issue to determine whether he was a partner or held him self out to be a partner in the defendant firm (c). These rules follow from the peculiar nature of a suit against a firm and from the special rules as to service of summons in such a suit. To understand the present rule it is necessary to peruse rules 36 and 37 of Order 30. The

(b) *Jagdish Chandra v. Ganga* (1955) 3 Cal 14 | (c) *Doe v. Hyman & Co* [1903] 1 KB 84  
1909 L.C. 84 (6) A.C. 1



important point to note is that where persons are sued as partners *in the name of their firm* it is not necessary that the summons should be served upon each one of them or indeed upon any one of them—it may be served upon any one or more of the partners or at the principal place of the firm's business *upon any person having the control or management of the business though he may not be a partner*

Where a decree has been passed against a firm—Execution under this rule can only be granted where a decree has been passed against a firm in the firm's name. A decree cannot be passed against a firm unless the suit is against partners in the name of their firm. And conversely where a suit is against partners in the name of their firm the decree must be against the firm in the firm's name. See O 30 r 6 and notes

Against any property of the partnership—Property belonging to a partnership shall not be attached or sold in execution of a decree other than a decree passed against the firm or against the partners in the firm as such. See r 49 (1) above

Against any person who has appeared—See O 30 rr 3 5 6 and 7 and notes

Against any person who has been individually served—See O 30 r 5 and notes

Sub rule (2) Leave to issue execution—Order 30 deals with suits by or against firms. Rule 1 provides that two or more persons being liable as co partners may be sued in the firm's name. It does not matter that the firm is dissolved at the date of the suit so long as the claim in respect of which the suit is brought arose during the continuance of the partnership (d). But where a firm is dissolved *to the knowledge of the plaintiff* before the institution of the suit the plaintiff is bound to serve the summons upon every partner within British India whom it is sought to make liable as provided by O 30 r 3. No order can be made under sub rule (2) against a former partner who has to the knowledge of the plaintiff left the firm before the institution of the suit. The reason is that O 30 r 3 overrides sub r (2) of the present rule. Sub r (2) applies only where there has been no dissolution or none to the knowledge of the plaintiff. Where there has been a dissolution to the knowledge of the plaintiff an outgoing partner cannot be made liable unless he has been served with the summons in accordance with the proviso to rule 3 of Order 30 (e).

O 21 r 50 is not controlled by O 30 r 2 (3). A suit is brought by a firm against A. On A's application the names of the partners of the firm are disclosed by the attorneys for the firm under O 30 r 2. A then files a counter claim against the firm. The firm's suit is dismissed and a decree is passed against the firm on the counter claim. A takes out execution against X whose name was given by the firm's attorneys as one of the partners of the firm. X denies that he was a partner and says that he did not instruct the firm's attorneys to give his name as a partner. There is nothing in the provisions of O 30 r 2 (3) to preclude X from raising this contention and the question whether he is a partner or not should be decided in the manner provided by O 21 r 50 (2) (f).

Execution against legal representatives—If a partner has died the suit against firm cannot include the legal representatives of the deceased partner though they may be added as defendants and served with summons under O 30 r 3 if it is sought to make the separate estate of the deceased partner liable. Sub rule (2) which is subject to O 30 r 3 does not empower the Court to give leave to execute the decree against the legal representatives (g). If a decree against a firm makes a partner personally liable under

(d) *Ell v Wade* on [1899] 1 Q B 11 16

(e) *Wigam v Cox Sons Buckle & Co* [1894] 1 Q B 9

(f) *Natravati v Sa soon & Co* (19 7) 51 Bom 94 101 I C 6, (-7) A B 447  
(g) *Mithu ud v Fbrahm* (19 ) 51 Bom 998 10 I C 81 (-) A B 581

sub rule (1) (a) or (1) (b) it may be executed against his legal representatives after O 21, r 2  
notice under r 22 (h)

Issue to determine liability —See notes above Scope of the rule

Court which passed the decree —See notes below Award

Where decree transferred for execution —An ex parte order under sub rule (2) granting leave to execute the decree and transferring the decree for execution to another Court does not preclude the transferee Court from determining the question whether the decree transferred was a nullity (1)

Sub rule (3) —An ex parte order made under sub rule (2) above is not within sub rule (3) Sub rule contemplates an order where the liability has been tried and determined (j)

Sub rule (4) —This sub rule relates to persons other than those referred to in sub r (1) cls (b) and (c) The summons to appear and answer in sub r (4) does not mean the writ of summons It means a summons or a notice to appear and answer the application specified in sub r (2) The object of sub r (4) is to give an opportunity to a person against whom the decree holder seeks to execute the decree other than such a person as is referred to in sub r (1) cls (b) and (c) of disputing his liability as a partner if he desires to do so (k)

Minor partner —The proviso to sub r (1) declares that nothing in that sub rule should be deemed to limit or otherwise affect the provisions of section 247 of the Contract Act The combined effect of that section and the present rule is that where a decree has been passed against a firm containing a minor who is admitted to the benefits of a partnership execution may be granted against the property of the firm including the share of such minor in the property of the firm but it cannot be granted against the separate property of the minor Having regard to the definition of a firm in s 39 of the Contract Act and to a minor's inability to contract the share of such minor in the property of the firm mentioned in s 247 is merely his right to participate in the property of the firm after its obligations have been discharged (l)

Award —It has been held by the High Courts of Calcutta (1) and Allahabad (n) that an award against a firm filed under s 11 of the Indian Arbitration Act 1899 stands on the same footing as a decree and that the provisions of this rule apply to such an award In the case of an award the Court which passed the decree referred to in sub r (2) is the Court in which the award is filed (o) The High Court of Allahabad has held relying on s 4 of the Code that where an award is sent for execution by one Court to another the latter Court has the power to try the issue as to partnership under sub r (2) (p)

Insolvency of firm —Where a decree has been passed against a firm execution may be taken out against any partner who was served with the summons The insolvency of the firm is no bar to execution against individual partners (q)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>(h) <i>Jagdish Chandra Chandra C</i> (19 6) 1 Cal 14<br/>91 I C 84 ( 5) A C 1</p> <p>(i) <i>Attorney General v. The East India Co</i> (19 9) All I J<br/>553 115 I C 86 ( 9) A A 390</p> <p>(j) (19 9) 7 All I J 53 11 I C 86 ( 9)<br/>A A 390 s pra</p> <p>(k) <i>Jagdish Chandra Chandra C</i> (19 6) 53 C 1 14<br/>0 1 91 I C 84 ( 5) A C 71<br/><i>Jagdish Chandra Chandra C</i> (19 9) 11 I C 86<br/>1037 68 I C 67 ( 3) A B 66 M 1 R<br/>d v. <i>For the</i> (19 7) 51 Bom 96 10<br/>I C 84 ( 5) A B 51</p> <p>(l) <i>Sanyal</i> (1) M 11 A 11/11</p> | <p><i>Id. v. (19 9) 49 I A 104 49 Cal 560</i><br/><i>Id. v. (1 4) A A 11 3</i></p> <p>(n) <i>Lois Dr. v. Co</i> (19 9) 11 I C 86<br/>4 ( 1) 9 61 I C 3 (1 d to 11 d<br/>C 10 b (19 3) C W 666</p> <p>(o) <i>Id. v. (19 3) 11 I C 86</i><br/>43 A 11 394 61 I C 401 ( 1) A A 199</p> <p>(p) (19 3) C W 666 665 I C 86<br/>( 4) A C 117 s</p> <p>(q) (19 1) 43 A 11 394 61 I C 401 ( 1) A A<br/>192 <i>supra</i><br/>( 1) A D s T 11/11 D s (19 ) I h<br/>I J 16 89 I C 133 ( 1) A L 39</p> |
|--|---|

53      53 [S 273] (1) Where the property to be attached is a decree, either for the payment of money or for sale in enforcement of a mortgage or charge, the attachment shall be made,—

Attachment of decrees

- (a) if the decrees were passed by the same Court, then by order of such Court and,
- (b) if the decree sought to be attached was passed by another Court, then by the issue to such other Court of a notice by the Court which passed the decree sought to be executed requesting such other Court to stay the execution of its decree unless and until—
  - (i) the Court which passed the decree sought to be executed cancels the notice, or
  - (ii) the holder of the decree sought to be executed or his judgment-debtor applies to the Court receiving such notice to execute its own decree

(2) Where a Court makes an order under clause (a) of sub rule (1) or receives an application under sub-head (ii) of clause (b) of the said sub rule it shall on the application of the creditor who has attached the decree of his judgment-debtor proceed to execute the attached decree and apply the net proceeds in satisfaction of the decree sought to be executed

(3) The holder of a decree sought to be executed by the attachment of another decree of the nature specified in sub-rule (1) shall be deemed to be the representative of the holder of the attached decree and to be entitled to execute such attached decree in any manner lawful for the holder thereof

(4) Where the property to be attached in the execution of a decree is a decree other than a decree of the nature referred to in sub rule (1) the attachment shall be made by a notice by the Court which passed the decree sought to be executed, to the holder of the decree sought to be attached prohibiting him from transferring or charging the same in any way and, where such decree has been passed by any other Court also by sending to such other Court a notice to abstain from executing the decree sought to be attached until such notice is cancelled by the Court from which it was sent

sub rule (1) (a) or (1) (b) it may be executed against his legal representatives after notice under r 22 (h)

Issue to determine liability — See notes above Scope of the rule

Court which passed the decree — See notes below Award

Where decree transferred for execution — An ex parte order under sub rule (2) granting leave to execute the decree and transferring the decree for execution to another Court does not preclude the transferee Court from determining the question whether the decree transferred was a nullity (i)

Sub rule (3) — An ex parte order made under sub rule (2) above is not within sub-rule (3) Sub rule contemplates an order where the liability has been tried and determined (j)

Sub rule (4) — This sub rule relates to persons other than those referred to in sub r (1) (a) (b) and (c) The summons to appear and answer in sub r (4) does not mean the writ of summons It means a summons or a notice to appear and answer the application specified in sub r (2) The object of sub r (4) is to give an opportunity to a person against whom the decree holder seeks to execute the decree other than such a person as is referred to in sub r (1) (a) (b) and (c) of disputing his liability as a partner if he desires to do so (k)

Minor partner — The proviso to sub r (1) declares that nothing in that sub rule should be deemed to limit or otherwise affect the provisions of section 247 of the Contract Act The combined effect of that section and the present rule is that where a decree has been passed against a firm containing a minor who is admitted to the benefits of a partnership execution may be granted against the property of the firm including the share of such minor in the property of the firm but it cannot be granted against the separate property of the minor Having regard to the definition of a firm in s 39 of the Contract Act and to a minor's inability to contract the share of such minor in the property of the firm mentioned in s 247 is merely his right to participate in the property of the firm after its obligations have been discharged (l)

Award — It has been held by the High Courts of Calcutta (m) and Allahabad (n) that an award against a firm filed under s 11 of the Indian Arbitration Act 1899 stands on the same footing as a decree and that the provisions of this rule apply to such an award In the case of an award the Court which passed the decree referred to in sub r (2) is the Court in which the award is filed (o) The High Court of Allahabad has held relying on s 47 of the Code that where an award is sent for execution by one Court to another the latter Court has the power to try the issue as to partnership under sub r (3) (p)

Insolvency of firm — Where a decree has been passed against a firm execution may be taken out against any partner who was served with the summons The insolvency of the firm is no bar to execution against individual partners (q)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>(h) <i>J v I (1) I v I (1) (19 6) 57 Cal 14</i><br/> <i>91 I C 84 (6) A C 1</i></p> <p>(i) <i>117 I C 1 Co If 117 (19 3) All I J</i><br/> <i>553 11 I C 80 (9) A A 390</i></p> <p>(j) (19 J) All I J 5 3 11 I C 86 (9)</p> <p>(k) <i>J v I (1) I v I (1) (19 6) 57 Cal 14</i><br/> <i>91 I C 84 (6) A C 1</i><br/> <i>J v I (1) I v I (1) (19 6) 57 Cal 14</i><br/> <i>1037 68 I C 67 (3) A A 390</i><br/> <i>1037 68 I C 67 (3) A A 390</i><br/> <i>1037 68 I C 67 (3) A A 390</i></p> <p>(l) <i>Sa yam (1) A A 11 I I A 1 A A</i></p> | <p><i>I v I (1) (19 6) 57 Cal 14</i><br/> <i>91 I C 84 (6) A C 1</i></p> <p>(m) <i>J v I (1) (19 6) 57 Cal 14</i><br/> <i>91 I C 84 (6) A C 1</i></p> <p>(n) <i>J v I (1) (19 6) 57 Cal 14</i><br/> <i>91 I C 84 (6) A C 1</i></p> <p>(o) <i>J v I (1) (19 6) 57 Cal 14</i><br/> <i>91 I C 84 (6) A C 1</i></p> <p>(p) <i>J v I (1) (19 6) 57 Cal 14</i><br/> <i>91 I C 84 (6) A C 1</i></p> <p>(q) <i>J v I (1) (19 6) 57 Cal 14</i><br/> <i>91 I C 84 (6) A C 1</i></p> |
|--|---|

**51 [S 270]** Where the property is a negotiable instrument not deposited in a Court, nor in the custody of a public officer, the attachment shall be made by actual seizure, and the instrument shall be brought into Court and held subject to further orders of the Court

Attachment of negotiable instruments

The proper method of attaching a promissory note in the hands of an individual is by its actual seizure and not by the issue of a prohibitory order for if it is not seized the promisee may negotiate it and mere notice will not avail against a holder in due course (r). But notice of the order of attachment to the debtor or promisor is sufficient protection against his paying the amount due to the promisee or anyone else (s).

**52 [S 272]** Where the property to be attached is in the custody of any Court or public officer, the attachment shall be made by a notice to such Court or Officer, requesting that such property, and any interest or dividend becoming payable thereon, may be held subject to the further orders of the Court from which the notice is issued

Attachment of property in custody of Court or public officer

Provided that where such property is in the custody of a Court, any question of title or priority arising between the decree holder and any other person, not being the judgment-debtor, claiming to be interested in such property by virtue of any assignment attachment or otherwise, shall be determined by such Court

**Attachment of dividends in the hands of Official Assignee**—The Official Assignee is a public officer within the meaning of this rule and moneys in his hands payable by way of dividend to a creditor of an insolvent may be attached in execution of a decree against the creditor in the manner provided by this rule (t).

**Attachment of property in the hands of a receiver**—A receiver is an officer of the Court. No attachment therefore of money in the hands of a receiver can be made without leave of the Court (u).

It was held by the High Court of Bombay in some of the earlier cases that in the case of a decree against a firm the assets of which are in the hands of a receiver appointed in a previous partnership suit the proper course for the decree holder to follow is to ask the Court for a charging order, undertaking by the order to deal with the charge according to the order of the Court (v). On the other hand it has been held in a recent case that the proper course is to issue a notice to the receiver under this rule and not a charging order (w).

**Anticipatory attachment**—This rule does not permit an anticipatory attachment of money expected to reach the hands of a public officer but applies only to money

(r) *S. drama a v Chokkai ga* (1933) 46 Mad 415. (s) 1 C 189 (1933) A M 31.

(t) *Namag v Muthu F. Jayappa* (1939) 56 Mad L. J. 0 1113 C 857 (1939) A M 940.

(u) *Hurdavay v Hay Adam* (1935) 49 Bom 638. (v) 1 C 1011 (1935) A B 344.

(w) *M. Hommed v Mahommed* (1894) 1 Cal 85. *Kahn v All Mahommed* (1897) 16 Bom

5. (x) *A. H. J. Irmal d Co v P. Irmal d* (1910) 34 Bom 444. (y) 1 C 135. *Shadi noorpa v Shankarappa* (1904) 28 Bom 161. (z) *Kakba v Hargovan* (Bom H Ct—suit no 194 of 1919 (Pratt J.) unreported).

(w) *Van akhagars v Payabally* (1939) 9 Bom L. R. 649. 106 1 C 184 (1939) A B 405.

actually in his hands. An attachment made before the money has reached the hands of the officer is invalid (x)

O 21,

**Priority**—There is a conflict of decisions as to whether if a fund in Court is attached by several decree holders they are entitled to have rateably or whether they are to be paid in the order of their attachments. As to partnership assets in the hands of a receiver the High Court of Bombay held in one case that no one judgment creditor of the firm is entitled to priority over others by attaching the partnership asset and that they should be distributed pro rata among all the judgment creditors (y). On the other hand it was held in a recent case that the judgment creditor who first took out execution against the assets was entitled to have his decree satisfied to the full in priority over other non attaching creditors (z). It is submitted with great respect that the latter decision is incorrect. Where a receiver is appointed in an administration suit and a creditor of the deceased obtains a decree against the legal representative of the deceased after such appointment he is not entitled to execute the decree against the estate of the deceased (a).

The following propositions have been laid down by a Full Bench of the Madras High Court in *Isaianadhan v Arunachalam* (b) overruling *Katum v Haji Mahomed* (c) an earlier decision of the same High Court.

(1) Where the property attached is in the custody of a Court it is the duty of such Court to hold it at the disposal of the attaching Court and it is the duty of the attaching Court if the property attached is money to call upon the custody Court to pay it into the attaching Court and in other cases to provide for the realisation of the property and to divide the money or proceeds rateably between the attaching decree holder and the other decree holders who are entitled to distribution under s 73 of the Code of Civil Procedure (1) those who have applied to it for execution before the receipt of such assets.

(2) Where the property in the custody Court is the subject of several attachments in execution of several decrees the custody Court must award priority to the first in point of time. If the other decree holders want to share in the rateable distribution they must apply in time to the first attaching Court. The power conferred on the custody Court by the proviso to O 21 r 13 to determine claims to priority etc does not entitle the custody Court itself to distribute the assets rateably among the attaching decree holders.

(3) When the attaching Court and the custody Court are the same there is a receipt of assets within the meaning of s 73 of the Code of Civil Procedure only when so much of the money standing to the credit of the judgment debtor as is necessary to satisfy the decree holders who have applied to it for execution is ordered to be transferred to the credit of the first attaching creditor's suit.

The Calcutta High Court (d) has followed *Katum v Haji Mahomed* but this was before the Full Bench case.

#### Form—See Sch I App I No 7

(x) *Tul v Tul* (1873) 11 B m 39 c m  
 n t d upo l t m br 4 s t  
 (191) 33 B m 80 (p 9) 1 C 14  
 T g t l v l f g t ah (1914)  
 6 M 1 L J 304 4 I C 61 T L r  
 f Jo ph (1917) 44 C 1 10 41 I C  
 516  
 (y) *KA v All V h met* (189) 16 B m 5  
 (z) *Ke ba v Jal* (19) 9 B m L R  
 66 106 I C 113 (7) A I 394 v n  
 i l l g r l j u b a l l y (19 7) 1 B m I  
 1 6 J 106 I C 144 (9) A R 40

( ) *Dura t u v Bhol n* (19 ) 9 F m L R  
 409 10 1 C 413 (7) A R 67 B h ja  
 t d t t G m t (1899) 3 Lom  
 4 s j e c t a t m l n l of Admini t r a t o r  
 G n r l l  
 (b) (19 1) 44 M ad 100 60 I C 30 (21) A M  
 18 v h a y j a v S b b e r (19-3) 46 M ad  
 506 513 7 I C 870 (-3) A M 50  
 ( ) *Kat m v Haj Mahomed* (1915) 33 M ad  
 1 99 I C 39  
 (d) *Th l d s v Joseph* (191 ) 44 Cal 1072  
 41 I C 516

53      53 [S 273] (1) Where the property to be attached is a decree, either for the payment of money or for sale in enforcement of a mortgage or charge, the attachment shall be made,—

Attachment of decrees

(a) if the decrees were passed by the same Court, then by order of such Court, and,

(b) if the decree sought to be attached was passed by another Court, then by the issue to such other Court of a notice by the Court which passed the decree sought to be executed, requesting such other Court to stay the execution of its decree unless and until—

(1) the Court which passed the decree sought to be executed cancels the notice, or

(ii) the holder of the decree sought to be executed or his judgment debtor applies to the Court receiving such notice to execute its own decree

(2) Where a Court makes an order under clause (a) of sub rule (1), or receives an application under sub head (ii) of clause (b) of the said sub rule, it shall, on the application of the creditor who has attached the decree of his judgment debtor, proceed to execute the attached decree and apply the net proceeds in satisfaction of the decree sought to be executed

(3) The holder of a decree sought to be executed by the attachment of another decree of the nature specified in sub rule (1) shall be deemed to be the representative of the holder of the attached decree and to be entitled to execute such attached decree in any manner lawful for the holder thereof

(4) Where the property to be attached in the execution of a decree is a decree other than a decree of the nature referred to in sub rule (1), the attachment shall be made by a notice by the Court which passed the decree sought to be executed, to the holder of the decree sought to be attached, prohibiting him from transferring or charging the same in any way, and, where such decree has been passed by any other Court, also by sending to such other Court a notice to abstain from executing the decree sought to be attached until such notice is cancelled by the Court from which it was sent

(5) The holder of a decree attached under this rule shall give the Court executing the decree such information and aid as may reasonably be required

(6) On the application of the holder of a decree sought to be executed by the attachment of another decree, the Court making an order of attachment under this rule shall give notice of such order to the judgment debtor bound by the decree attached, and no payment or adjustment of the attached decree made by the judgment debtor in contravention of such order after receipt of notice thereof, either through the Court or otherwise, shall be recognized by any Court so long as the attachment remains in force

**Alterations in the rule**—This rule corresponds with s 213 of the Code of 1892 except in the following particulars —

- 1 The words or for sale in enforcement of a mortgage or charge in sub r (1) are new See notes below Attachment and realization of decrees
- 2 The words or his judgment debtor in sub r (1) cl (b) sub head (ii) are new These words give effect to the opinion expressed by M Clean C J in the unmentioned case (e)
- 3 Sub rules (3) and (6) are also new See notes below under the sub rules

**Attachment and realization of decrees**—For the purpose of this rule decrees have been divided into two classes namely —

- (1) decrees for the payment of money or for sale in enforcement of a mortgage or charge and
- (2) other decrees

**First as to attachment of decrees**—Decrees of the first class are attached in the manner prescribed by sub r (1) Decrees of the second class are attached in the manner prescribed by sub r (4)

**Next as to realization of attached decrees**—Decrees of the first class are realized in the manner prescribed by sub r (2) There is no provision in this rule for the realization of decree of the 2nd class e.g. a decree for partition (f) or for foreclosure of a mortgage (g) These decrees are realized by a sale of the decree itself But decrees of the first class that i. money decrees (h) and mortgage decrees are not realized by sale (i) They can only be realized in the manner prescribed by sub r (2) The reason of this distinction is as follows —

Decrees are not expressly mentioned in s 60 as property liable to attachment and sale Hence they are attachable and saleable as comprised in the expression all other saleable property which occurs in that section Being liable to attachment as saleable property they can be sold in execution of another decree But money decree and mortgage decrees must not be sold because the present rule prescribes special procedure for the realization of such decrees [sub r (2)] But for this provision money

(e) *411 (1) Ira v J I Mor n (189) 4 Cal 74 9 The decision in Ira v J I Mor n (189) 3 M 16 9 I C 86 would have been different if the case was governed by the present Code*

(f) *Gopal v Jotimal (189) 16 Bom 5*

(g) *Barth v D v B J Lal (1901) 6 All 91*

(h) *S Han Kuar v C I Lari L I (18 0) 411 90 2 ruv g da v I g t d g (1893) 6 Mad 419 Joti Ira v I v Dv Ia v th (1893) 0 Cal 111*

(i) *Futh lida v S brava (19 1) 45 Tem 313 59 I C 541 (1) A B 1 Ma g Lum Eya Ma ng Jo v Yu (1903) 1 Lard 300 61 C 69 (4) 4 L 1*



decrees and mortgage decrees would have to be realized by *sale* like other decrees. The special procedure prescribed by sub r (2) is an exception to the general rule that property when attached can only be realized by sale.

Under the old section decrees were divided into two classes namely —

- (1) decrees for the payment of money and
- (2) other decrees

There was no specific provision for decrees for sale in enforcement of a mortgage. Hence the question arose whether such decrees belonged to the first class or the second class. The decisions on the subject were conflicting. (j) To remove this doubt the words "or for sale in enforcement of a mortgage or charge" have been inserted in sub r (1). These words made it clear that mortgage decrees should be attached and realized in the same manner as money decrees [see sub rules (1) and (2)].

**Decree for dissolution of partnership**—A decree for the dissolution of a firm and for the taking of accounts where a receiver has been appointed by the decree for the sale of the assets of the firm and for the payment of the partnership debts is a decree for the payment of money within the meaning of this rule though part of the partnership assets consists of immovable properties (k).

**Decrees other than money decrees and mortgage decrees**—D1 holds a decree against J for partition of certain property passed in Court Y. D2 obtains a decree against D1 for Rs 6 000 in Court X. If D1 fails to satisfy the decree obtained against him by D2, D2 may apply to Court X to execute his decree by attachment and sale of the decree held by D1 against J. The decree held by D1 being neither a money decree nor a mortgage decree, the only mode of realizing it in execution of D2's decree is by attachment and sale.

**Money decrees and mortgage decrees**—Where the decree attached is a money decree or a mortgage decree, it can only be realized by execution; it cannot be sold in execution. For this purpose two applications must be made, one for attachment of the decree and the other for its execution. The application for attachment must be made by the holder of the decree sought to be executed to the Court which passed it. But the application for execution of the attached decree must be made to the Court which passed the decree attached and it may be made either by the holder of the decree sought to be executed or by the holder of the decree attached as in the following illustrations:

(a) *Where the decree sought to be executed and the decree sought to be attached are passed by the same Court*—D1 holds a decree against J for Rs 5 000 passed by Court Y. This is a money decree. D2 obtains a decree against D1 also in Court Y for Rs 6 000. If D2 seeks to attach D1's decree in execution of his decree, he should apply to Court Y for attachment and either he or D1 may then apply to that Court for execution of the decree held by D1 against J. D2 can apply for execution for he is deemed to be the representative of D1 [see sub r (3)].

(b) *Where the decree sought to be executed and the decree sought to be attached are passed by different Courts*—D1 sues J on a mortgage and obtains a decree for sale of the mortgaged property under O 34 r 5 in Court X. This is a mortgage decree. D2 obtains a decree against D1 for Rs 6 000 in Court Y and in execution of his decree applies to Court X for attachment of the mortgage decree held by D1 against J. The attachment

(j) See *Delhi & London Bank Ltd v. Partab Singh* (1906) 3 All 71 (mortgage decree held not to be a money-decree). *Idhar nadaram v. Somasundaram* (1905) 8

M d 4 3 (mortgage decree held to be a money decree)

(k) *Sadli nappa v. Shankarappa* (1903) 7 Bom 58

is to be made by the issue to Court Y of a notice by Court X requesting Court X to stay execution of D1's decree against J unless and until—

(i) the notice is cancelled by Court Y or

(ii) an application is made to Court X by D2 or D1 to execute the decree held by D1 against J

If an application is made by D2 or D1 to Court X to execute the decree held by D1 against J Court X will proceed to execute the decree and the nett proceeds that may be realized in execution will be applied in satisfaction of D2's decree

If in the case put above Court X does not stay execution of D1's decree on receiving the notice from Court Y and proceeds with the execution in spite of the notice the proceedings will be deemed to be *ultra vires* and a sale held in execution of that decree will be set aside as void (l)

Sub rule (1) Stay—The stay under sub r (1) (b) is only a limited stay and does not prevent either the holder of the decree sought to be executed or his judgment debtor from seeking to execute the original decree (m)

Sub rule (3) Representative—This sub rule is new It gives effect to the undermentioned decisions (n) under the Code of 1882 It declares in effect that one who attaches a decree is a representative of the decree holder within the meaning of s 47 Thus in the cases put above D2 is the representative of D1

A holds a money decree against B B holds a decree for sale in enforcement of a mortgage against C A attaches in execution of his own decree the decree held by B against C C brings into Court from time to time sums of money for satisfaction of the decree held against him by B Since A is the representative of B the payments made by C become forthwith available to A and operate from their respective dates as partial satisfaction also of the decree held by A against B Hence interest on the decree held by A runs only up to the dates of the deposit and not up to the date when A with draws the moneys from Court (o)

Sub rule (6) Adjustment of attached decree—This sub rule is new The latter part of the rule gives effect to a Bombay decision that where a decree is attached no adjustment of the decree subsequent to the attachment can be recognized by the Court (p) See O 2 r 2 A Full Bench of the Madras High Court has held that though the attachment is effected by notice to the Court under sub rule (1) yet a payment or adjustment made by the judgment debtor in ignorance of the attachment and before he has received notice of the order of attachment under sub rule (6) is valid This sub rule merely provides in cases of bona fide transactions by judgment debtors an exception to the general rule laid down in s 64 above (q)

Decree—A decree whereby B was compelled to deliver up possession of certain lands to C is reversed in appeal and B is declared to be entitled to recover back possession from C with mesne profits A obtains a decree against B and applies in execution of his decree to attach B's right to recover mesne profits from C The right is not attachable for it is not a decree The language [of this rule] seems to apply only to cases where the right attached is a right expressly settled by the decree and not a right arising from the decree by way of restitution (r)

- (l) *Bham v. D. Baji* L I (1904) 6 All 91  
*Maik v. B. a. al* (1905) 3 All 1104  
 (m) *Chand v. J. a. v. H. l. s. pp.* (1904) 48 Lom  
 48 401 80 L. 34 (4) A B 333  
 (n) *Sah v. M. H. v. Kanag. bap. th.* (1893) 16  
 Mal. O. Krishnan v. Le. kat. pathi (1906)  
 J. M. I. 318  
 (o) *Maitan v. Han v. Bishnupada* (1905) 35 C I

- L J 109 64 L. 30 (1) A. C. 580  
 (p) *Gop. v. Jaha m. l.* (189) 16 Bom 5  
*Jatt v. B. shan* (1909) 10 Lah 143 110  
 L. C. 41 (4) A. L. 834  
 (q) *L. k. h. h. m. L. k. h. m. aramul m.*  
 (1905) 50 M. d. 6 103 L. C. 0 (1)  
 A. M. 3 F. B.  
 (r) *Vasudera v. Varaja a.* (1901) 4 Mad 341

**54 [S 274]** (1) Where the property is immovable, the attachment shall be made by an order prohibiting the judgment debtor from transferring or charging the property in any way, and all persons from taking any benefit from such transfer or charge

(2) The order shall be proclaimed at some place on or adjacent to such property by beat of drum or other customary mode, and a copy of the order shall be fixed on a conspicuous part of the property and then upon a conspicuous part of the Court house, and also, where the property is land paying revenue to the Government, in the office of the Collector of the district in which the land is situate

**Immovable property**—The equity of redemption of a mortgagor is immovable property within the meaning of this rule (s). The life interest taken by a Parsi widow under her husband's will in the income of his immovable property is not movable but immovable property and is attachable under this rule (t).

**Proof of service of prohibitory order**—Where it is found as a fact that a prohibitory order was duly served on all the judgment debtors, the destruction of part of the record which afforded proof of the service of notice does not render the execution sale invalid (u).

**Mortgage debt**—The sale of a mortgage debt in execution of a decree carries with it the security and an attachment of the property under this rule is not necessary see notes to r 46. **Attachment of mortgage debt**

**Omission to beat drum**—Such an omission is a material irregularity within the meaning of r 90 of this Order (v).

**Land paying revenue to Government**—Shrotrivram villages in the Madras Presidency are land paying revenue to Government within the meaning of this rule (w).

**Proclamation of sale**—See r 64 below and note thereto. See also notes to s 64. Where an attachment has been made

**Removal of attachment after satisfaction of decree** **55 [S 275]** Where—

- the amount decreed with costs and all charges and expenses resulting from the attachment of any property are paid into Court, or
- satisfaction of the decree is otherwise made through the Court or certified to the Court, or
- the decree is set aside or reversed,

(s) *Paasham v Cora* (1899) 1 Bom 46  
*Ba e dra Nath v Marikand Co* (1911) 3 Cal L J 136 1 C 16 (1) A C 801  
 (t) *Nalla v Dhundaji* (1899) 23 Bom 1  
 (u) *Mohammad Abdul v Akram* (1911) All

L J 63 83 1 ( 8 3 ( 4 ) A 1 4  
 (v) *Tal* 10 Bom 504  
 (w) *Ganman v Heredd* (1911) 46 Mad 6  
 I C 369 ( 4 ) A 1 1  
 I C 369 ( 4 ) A 1 1  
 I C 369 ( 4 ) A 1 1  
 I C 369 ( 4 ) A 1 1

the attachment shall be deemed to be withdrawn, and, in the case of immovable property, the withdrawal shall, if the judgment debtor so desires, be proclaimed at his expense, and a copy of the proclamation shall be affixed in the manner prescribed by the last preceding rule

#### Alterations in the rule —

- 1 The words "or certified to the Court" in cl (b) are new. The effect of the words is to place satisfaction certified under r 2 of this Order on the same footing as satisfaction made through the Court.
- 2 The latter part of the rule commencing with the words "the attachment shall be deemed to be withdrawn" etc is new. Under the old section an express order was necessary for the withdrawal of the attachment. No such order is necessary under the present rule. The attachment is to be deemed to be withdrawn on the happening of any of the events specified in cls (a) (b) and (c).

**Relation of this rule to s 73**—See notes to s 73. Assets not available for rateable distribution.

**The attachment shall be deemed to be withdrawn**—A's property is attached in execution of a decree obtained against him by B. C, another judgment creditor of A, applies for execution of his decree, but no attachment is issued upon his application. On the date fixed for the sale, A pays into Court the amount payable under B's decree. The next day C applies for sale of the property. C is not entitled to have the property sold because the effect of the payment into Court was the withdrawal of the attachment under this rule, and there being no attachment under C's decree no sale can be ordered in execution of his decree (x).

**56 [S 27]** Where the property attached is current coin or currency notes, the Court may, at any time during the continuance of the attachment, direct that such coin or notes, or a part thereof sufficient to satisfy the

Order for payment of coin or currency notes to party entitled under decree

decree, be paid over to the party entitled under the decree to receive the same.

**57 [View]** Where any property has been attached in execution of a decree, but by reason of the decree holder's default the Court is unable to proceed further with the application for execution it shall either dismiss the application or for any sufficient reason adjourn the proceedings to a future date. Upon the dismissal of such application the attachment shall cease.

Determination of attachment

**Object of the rule**—The object of the rule is to put a stop to the practice of making order striking off proceedings for removing proceedings from the file.

(x) See also A.I. (1916) 361 m 1 v 1 C 1 in the notes to s 3 and r 1. Assets held by a Court.

57 a form of order for which there was no justification under any of the earlier Codes (y) and which made it doubtful whether the effect of the order was whether the attachment ceased or whether it still continued. This subject has already been discussed in the notes to s 64 under the head Effect of striking off execution proceedings or of removing them from the file.

By reason of the decree holder's default—The provisions of this rule that the attachment should cease upon the dismissal of the application for execution do not apply unless the dismissal was on the ground of default on the part of the decree holder (z). The word default is not confined to default in appearance or in payment of process fees or in production of documents but includes failure to do what a decree holder is bound to do that is to proceed with his application for execution. Failure therefore to give notice to the judgment debtor prior to the drawing up of the proclamation as required by r 66 of this Order is default within the meaning of this rule (a). Where a sale in execution of a decree is set aside for any reason other than this default on the part of the decree holder the antecedent attachment is revived so as to support a second application for execution of the decree by sale of the same property and a fresh attachment is necessary (b).

Upon the dismissal of such application the attachment shall cease—These words are imperative. A Court therefore has no power while dismissing an application for default on the part of the decree holder to direct by its order that the attachment shall continue. Thus where an executing Court made an order that the execution case is accordingly dismissed the properties will remain under attachment it was held that the order being one dismissing the application for execution the attachment ceased by virtue of the provisions of this rule notwithstanding the direction that the attachment should continue (c). In an Allahabad case the order ran in these terms: The execution case should for the time being be dismissed but the attachment shall remain in force. The Court held that it was in effect an order adjourning the proceedings and was therefore valid (d). In a later Allahabad case the executing Court struck off the file an application of its own motion and without any default on the part of the decree holder. It was held that there was no dismissal of the application within the meaning of the rule and that the attachment had not ceased (e). These questions derive importance from the fact that an alienation of property after the attachment has ceased is not within the prohibition contained in s 64.

Attachment before judgment—A Full Bench of the High Court of Madras has held that the words property attached in execution of a decree apply to property attached before judgment. So when an execution application for the sale of property attached before judgment was dismissed for default the attachment though it was made before judgment ceases (f). A sues B and obtains an order for attachment before judgment. A then obtains a decree in the suit against B. Thereafter A applies for execution of the decree but the application is dismissed for default of prosecution. The dismissal of the application puts an end to the attachment before judgment. This is

(A) *Dewan Chaudhary Bhatta* (1919) Punj Rec no 154 pp 410 413 5 I C 294

( ) *Aziz Bhatta v Kanu* (191 ) 34 All 490 15 I C 49

(a) *Nandu Bhatt v Rooha Miah* (1911) 39 Cal 48 9 I C 503 *Dildor Huss v Shauk* (1919) 41 All 15 49 I C 113 *Fateh Din v Qab Din* (19 ) 3 Lah 7 67 I C 543 ( ) A L 108

(f) *Mahabharat v Raja Kantia* (1918) 3 Pat L J 310 45 I C 589 *Yakubee Rayyan v Aswatha* (19 3) 45 Mad L J 415 (1 I C 493) A M 03 But see

*G p t Bhatta v Dugga* (19 ) 46 Bon 94 6 I C 895 ( 3) A B 30

(c) *Nandu Bhatt v Rooha Miah* (1911) 38 Cal 48 9 I C 503 *Dildor Huss v Shauk* (1919) 41 All 15 49 I C 113

(d) *Muhammad Yubor v Sahu* (19 ) 41 All 24 65 I C 91 ( ) A A 6

(e) *Bj v Raghu* (19 6) 48 All 69 97 I C 10 ( ) A A 734

(f) *Meejappa v Chandra Baram* (19 4) 47 M d 483 63 I C 91 ( 4) A M 490 overruling *Fateh Bhatt v Y. Lal Seshya* (1919) 40 Mad 1 48 I C 3

directly opposed to the decisions of the High Courts of Allahabad (g) and Calcutta (h) where it was held that the words "attached in execution of a decree" do not include an attachment before judgment. The High Court of Bombay has followed the Madras decision. It is submitted that the view taken by the High Courts of Calcutta and Allahabad is the correct one (i).

### *Investigation of Claims and Objections*

**58 [S 278]** (1) Where any claim is preferred to, or any objection is made to, the attachment of, any property attached in execution of a decree on the ground that such property is not liable to such attachment, the Court

Investigation of claims to and objections to attachment of attached property

shall proceed to investigate the claim or objection with the like power as regards the examination of the claimant or objector and in all other respects, as if he was a party to the suit.

Provided that no such investigation shall be made where the Court considers that the claim or objection was designedly or unnecessarily delayed.

(2) Where the property to which the claim or objection applies has been advertised for sale, the Court ordering the sale may postpone it pending the investigation of the claim or objection.

Postponement of sale

**Rules 58 to 63**—These rules deal with investigation of claims preferred to property attached in execution of a decree and of objections to the attachment of such property.

**Scope of the rule**—Objections to attachment raised by a party to the suit in which the decree under execution was passed or his representative fall within the scope of s 47. Objections to attachment raised by a third party come under the present rule. This distinction is important in two ways—

1. Where an objection to attachment is made by a party to the suit or his representative the objector should proceed by an application under s 47, a separate suit for the purpose is barred. But where an objection to attachment is made by a third party the objector may either proceed by an application under this rule or he may bring a regular suit to establish his objection. Failure to proceed by an application under this rule is no bar to a separate suit. The object of this rule is to give a claimant a speedy and summary remedy, but the rule does not deprive him of his remedy by suit. The summary remedy given by this rule is alternative to the remedy by way of suit (j). See notes to s 47. Objections to attachment or sale by third parties and notes to r 63 below. Payment by claimant under protest.

- (g) *Batra Alhet Pa v. Bat* 19 4 48  
All 895 80 106 (4) A A 860  
(h) *G. P. A. v. L. ca* Lal (191) 16 Cal L J  
86 14 1 C 345 *Shid ath v. ngh*  
*N. A. h. Sabar dd* (19 3) 56 Cal 416  
(i) 9) A C 46  
(j) *Sh. ni s v. Ha* 19 9 53 Bom 543

- (9) A B 3 1  
(j) *Ka h v. L. t* *Natio t Ba t f Ind a*  
(1913) 40 Cal 594 40 I A 56 18 I C  
949 *Sunder S gh v. Ghari* (1896) 18  
All 410 *Krishn Bhupati* *Ikrama*  
(1895) 18 Mad 13 1 *Paghunath v*  
*S. ash Rama* (1899) 3 Bom 66

2 An order made under s 47 allowing or disallowing an objection to attachment is a decree (s 2) and is therefore *appealable*. But orders under rr 60 61 or 62 made upon an application under this rule are *not appealable* under the Code (k) and the remedy of the party against whom the order is made is by a regular suit to establish the right which he claims to the property in dispute (r 63). Such suit must be brought within one year from the date of the order [Limitation Act art 11] (l) but subject to such suit the order is conclusive (m) see r 63.

The following illustration shows the operation of rr 58 62. In execution of a decree obtained by A against B certain property alleged to belong to B is attached. If the property attached is claimed by C C may bring a regular suit for a declaration that the property attached belongs to him and for removal of the attachment. Or if he desires to avail himself of the speedy remedy provided by this rule he may present an application to the Court executing the decree claiming that the property belongs to him and praying for the removal of the attachment. If C's claim is allowed (r 60) A may bring a suit under r 63 for a declaration that the property belongs to B and is therefore liable to attachment. And if C's claim is disallowed (r 61) he may bring a suit for a declaration that the property attached belongs to him and is therefore not liable to attachment. If no such suit is brought within one year from the date of the order under r 60 or 61 the order will be conclusive.

Objections to attachment though made by a party to a suit or his representative come within the scope of this rule if property attached is held by the objector on behalf of a third party as a trustee guardian or in any other fiduciary capacity. See notes to s 47 under the heads Parties to the suit p 154 above and Objection by party or his representative that property attached is not liable to attachment.

On the ground that such property is not liable to attachment—The Allahabad High Court has held that these words refer to the case only of an objection made to attachment and not to the case of a claim preferred to the property attached. Therefore any claim such as that of a mortgagee which would be inconsistent with the continuance of an unqualified attachment is liable to adjudication by the Court (n).

Where objection to attachment is raised after sale—The application for removal of attachment under this rule should be made before the property attached has been sold. The executing Court has no power to entertain such an application after sale (o).

Mortgage decree—This rule does not apply where the property in dispute is directed to be sold under a mortgage decree. The reason is that the property directed to be sold under a mortgage decree does not require to be attached by way of execution (p) and the benefit of the summary procedure afforded by the present rule is limited to claims and objections arising in respect of an attachment. A obtains a decree against B for sale of certain property mortgaged to him and applied in execution for the sale thereof. If the property is claimed by C he must proceed by a suit for a declaration that the property belongs to him and not by an application under this rule (q).

(k) *Abdul v Muhammad* (188 ) 4 All 190  
Datta m v Gora dha d s (1904) 8 Bom 43

(l) *Harsia l v Nar* (1894) 18 Bom 60  
(m) *R h m Bur v Abd l f der* (190 ) 30 Cal 53  
P j m v R oh ban ma (1897)  
P ch l o s S al a L l v Ambik  
P ch l d (1898) 15 Cal 5 1 5 6 15 I A 13

(n) *Debi Das v Ma?* J P p l d (19 ) 49  
All 903 10 I C 9- (-) A A 593

(o) *Mauing l o Pe v Mau g Awa* (19 7) 5

(p) *Ran?* 7 1 107 I C 161 ( 8) A R 80  
*Daj cl l v Her h d* (1880) 4 B m 515  
5 0 l nkat ra mah v Pam a (18 9)

M d 104 11 I tan Lal v Bala Pa  
sh d (1918) Punj Rec no 58 p 19 44  
I C 986

(q) *Huamtr m v K l al* (1894) 18 Bom 98  
*De flots v Fed s* (189 ) 14 Cal 631  
5 w l Da v B smil A (189 ) 19 All 420

481 48 M h bir Pr sad v Joge d a  
Aota (19 1) 26 C W N 50 63 I C 71  
( 1) A C 49

Whether rules 58 to 63 apply if the property attached is a debt — 4 obtains a decree against B for Rs 5000 and attaches in execution of the decree a debt alleged to be due by C to B. Can C apply under this rule to have the attachment removed? Yes and if the attachment is not removed he may institute a suit for a declaration that no debt is due from him to B within a year from the date of the order against him. If no such suit is filed the order will be conclusive against him (r). In an earlier Bombay Case the opinion was expressed that the procedure laid down in the sections of the Code of 1882 corresponding to rr 53 to 63 did not apply to a debt attached in execution of a decree the reason given being that a debt was not property capable of possession within the meaning of rr 60 and 61 and that if C alleged that no debt was due the proper course was for the Court to satisfy itself as to its existence (r 66) and if it was satisfied that no debt existed it should abstain from proceeding to sell the debt (s). But this view has since been disented from and it has been held that the words "possessed of" in rr 60 and 61 are not restricted to object capable of physical possession but apply also to object capable of constructive possession such as a debt. Moreover the word "property" in the present rule is wide enough to include a debt. As to a garnishee's right to set off see notes to r 46 above.

**Appeal** — No appeal lies under the Code from an order made in a claim case [see notes to s 47]. Objections to attachment or sale by parties or their representatives and Objections to attachment by third parties. But it has been held by the High Court of Madras that an appeal lies from such an order under cl 15 of the Letters Patent and that where such an appeal is preferred the period of limitation for the suit contemplated by r 63 below is to be calculated from the date of the order made on appeal (f). The High Court of Pangoon has held that there is no appeal from an order under this rule under the Letters Patent (u).

**59 [s 279]** The claimant or objector must adduce evidence to show that at the date of the attachment he had some interest in, or was possessed of the property attached.

Evidence to be adduced by claimant

**Some interest** — The words mean such an interest as would entitle the possessor of the judgment debtor's possession not on his own account but on a joint account or in trust for the claimant (v).

**Or was possessed of** — The words mean was possessed of for himself and not as trustee for the judgment debtor. See the next rule and the notes thereon.

**Limits of inquiry under rules 59 to 61** — In *Sardhari Lal v. Laxmi Prasad* (u) their Lordships of the Privy Council said that the Code does not prescribe the extent to which the investigation should go and though in some cases it may be very proper that there should be a full and complete investigation as if a suit were brought for the very purpose of trying the question in other cases it may also be the duty of the Court and proper course to deliver an opinion on such facts as are before the Court at the time having the necessary party to bring the suit which the law allows. Rules 59 to 61 provide for a summary investigation into possession as distinct from a thorough trial of ultimate right. It is impossible to separate altogether the investigation and the trial of title. Thus if the judgment debtor was in possession of the property as agent or trustee for another [rr 60 61] and the latter is the plaintiff

(r) (1) 11 B. & C. 111 (1844) 11 M. 111  
(2) 11 B. & C. 111 (1844) 38 B. M. 631

(s) 11 B. & C. 111 (1844) 11 M. 111  
(t) 11 B. & C. 111 (1844) 11 M. 111

(u) 11 B. & C. 111 (1844) 11 M. 111  
33 M. 111 1190 111 11 30

(v) 11 B. & C. 111 (1844) 11 M. 111  
(1) 11 B. & C. 111 (1844) 11 M. 111

(f) 11 B. & C. 111 (1844) 11 M. 111  
(1) 11 B. & C. 111 (1844) 11 M. 111

(u) (1) 11 B. & C. 111 (1844) 11 M. 111  
(1) 11 B. & C. 111 (1844) 11 M. 111



into To that extent the title may be part of the inquiry in a claim case but no ultimate questions of trust are intended to be thrashed out (x) In execution of a decree obtained by A against B three pieces of Government securities are attached The securities stand in the name of C C applies for removal of the attachment under r 58 alleging that the securities belong to him and they are held by him on his own account A alleges that the securities are held by C *benami* for B It is not open to the Court under these circumstances to inquire whether C in whose name the securities stand is merely a *benamidar* for B The property must therefore be released from attachment (y) and the question whether C is merely a *benamidar* is a question of title which should be the subject of a suit under r 63 Similarly if the property attached is claimed by a person as a Mutawali under a deed of wakf and it is proved that he has been in possession as Mutawali for upwards of 20 years the property must be released from attachment The Court has no power under these rules to decide whether the deed of wakf is valid (z) The words possession of the judgment debtor or of some person in trust for him in rr 60 and 61 refer to cases in which the possession of a claimant as a trustee is of such a character as to be really the possession of the judgment debtor and not to cases in which very intricate questions of law may arise as to whether or not valid trusts may result in particular instances (a) If instead of determining the question of possession the Court determines the question of title and disposes of the application on the question of title the order is open to revision under s 115 of the Code (b) Similarly where a Court ought to inquire into the question whether the possession of the judgment debtor was on his own account or on account of some other person but it refuses to do so the order is open to revision The word conclusive in r 63 means non appealable it does not mean not capable of revision (c)

## 60 [S 280] Where upon the said investigation the

Release of property from attachment

Court is satisfied that for the reason stated in the claim or objection such property was not when attached, in the possession of the judgment debtor or of some person in trust for him, or in the occupancy of a tenant or other person paying rent to him, or that being in the possession of the judgment debtor at such time it was so in his possession, not on his own account or as his own property, but on account of or in trust for some other person, or partly on his own account and partly on account of some other person, the Court shall make an order releasing the property, wholly or to such extent as it thinks fit from attachment

Limits of inquiry under rules 59 61—See notes to r 59 above under the same head

Property in possession of some person not in trust for judgment debtor—A obtained a decree against B as the heir and legal representative of his

- (x) *Najimu v Nectaraddin* (194) 51 Cal 544 83 I C 733 (4) A C 44 *Moh t Bhagur I better Mon* (1896) 1 C I W N 617 *Mo mohin v Radha K. to* (190) 9 Cal 543 *Hamid v Buktair* (188) 14 C L 61 *Deoraj v Gov I* (1891) 18 Cal 90

- (y) (190) 3 Cal 543 *s pra*

- (z) (1897) 14 C I 617 *s pra* *Pa gan wal v*

*Setug n* (1915) 8 Mad L J 37 9 I C 8

- (a) (1887) 14 Cal 61 60 *sup a*

- (b) *Appa wam v Balakrishn* (19) 48 Mad L J 603 87 I C 189 (2) 4 M 548 (191) 9 Mad L J 37 3 I C 8 *supra* (188) 14 Cal 61 *supra* (1891) 15 Cal 3 *supr*

- (c) *Phemon Singh A J Wells* (1903) 1 Rang 76 6 I C 67 (23) A R 195

deceased father and in execution of the decree attached certain money in the hands of C due to the estate of the deceased. Prior to the date of the decree an order had been made by the High Court under ss 17 and 18 of the Administrator General's Act 2 of 1874 [now Act 3 of 1913 ss 10 and 11] authorising the Administrator General to collect the assets of the deceased. It was held on the application of the Administrator General that the attachment should be removed. As the order under the Administrator General's Act authorised the Administrator General to realise the debt from C as part of the assets of the deceased, the amount in the hands of C could not be said to be property in the possession of a third person in trust for the judgment debtor (B) (d). See notes to r 62 below.

Property in possession of a judgment debtor not on his own account but on account of or in trust for some other persons—Such property if attached should be released from attachment under this rule. A consigned goods by railway to B and B had made specific advances against them and the goods on arrival at the railway station were attached in execution of a decree against A. It was held that the goods though in the hands of the Railway Company were in the possession of A but on account of or in trust for B and should therefore be released from attachment on B's application (e).

Effect of order of release.—An order made under this rule releasing the property attached from attachment is only provisional and liable to be set aside by a regular suit (r 63). It is not conclusive a suit may be brought to claim the property notwithstanding the order (f). It has not the effect therefore of putting an end to an attachment duly made so as to leave the claimant free to deal with the property as he likes. If a suit is brought by the decree holder to establish his right to attach the property and the decree is in his favour it has the effect of setting aside the order of release and of maintaining the attachment originally made. The result is that any private transfer of the property by the claimant though made after an order under this rule releasing the property from attachment will be void under s 64 if the right to attach is subsequently established by suit under r 63 (g). In execution of a decree obtained by A against B certain property standing in the name of C (B's son) is attached. C objects to the attachment and the property is released from attachment under this rule. C afterwards mortgages the property to M. A then sues B and C for a declaration that B and not C is the real owner of the property and a decree is passed in his favour. The property is then reattached and sold in execution of A's decree and purchased by P. The mortgage to M is a transfer contrary to the attachment within the meaning of s 64 and P takes the property free from the mortgage. The second attachment in such a case relates back to the date of the first attachment. Similarly any payment made by a debtor to his creditor though after the attachment on the debt has been raised cannot prevail over the attaching decree holder who eventually succeeds in a suit brought by him under this rule (h). In the case however of an attachment before judgment it is obligatory upon the Court to withdraw such attachment upon the dismissal of the suit [O 38 r 9] and the reversal of the judgment of the trial judge on appeal does not operate to revive the attachment which has been withdrawn (i).

Appeal—See notes to r 68 above. Appeal.

Revision—See notes to r 69 above. Limit of inquiry under rules 63 to 61.

|  |   |
|--|---|
| (d) <i>Bt v Admstr Genl of Bombay</i> (1833) 31 Com 48             | 36 11 C 91 <i>Lulu A v Ba</i> (1861) 10 Horn 400 40 4 <i>th v v M</i> (1861) 45 31 1 61 69 1 C 64 (1861) 31 1 6 1 6 1 <i>the matter of</i> (1861) 71 1 61 118 1 C 61 (23) 1 R 1 |
| (e) <i>1 cl v 1 h v 1</i> (189) 1 B m 4                            | (h) (1861) 4 Mad 81 61 1 C 64 (1861) 4 M 1 6 p  |
| (f) <i>Sa d' Lal v 1 b la 1 e had</i> (1844) 15 Cal 5 1 15 1 4 1 3 | (i) <i>Meheba</i> (1911) 13 C 1 L J 43 31 C 913 <i>1 otap (1861) 4 dra</i> (1861) 4 C W 544 6 1 C 344   |
| (g) <i>Bo o 1 v 1 r s</i> (1896) 3 C 1 8 3                         |   |
| <i>1 C 1 n d r r s M 1 s</i> (1896) 3 C 1 8 3                      |   |
| <i>1154 F of 1 (ha 1 a</i> 1 C 1 8 3 41                            |   |
| <i>(1900) C W 544 6 1 C 344 41</i>                                 |   |
| <i>Ad 1 d 1 han v Lous 1 h</i> (1899) 31 All                       |   |

Disallowance of claim to  
property attached

**Effect of order under this rule**—An order in favour of a decree holder made under this rule does not enure for the benefit of other decree holders who are not parties to the proceedings (1)

**Appeal**—See notes to r 58 above      **Appeal**

**62 [S 282]** Where the Court is satisfied that the property is subject to a mortgage or charge in favour of some person not in possession, and thinks fit to continue the attachment, it may do so, subject to such mortgage or charge

Continuance of attachment subject to claim of encumbrancer

**Scope of the rule**—This rule is an enabling rule empowering the Court to make an order continuing the attachment subject to a mortgage if the Court is satisfied that the property attached is subject to a mortgage in favour of some person not in possession. The decisions are conflicting as to whether an order which refuses to recognize a mortgage or a charge and directs the continuance of an attachment free from such mortgage or charge is to be referred to rule 66 or to this rule. The Bombay High Court and an old Allahabad case refer it to rule 66 (i). But the Madras High Court and a recent Allahabad case decide that rule 58 applies (m). The latter view cuts down the mortgagee's time for suing to one year. *secs 63*

Subject to a mortgage.—The Code clearly makes a distinction between the case in which property is expressly sold subject to a mortgage and the case in which notice of an alleged mortgage is given in the proclamation of sale. The former is provided for by the present rule and the latter by r 66 below. In the former case the Court after being satisfied of the existence of the mortgage sells only the judgment debtor's equity of redemption that is to say the purchaser buys the property *subject to the mortgage*. In the latter case he buys the property with *notice of the mortgage and subject to such risk as the notice might involve*. The executing Court does not decide whether the mortgage subsists or not. Such being the case if there is in reality a subsisting mortgage then

- (j) *Jagan Nath v Ganesh* (1895) 18 All 413  
(k) *Byagwan D v Raj Nath* (191 ) 34 All 38  
14 I C 90  
(l) *Ga e h v Damoo* (191 ) 41 Bom 64 30 I C  
913 *Durga P atad v M sa P m* (1903) 1

- (m) **F** AP L J 531  
 (u v A wug m (19 0) 35 Mad L J 397  
 58 I C 491 L k A ma an v Pa stream  
 (1919) 37 Mad L J 159 5 I C 0  
 D b J v M h raj F p h a I (19 )  
 49 411 903 10 I C 9 ( ) A A 593

purchaser has to redeem it. If on the other hand the mortgage specified in the proclamation of sale turns out invalid the purchaser acquires the property free from liability for the mortgage. The point to be noted is that mere notice of an alleged mortgage in the proclamation of sale does not preclude the purchaser from questioning the validity of the mortgage (π). And it is also to be noted that if the mortgage specified in the proclamation proves to be invalid the judgment debtor is not entitled to claim from the purchaser the amount alleged to have been due on the mortgage (o).

**Mortgage in favour of some person not in possession**—It has been held by the High Court of Bombay that where a mortgagee is in possession of the mortgaged property at the time of attachment he can claim to have the attachment removed under r 60 the reason given being that a mortgagee cannot be said to be in possession as a trustee for the judgment debtor (p). The High Court of Patna has taken the contrary view (q). See notes to r 41 above. See also s 73 (1).

**Attachment of property agreed to be sold**—An agreement for a sale of immovable property does not create any interest in or charge on the property even if earnest money has been paid. The property may therefore be attached after the agreement and a sale thereof in execution will pass a good title to the auction purchaser (r). But it is otherwise where the purchase money has been paid and possession delivered for the purchaser is in that case entitled to a charge on the property (s).

**63 [S 283]** Where a claim or an objection is preferred, the party against whom an order is made may institute a suit to establish the right which he claims to the property in dispute, but, subject to the result of such suit, if any, the order shall be conclusive.

<sup>a</sup>avin of suits to establish right to attached property

**Alteration in the rule**—S 283 of the Code of 1882 ran as follows. The party against whom an order under sections 280, 281 or 282 [now rr 60, 61 or 62] is passed may institute a suit to establish the right which he claims etc. The present rule on the other hand says that where a claim or an objection is preferred the party against whom an order is made may institute a suit to establish the right which he claims etc. The specific reference to the previous sections or rules has been omitted. A corresponding change has also been made in the Limitation Act 1908 Sch I art II. See notes below. Ord r against party to a claim or objection.

**Parties to suits under this rule**—This rule provides that unless the party against whom an order is made institutes a suit to establish the right which he claims to the property in dispute [within the period of a year from the date of the order as provided by art 11 of the Limitation Act 1908] the order made against him shall be conclusive. Now the party against whom an order may be made may be the decree

(1) *Shib Prasad v. Sheo Prasad* (1908) 8 All 418 (1st) *Prasad v. Prasad* (1903) 33 Bom 311 (1st) 106 *Nat. J.* (1911) 31 *Lon.* 101 (1st) 913 *J.* *M. I.* 1 *H. A. Han* (1913) 3 All 61 C 1 *I. I. I.* *Prasad v. Prasad* (1909) 4 C 1 446 *I. C.* 189 *Prasad v. Prasad* (1911) 43 All 49 63 *I. C.* 33 (1st) 44 *J.* *Prasad v. Prasad* (1911) 44 All 14 63 *I. C.* 90 (1st) 44 443 *I. I. I.* *Prasad v. Prasad* (1911) 44 All 14 63 (1st) 44 441

(o) *Prasad v. Prasad* (1909) 31 All 583 36 *I. A.* 63 *I. I. I.* 93  
(p) *Prasad v. Prasad* (18 *J.*) 10 *B. H.* 100 [C 1 C 1 *J. s.* 46]  
(q) *Prasad v. Prasad* (19 *J.*) 1 *Pat.* 19 *O.* *I. C.* 306 (1st) *A. I.* 403  
(r) *Prasad v. Prasad* (1894) 18 Bom 13 *Tr. n. r. of Prop. rty.* Act 19  
(s) *Prasad v. Prasad* (1900) 4 Bom 401 *Tr. n. r. of Prop. rty.* Act, 1 *s.* (o) (1)

53 holder (r 60) or the claimant including an incumbrancer (r 61) or even the judgment debtor. The result therefore is as follows —

1 The decree holder against whom an order is made under r 60 may sue the successful claimant for a declaration of his right to attach and sell the property released from attachment (i). To such a suit the judgment debtor is not a necessary party (u).

2 The claimant whose claim has been disallowed under r 61 may sue the decree holder to establish his right to the property attached (i). To such a suit the judgment debtor is a necessary party (u). And since the right conferred by this rule is not a personal one confined to the original claimant a purchaser of the interest of the original claimant can also bring a declaratory suit under this rule (x).

3 A attaches a house in execution of a decree against B. The property is claimed by C. The Court allows C's claim and the property is released from attachment. This is an order against A the decree holder (r 60). Does it also amount to an order against the judgment debtor? In other words can it be said by reason of the fact that C's claim to the property is allowed that the order operates also against B the judgment debtor? Assuming that the order does operate against B it can only do so if B is deemed to be a party against whom an order is made within the meaning of this rule. If so B must bring a declaratory suit against C within a year from the date of the order otherwise the order against him would be conclusive. But it has been held that a judgment debtor who is not in fact a party to the claim proceedings does not in the eye of the law become such by reason solely of his being the judgment debtor. Unless therefore he is a party in fact the order is not binding upon him and he may institute a suit even after the lapse of one year from the date of the order provided he does so within the ordinary period of limitation applicable to the suit to establish his title to and recover possession of the property from the claimant [C] (y). But if he was a party in fact the order would be binding on him unless he brought the suit within the period of one year.

**Alienation by claimant after order in his favour**—A purchaser of property from a claimant after an order has been passed in the claimant's favour removing the attachment on the property but before the institution of a suit by the decree holder against the claimant under this rule is an *aliene pendente lite* and is not therefore a necessary party to the suit. The alienee however takes the property subject to the provisions of s 53 of the Transfer of Property Act (z). In execution of a decree obtained by A against B certain property alleged to belong to B is attached. C claims the property. C's claim is allowed and the attachment is removed. C then sells the property to D. A then sues B and C for a declaration that at the date of attachment the property belonged to B and that he was entitled to attach it. D is not a necessary party to the suit. But the alienation by C to D will be affected by the doctrine of *lis pendens* as laid down in s 53 of the Transfer of Property Act 1882.

**Period of limitation for suit under this rule**—The period of limitation for a suit under this rule is one year from the date of the order [Limitation Act 1908 Sch I art 11]. In *Sardhar Lal v Ambika Pershad* (a) the Judicial Committee said: It [that is the order] is not conclusive a suit may be brought to claim the property notwithstanding the order but then the law of limitation says that the plaintiff

(i) *Mitchell v Mathura Dass* (1885) 1 I.A. 150  
( ) *Ghosi Parn v Mangal Chand* (1906) 8 All

(r) *Nagai ram v Balkrishna* (1880) 4 Bom  
59

(w) *Ghani Ram v Mangal Chand* (1906) 8 All  
41 43

(x) *Chakraborty v Kashi Nath* (1904) 26 All 89

(y) *Krishnasami v Somasundaram* (1907) 30  
Mad 335 *Fad palli v Dronamraju* (1908)

31 Mad 153 *Srinivas v Dod* (1887) 11  
Bom 115 *Fadar Nath v Rakhil Das*  
(1898) 15 Cal. 674 *Ana t R m v Dama*  
*dar Das* (1914) Punj Rec no 84 p 96  
I C 97

(z) *Krishnappa v Abdul Khader* (1915) 38 Mad  
535 — I C 11 *Srinivas v Shuddika*  
(1915) 7 Bom L R 931 89 I C 50 ( 5)  
A B 413

(a) (1888) 15 I A 123 15 Cal 5 1

Suit not necessary if the property is released from attachment within the period of limitation—Where after an order disallowing a claimant's claim and directing the attachment to continue the attachment ceases within the period of one year from the date of the order e.g. by reason of the dismissal of the application for execution under r. 57 above for default of prosecution (d) or by reason of the withdrawal of attachment on payment by the judgment debtor to be decree holder of the amount of the decree (e) it is not incumbent upon the claimant to institute a suit under this rule or to prosecute the suit if he has already brought one and he will not be affected by any of the consequences which result from a failure to institute a suit under this rule. In execution of a decree obtained by A against B certain property alleged to belong to B is attached. C claims the property as his own but the claim is disallowed. Within one year from the date of the order A's application for execution is dismissed under r. 7 above. C is not bound to bring a suit under this rule.

A suit under this rule is not limited by any special standard of evidence or of law. The claimant may if necessary thrash out his title in the fullest and most ultimate sense. But if the title which he claims is not the ultimate full title to the property then of course he must be content to assert whatever the title claimed may be. So too the decree holder may make out his debtor's title exactly as if it were a suit for possession by the debtor (L).

Subject to the result of such suit the order shall be conclusive — This means that unless the suit is brought as provided by this rule the party against

- (b) Venugop Iy Venkatasubbiah (1915) 39 Mad 1196 81 C 367  
(c) Jf th a Chet C P Lim oppa (19 8) 5 I A 56 109 I C 6 6 ( 8) A I C 139  
(d) V u ne s V a h a d d (19 4) 51 Cal 548 831 C 33 ( 4) A C 44 K m a r a v T h a r a j a (19 5) 44 Mal I J 616 8 I C 635 ( 5) A M 1113 P a t e h D n a Q f i b D i (19 ) 3 Lah 6 I C 543 ( ) A L 104  
(e) M i l i v N a t h i i (19 1) 45 Bom 561 59 I C 4 ( 1) A B 3 L m of C p u d e r v T a j B i l l a h (18 ) 8 Cal 9  
(f) S i v J a m B m C e s d (19 ) 16 Bom 608 P i r e J e d i s v J a n a y a (1917) 40 Mad 733 36 I C 443  
(g) (1917) 40 Mad 733 36 I C 44 s p  
(h) K i s m h a n v H e u k h D a (1890) 17 Cal 436 17 I A 1  
( ) C P T h e v O d O K P M F r m (19 7) 5 Rang 693 106 I C 368 ( 8) A R 31  
(j) A m b u v K u l l a m m a (1891) 11 M I 3 K a s t a m P a h a B e e (1906) 2 M I 151 V e i t a n b o n v I n g e n a d u (19 9) 56 M d d L J 5 110 I C 56 ( ) A M 840  
(k) V a y m u s s v V a p a d i a (18 4) 7 Cal 548 ( 4) A C 44 83 I C 33 V a s u d e v E k n a t h (1910) 25 I o m 2 49 8 I C 639

whom the order is made cannot assert either as plaintiff or as defendant in any other suit or as a party to any other proceeding the right denied to him by the order (l) *A* obtains a decree against *B* and in execution of the decree attaches certain property alleged to belong to *B*. *C* claims that he is in possession of the property under a sale from *B* of a date prior to the attachment and applies that the property be released from attachment. The executing Court finds that *C* was in possession at the date of the attachment but that the sale to him was fictitious and disallows *C*'s claim. No suit is brought by *C* within the period of a year to establish his right to the property. The property is then sold in execution and purchased by *I*. *P* then sues *C* for possession. *C* is precluded in this suit from again asserting his right as purchaser from *B*. No suit having been brought by him within the period of limitation the order disallowing his claim became conclusive against him under this rule. Similarly if *A* in execution of a decree against *B* attaches a debt alleged to be due by *C* to *B* and *C* objects to the attachment on the ground that no such debt is due and *C*'s objection is overruled but *C* brings no suit under this rule he will be precluded in a suit against him by the execution purchaser of the debt from contending that no debt was due by him to *B* (m). The result would be the same even if *C* had brought a suit against *A* and *B* to establish his right to the debt and the suit was dismissed. The result of failure to file the suit as also of the dismissal of the suit if one is filed is that the order becomes conclusive not only as regards the parties to the order or the suit but also as regards the auction purchaser. In either case *C* cannot assert his claim in a substantive suit against the auction purchaser nor can he set it up by way of defence to a suit against him by the auction purchaser (n).

The order is conclusive as against the party against whom it is made—4 obtains a decree against *B* and attaches *L*'s property in execution of his decree. *C* claiming to be a mortgagee of the property puts in a claim under r 38. *A* contends that the mortgage is not valid but his contention is disallowed. No suit is instituted by 4 as required by the present rule and the order becomes conclusive against him. The property is then sold subject to *C*'s mortgage and it is purchased by *A*. Subsequently *C* sues *A* (purchaser) and *B* (mortgagor) to recover the mortgage debt by sale of the mortgaged property. *B* not being a party to the claim proceeding may contend in *C*'s suit that the mortgage is not valid but *A* cannot for the order became conclusive against him. The fact that *B* the judgment debtor can impeach the validity of the mortgage and that the property purchased by *A* is the property which belonged to *B* does not entitle *A* to be placed in *B*'s position so as to give him the same right to attack the mortgage as *B* has (o). See notes above. Parties to suits under this rule para 3.

Property in respect of which order is conclusive—An order in a claim case is conclusive only as regards the particular property in dispute (p).

Order against party to a claim or objection —

1. An order made on an application which does not come within the scope of r 38 is not an order to which the present rule applies (q).

2. Order dismissing a claim for default—Section 233 of the Code of 1883 ran as follows. The party against whom an order under sections 240, 261 or 282 is passed

|   |  |
|---|--|
| (l) <i>Val v I a</i> (188) 10 Bom 35 <i>Ba luv v Lat / n a</i> (188) 4 Mad 50 <i>A ma guda v Pa e l</i> (1898) 2 Bom 640 <i>S n m y v Ash to h</i> (1900) Cal 14 <i>Ko r y a v Doory</i> (1906) 9 M d 5 | (o) <i>P mu A j v Ial pp</i> (191) 3 Mad 35 81 C 11  |
| (n) <i>S b b v Mo l e</i> (19 3) 44 Mad L J 88 1 C 5 4 ( 3) 4 M 56  | (p) <i>A h a B b v Awa lal E b</i> (191) 44 Cal 694 37 I C 35  |
| ( ) <i>S t g A v l j B</i> (19 1) 44 Mad 68 60 I C 5 ( 1) A M 10  | (q) <i>B la i r A n v P ngan</i> (188) 4 Mad 669 1 C 3 6 ( ) A M 153 [att im nt b for 1 l ency] <i>B th v L i p r</i> (19 ) 1 lat 150 01 C 306 ( ) A P 408 [u auctuary mortg ge] |

may in title a suit etc. It was accordingly held in some cases that the order referred to in s 283 must be one made *after investigation* of the claim as contemplated by sections 280 281 and 282 and that an order dismissing a claim for default and without investigation did not come under that section. Accordingly it was held that an order dismissing a claim for default did not become conclusive against the party against whom it was made so as to preclude him from instituting a suit more than one year after the date of the order provided the suit was within the ordinary period of limitation (r). The language of the present rule is more comprehensive than the language of s 283. This rule makes no reference to the previous rules namely rules 60 61 and 62 and a corresponding change has also been made in art 11 of the Limitation Act. The result is that the rule applies to every order made against a party to a claim preferred or an objection made under r 54 even if the order was made for default and without investigation (s). But this does not take away the right of the party to apply to have the order dismissed for default set aside (t).

3 *Order refusing to investigate a claim on the ground of delay*—Where a claim or objection is preferred under r 58 and the Court rejects it under the proviso to that rule on the ground that it was designedly or unnecessarily delayed the order is one made against the claimant or objector within the meaning of this rule (u).

4 An order in a claim petition stating that as the petition was filed late the claim will be notified to the bidders is in effect an order rejecting the claim. Such an order is one made against the claimant within the meaning of this rule (1). But an order in the same terms, namely, Sale stopped, the claim cannot be investigated by this Court. A petition dismissed has been held not to be an order against the claimant (u). Similarly, where a mortgagee applied that the sale proceeds should be kept in Court to satisfy his mortgage, but the application was dismissed on the ground that the sale had already taken place and the Court had no jurisdiction to hear the application, it was held that there was no order against the mortgagee (x). Where a claimant referred a claim to the property attached on the ground that he was entitled to a share in the property and the Court made an order in the same terms, namely, Whatever right the judgment debtor has will pass by the sale, the claim does not require any further investigation, the claim put forward will be noted in the sale proclamation. It was held that it was not an order against the claimant (y).

o If in point of fact there has been no attachment art 11 of the Limitation Act cannot apply for unless there has been an attachment there can be no order made on an objection lodged to it nor can any claim be made to the property so attached and without such an order there can be no terminus a quo for the running of limitation and with this limitation itself is non-existent. So when a mortgagee preferred a claim in the belief that there was an attachment over the property mortgaged and it is subsequently proved that the order of attachment had never been carried out the Privy

[illegible]



3 Council held that the order passed rejecting the claim was a nullity and art 11 did not apply to the mortgagee's subsequent suit on his mortgage (z)

6 See also notes to r 62 above Scope of the rule

7 There is a material difference between an order which falls under this rule and an order which falls under r 63 below In the one case if the party affected does not sue within 12 months to set it aside it becomes conclusive In the other case it has no such effect (a)

8 No suit can lie under this rule unless there has been an order either allowing or disallowing an objection to attachment A person is not entitled to object to an attachment and then to withdraw the attachment and bring a suit under this rule (b)

Orders in proceedings for attachment before judgment—Rules 58 to 63 apply to claims preferred to property attached before judgment (c) But a Provincial Court of Small Causes has no power to attach immovable property before judgment and an order made by such a Court adjudicating a claim to property so attached is *ultra vires* (d) See notes to s 7 on p 21 above

Suit for refund of purchase money—This rule applies to a suit to establish the plaintiff's right to the property in dispute It does not apply to a case where a plaintiff whose claim to the property is disallowed under r 61 sues the judgment debtor for a refund of the money paid by him for the purchase of the property A sells certain property to B C obtains a decree against A and attaches the property in execution B claims the property as purchaser but his claim is disallowed B sues A for a refund of the purchase money more than a year after the date of the order but within the ordinary period of limitation The suit is not barred by limitation The reason is that r 63 does not apply to such a suit (e)

Revival of attachment on the suit being decreed—See notes to r 60 above Effect of order of release

Payment by claimant under protest—If the claimant fails and the attachment is not removed he is not compelled to bring a suit under this rule for a declaration of his title to the property he may prevent the sale of the property by paying the decretal amount to the decree holder and then sue for it as money paid under compulsion of law i.e. under pressure of execution proceeding (f) Further the claimant is not bound to take proceedings at all under the Code to set aside the attachment He may pay the amount of the decree under protest and then sue as stated above (g) See notes to r 64 below

Jurisdiction—In a suit for a declaration that property is not liable to attachment and sale in execution of a decree where the value of the property is in excess of the amount claimed in execution of the decree the value of the suit for purposes of jurisdiction is not the value of the property but the decretal amount (h) But where the plaintiff seeks not only for a declaration that the property is not attachable but

- (z) *Muthiah Chett v Pala ppa* (19 8) 5 I A 6 109 I C 66 (3) A 1 C 139  
*reversal Muthiah Chett v Pala ppa*  
 (19 1) 4 Mad 90 O I C 43 ( )  
 A M 44
- ( ) *Ch n Lal v Pira Miyay* (19 7) 99 Bom L R 28 101 I C 33 (7) A B 28
- (b) *Mull P v P lla* (19 6) 7 Lah 35 93 I C 907 (6) A L 318
- (c) *Pras da v Yudu v P ay* (1918) 41 Mad 819 47 I C 1000 [1 B] P Mishore v *Rhabotash* (19 9) 49 Cal L J 51
- (d) *Sadek Ali v Sa ad Ali* (19 3) 3 C W 16 80 I C 300 (4) A C 193
- (e) *P ti Lam v Barkmaj* (19 4) 46 All 4

- 7 I C 8 (4) A 4 300
- (f) *D lach d v Ramkishan* (1881) 7 Cal 614  
 81 A 93 *Jugl o v Rajah S gh* (1888)  
 15 Cal 66 See also *Jivatany v Secretary of Stat* (1890) 14 Bom 99
- (g) *K nhay Lal v Nat o ol Bank of Ind*  
 (1913) 40 Cal 593 40 I A 56 18 I C 949 See also *Mahad o v Drigbaya*  
 (19 1) 43 All 2 60 I C 831 (1) A A 81 [1886] attached admitted to be due
- (h) *Khet v M miaz Begam* (1916) 33 All 31 I C 89 *A d K wa v Ram ra* J a Das (1918) 40 All 505 43 I C 494 See also *Ph i K mar v Gha sh m Murra* (1903) 35 Cal 90 35 I A

for a declaration of his title to the property as against the decree holder and the judgment debtor the value of the suit for purposes of jurisdiction is the value of the property (i)

**Burden of proof**—The burden of proof in a suit under this rule lies on the plaintiff as in other cases and not on the defendant (j)

**Effect of attachment on adverse possession**—The High Court of Madras has held that attachment of property in execution of a decree does not arrest the running of time in favour of a party holding the property adversely to the judgment debtor (k) *A* obtains a decree against *B*. In June 1921 *A* attaches certain property alleged to belong to *B*. *C* objects to the attachment and the attachment is raised in April 1922. In January 1923 *A* sues *C* under this rule for a declaration that the property belongs to *B* and that he is entitled to attach it. *C* contends that he has been in possession of the property adversely to *C* for upward of 12 years and that *A*'s suit is barred by limitation. *At the date of the attachment* *C*'s possession was for 11 years only and *at the date of the suit* it was for upwards of 12 years. According to the Madras High Court the period of *C*'s possession is to be counted up to the date of the suit and *A*'s suit is therefore barred the reason given being that attachment could not prevent the running of time in favour of *C*. On the other hand according to the Bombay High Court the period of *C*'s possession must be counted only up to the date of attachment and hence *A*'s suit is not barred the reason given being that the real question in such a case was whether the judgment debtor [*B*] had a subsisting right to the property *at the date of attachment* (l). According to the Calcutta High Court also the material date is the date of attachment (m).

**Fraudulent transfer by judgment debtor**—Where a claim is made to the property attached by one claiming to be a transferee from the judgment debtor and the claim is disallowed and the claimant subsequently institutes a suit under this rule to establish his title to the property it is open to the attaching creditor to plead in defence that the transfer was in fraud of the general body of creditors (n). In execution of a decree obtained by *A* against *B* *B*'s property is attached. *C* claims the property as having been purchased by him from *B* before *A* obtained the decree against *B* but the claim is disallowed. *C* then sues *A* and *B* under this rule to establish his right to the property. *A* is entitled to plead in defence that the transfer by *B* to *C* was made with intent to defraud *B*'s creditors. If the claim is allowed and a suit is brought by the attaching creditor under this rule he is entitled to sue on his own behalf. He is not bound to sue on behalf of himself and all other creditors of the judgment debtor (o). Thus if in the case put above *C*'s claim is allowed and the attachment is raised it is competent to *A* the attaching creditor to sue *B* and *C* under this rule to establish his right to attach the property and he may prove in such suit that the transfer by *B* to *C* was fraudulent. *A* is not bound to bring a representative suit on behalf of all the creditors of *B*.

**Damages for wrongful attachment**—Where goods attached and belonging to the judgment debtor are claimed by a third party and his claim is disallowed he may sue under this rule not only for a declaration of his title to the goods but also for the value

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| (i) <i>S. I. Reg. v. Mher (191) P. 11</i>           | (j) <i>11 C. 633</i>                                |
| (k) <i>R. n. 8 p. 93 181 C. 80</i>                  | (m) <i>51 831 C. 33 (4) 44</i>                      |
| (l) <i>Ad. n. J. v. B. (1908) 30 All. 31</i>        | (n) <i>Pama v. M. H. p. a. (190) 43 Mad. 60</i>     |
| <i>I. r. 114 1 e. 2 y. n. (19) 4 M. 1</i>           | <i>591 C. 94 o. r. u. l. i. n. b. m. a. 4 v. y.</i> |
| <i>I. J. 14 91 C. 833 (3) A. M. 0</i>               | <i>M. H. v. J. H. (191) 41 M. d. 61 43</i>          |
| <i>4 B. 3 A. J. n. (19) 3 L. n. L. J. 194</i>       | <i>1 C. 61 [11] 11 Ad. I. A. d. 41 M. a</i>         |
| <i>0 1 C. 878 (1) A. 1 9 1 F. 4 1</i>               | <i>(191) 15 (al) I. J. 612 141 C. 15</i>            |
| <i>M. F. r. 31 a. v. B. J. v. n. (19) 7 5</i>       | <i>E. H. J. L. a. r. n. (191) 11 L. R.</i>          |
| <i>Ring. 8 10 I. C. 88 (7) A. 1 C.</i>              | <i>743 5 1 C. 430</i>                               |
| <i>37 [1 C.]</i>                                    | (o) <i>Polke v. A. H. m. d. (1919) 4 M. 143 51</i>  |
| (l) <i>S. I. 11 v. 11 (1901) 11 M. d. L. J. 344</i> | <i>1 C. 14 J. F. O. U. (11) 34 a. n.</i>            |
| <i>R. n. 11 a. v. 11 a. (19) 549 Mad. L.</i>        | <i>1 (14) 5 Ran. 5 4 L. 1 C. 4 ( )</i>              |
| <i>J. 6 6 90 I. C. 103 (6) A. M. 4</i>              | <i>A. P. 1</i>                                      |
| (f) <i>101 d. v. 24 a. h. (1911) 35 Bom. 9 8 90</i> |   |

of the goods as where they have depreciated owing to a fall in the market between the date of attachment and the date of sale. He is not bound to allege and prove that the decree holder resisted his application for the removal of attachment maliciously and without probable cause (p)

**Insolvency of judgment debtor**—Leave of the Insolvency Court under sec 28 (?) of the Provincial Insolvency Act 1920 is not necessary for the commencement of a suit by the attaching creditor under this rule for a declaration that the property belonged to the judgment debtor at the date of the attachment (q)

**Costs**—The costs incurred in the summary proceeding under rule 58 may be dealt with in the suit filed under this rule (r)

**Court fee**—The Court fee payable upon the plaint in a suit by a person whose claim to property attached in execution has been dismissed is Rs 10 under the Court Fees Act Sch II art 17 whether the claim is dismissed for default or after investigation (s)

**Revision**—See notes to r 59 above Limits of inquiry under rules 59 to 61

### *Sale generally*

**64 [S 284]** Any Court executing a decree may order that any property attached by it and liable to sale, or such portion thereof as may seem necessary to satisfy the decree, shall be sold, and that the proceeds of such sale, or a sufficient portion thereof, shall be paid to the party entitled under the decree to receive the same

Power to order property attached to be sold and proceeds to be paid to person entitled

**Sale of goods not belonging to judgment debtor**—A obtains a decree against B. In execution of the decree A points out to the sheriff a agent goods belonging to C as the property of B. C's goods are thereupon attached by the sheriff's agent and sold in execution. C is entitled to claim from A the market value of his goods as on the date of attachment. The sheriff is not liable in such a case (t)

**65 [S 286]** Save as otherwise prescribed, every sale in execution of a decree shall be conducted by an officer of the Court or by such other person as the Court may appoint in this behalf, and shall be made by public auction in manner prescribed

By whom conducted and how made

**Save as otherwise prescribed**—See r 76 below. The Bombay High Court has held that the Court may for good reasons direct that the bidders at an auction sale shall be restricted to a particular class of persons (u)

**Acceptance of bid**—There is nothing in the Code to require a bid to be accepted by a Judge before a contract of sale can be held to be complete. The officer conducting the sale is the person to declare the highest bidder to be the purchaser (v). It would

- (p) *K. Arim h n v H. I. D. s* (1890) 17 C 1 436 17 I A 17  
 (q) *S. J. m. J. m. v. A. mham* (19 9) 6 Mad L J 489  
 (r) *E. F. M. Firm v. M. n. g. P. K. J. ne* (19 9) 6 Kan 408 11 I C 85 (28) A R 48  
 (s) *Ph. I. K. mar. v. Gha. hyam M. ar* (1908) 35 (1) [P. C.] Soc. adra. A. th. v. S. J. m. (1921) 6 C W N 1 6 1 4 64 I C 713

- (t) ( ) A C 168  
 (f) *A. s. r. i. ohun v. Harulal Das* (1890) 17 Cal 436 17 I A 17 6 m. v. Lokaldas (18 9) 3 Bom 4 See also *Dorab Ally v. Abd. I. Aze* (1891) 5 I A 116  
 ( ) *D. gamb. r. v. H. ar. s* (19 7) 9 Bom L R 10 109 I C 100 (17) A B 143  
 (v) *M. J. Ohn T. n. v. P. R. M. I. S. R. M. Ch. ity. Firm* (19 9) 7 Rang 4 5 ( 9) A R 311

seem that in Patna Court sales are conducted by the Nazir but the bid is to be accepted by the Munif. Until such acceptance there is no contract of sale (w)

**66 [S 287]** (1) Where any property is ordered to be sold by public auction in execution of a decree, the Court shall cause a proclamation of the intended sale to be made in the language of such Court

Proclamation of sales by public auction

(2) Such proclamation shall be drawn up after notice to the decree holder and the judgment debtor and shall state the time and place of sale, and specify as fully and accurately as possible—

- (a) the property to be sold,
- (b) the revenue assessed upon the estate or part of the estate, where the property to be sold is an interest in an estate or in part of an estate paying revenue to the Government,
- (c) any incumbrance to which the property is liable,
- (d) the amount for the recovery of which the sale is ordered,
- (e) every other thing which the Court considers material for a purchaser to know in order to judge of the nature and value of the property

(3) Every application for an order for sale under this rule shall be accompanied by a statement signed and verified in the manner hereinbefore prescribed for the signing and verification of pleadings and containing, so far as they are known to or can be ascertained by the person making the verification the matters required by sub rule (2) to be specified in the proclamation

(4) For the purpose of ascertaining the matters to be specified in the proclamation, the Court may summon any person whom it thinks necessary to summon and may examine him in respect to any such matters and require him to produce any document in his possession or power relating thereto

Alterations in the rule —

- 1 The provision in sub r (2) for notice to be given to the decree holder and the judgment debtor is new
- 2 Sub r (3) is also new

Incumbrances to which the property is liable—Where a decree holder who held a simple money decree stated in his application [sub r (3)] that the property to be sold was subject to a mortgage in his favour but no mention was made of the mortgage in the proclamation the omission not being due to any fraud on his part it was held that he was not estopped from enforcing his mortgage against the auction purchaser (x). But he would be so estopped if he omitted to mention his mortgage in the application (y). See notes to r 62 of this order.

Value of the property—Clause (e) of the rule provides that the proclamation shall specify as fairly and accurately as possible every other thing which the Court considers material for a purchaser to know in order to judge of the nature and value of the property. There can hardly be any doubt that the value of the property to be put up for sale is a material fact within the meaning of cl (e). As said by the Judicial Committee in *Saadatnund Mohan v Phul Kuar* ( ) Whatever material fact is stated in the proclamation (and the value of the property is a very material fact) must be considered as one of the things which the Court considers material for a purchaser to know and it is enacted in terms (though express enactment is hardly necessary for such an object) that those things shall be stated as fairly and accurately as possible. If any enquiry into the value of the property is necessary the Court should hold an enquiry (a). If the value is understated in the proclamation and the understatement is such as is calculated to mislead bidders and to prevent them from offering adequate price and the sale results in a price altogether inadequate the sale must be set aside on the ground of material irregularity in publishing or conducting the sale within the meaning of r 90 below (b). In a Calcutta case it was said that the Court was not bound to investigate the value of the property (c) but these remarks were *obiter dicta* (d) and it was held in a later case that the Court is bound under this clause to investigate the value and insert it in the sale proclamation (e). In view of the decision of the Judicial Committee in the case cited above there is no doubt that the value of the property should be stated as fairly and accurately as possible in the sale proclamation. The Court may in an exceptional case state in the proclamation the values stated both by the decree holder and the judgment debtor instead of attempting itself to value the property (f). The Madras High Court has held that the Court is under no obligation to fix in the proclamation of sale its own valuation of the property to be sold (g).

Specifying property to be sold.—See notes to r 90 below. Material irregularity in publishing or conducting sale no 14.

Specifying revenue.—See notes to r 90 below. Material irregularity in publishing or conducting sale nos 14 and 2.

Specifying incumbrances.—See notes to r 90 below. Material irregularity in publishing or conducting sale no 1A.

Proclamation of sale to be settled by Court.—The power to settle the proclamation of sale cannot be delegated to a commissioner. The proclamation must be settled by the Court (A). If it is settled by a commissioner the sale would be invalid.

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| (x) <i>Pam Sarup v Ekharat Singh</i> (1921) 43 All. 703 64 I C 63 (21) A A. 113  | <i>dhari Singh v Mahabir Pershad Singh</i> (190 ) 31 I A 164                     |
| ( ) <i>Kalidas v Prasad Kumar</i> (1904) 47 Cal 416 453 4 6 5 I C 189  | ( ) <i>Kashi v Jamuna</i> (1904) 31 Cal 92.                                      |
| ( ) (1898) 70 All. 41 418 73 I A 146 <i>Munsh J gh dth v Ha-arial</i> (191 ) *P L J 150 3 I C 8 ~ <i>Is v Beni Prasad v Edal Singh</i> (1919) 4 Pat L J 3 49 I C 195 | (d) <i>Sa v dya v Hurrek Chaudhary</i> (1908) 1 Cal W N 51.                      |
| ( ) <i>S and a Mohan v Hurrek Chaudhary</i> (1908) 1 C W N 51  | ( ) <i>La hm v Ga ga</i> (191 ) 15 Cal W N 13 61 C 180                           |
| (b) <i>and tma d v Paul Kuar</i> (1899) O All. 41 25 I A 146 <i>Sivasami v Rat nam</i> (1900) 23 Mad 568 see also <i>Dhan ut</i>                                     | (f) <i>Bejoy Singh v A. Anoth</i> (1903) 5 C W N 55 83 I C 430 (24) A C 589      |
|  | (g) <i>Thiruvengadam v Gorindasam</i> (1908) 51 Mad 655 109 I C 698 (23) A M 503 |
|  | (A) <i>S. brahman v A. A. ta</i> (1906) 49 M d 333 91 I C 8 (28) A M 55          |

**Duty of Court in respect of Court Sales**—In a case in which the terms of the proclamation were not clearly explained by the officer of the Court conducting the sale to a bidder who asked for an explanation and who was thus misled into buying property which was subject to mortgages amounting to more than its value the Judicial Committee in setting aside the sale observed. In sales under the direction of the Court it is incumbent on the Court to be scrupulous in the extreme and very careful to see that no taint or touch of fraud or deceit or misrepresentation is found in the conduct of its ministers. It would be disastrous it would be absolutely shocking if the Court were to enforce against a purchaser misled by its duly accredited agents a bargain so illusory and so unconscientious as this (i)

**Non compliance with provisions of this rule**—See notes to r 90 below  
**Material irregularity in publishing or conducting sale** nos 14 and 2

**Where judgment debtor lies by** see notes to r 90 below **Waiver and estoppel**

**Appeal**—An order under this rule not being included in the list of appealable orders given in O 43 is not appealable as an order. The question then arises whether an order under this rule is an order in execution proceedings within the meaning of s 47. Now an order in execution proceedings may be a final order that is it may conclusively determine the rights of parties or it may be interlocutory. In the former case the order operates as a decree and is appealable as such [s 2 (2)] but not in the latter case [see notes to s 47 Interlocutory orders in execution proceedings]. The question therefore in each case is whether a particular order made under this rule *conclusively* determines the rights of the parties or not.

A Full Bench of the High Court of Madras in *Swagami v Subrahmaniam* (j) which was a case under the corresponding section 287 of the Code of 1892 held that no proceeding of a Court under that section in relation to the proclamation of sale is an order within s 244 (now s 47) so as to be appealable as a decree. In the course of the Order of Reference the learned Judges said. We are disposed to think that the preliminary objection is well founded and that under section 287 Civil Procedure Code the proceedings are in themselves administrative and not judicial but that if and when a sale does take place if ever and it has to be judicially confirmed objection may be taken to the confirmation of the sale on any of the grounds mentioned in section 311 Civil Procedure Code (now O 21 r 90) some of which may relate to the contents of the proclamation. This view receives strong corroboration from the provision enacted by section 288 Civil Procedure Code that no Judge or other public officer shall be answerable for any error mis statement or omission in any proclamation under section 287 Civil Procedure Code unless the same has been committed or made dishonestly a provision which in view of Act XVIII of 1890 would have been quite superfluous if proceedings under section 287 Civil Procedure Code were judicial and not administrative. In delivering their opinion the Full Bench said. We concur in the reasons given in the Order of Reference and we may add that the view that the proceedings in themselves under section 287 are of an administrative and not of a judicial character is further supported by the fact that special provision is made in section 287 (now O 21 r 66 (4)) to summon witnesses and make enquiry into the matters referred to in the section a provision which would be superfluous if the proceedings were judicial. It has accordingly been held by that Court that an order under this rule determining the value of the property to be sold the place where the sale is to take place the lot in which it is to be sold and the amount for the recovery of which the property is to be sold is not a judicial but an administrative order and that it does not come within s 244 (now s 47) and is not

(i) *A. I. M. A. H. v. P. C. I.* (1909) 36 Cal 33  
 314 3d I. A. 33 11 C 1  
 (j) (1904) Mad 59 *Chandambam v. The*

*Swagami v. Subrahmaniam* (1903) 46 Mad 68 80 I. C.  
 155 (4 A M 1)

6 appealable (l) It may here be stated that s 288 of the Code of 1882 has not been reproduced in the present Code In a case under this Code (l) the High Court of Madras observed that the Full Bench decision was good law even under the present Code notwithstanding the omission of s 288 though in another case (m) Schwabe C J expressed a doubt on that point As to a decision as to the order in which the properties are to be put up for sale the Madras High Court has held that such a decision is an order within sec 47 and that it is appealable if it affects the rights of co-defendants *inter se* for example in a case of execution of a decree on a mortgage where the interests of the owners of the items of the mortgaged properties will be seriously affected by the order in which the properties are sold (n) In a recent case the same High Court held that the Court is under no obligation whatever under this rule to fix and state in the proclamation of sale its own valuation of the property to be sold (o)

The Bombay High Court follows the Madras Full Bench Case (p)

The High Court of Calcutta has held that an order under this rule may be either final or interlocutory If it is final it falls within s 47 and is appealable as a decree but it is not appealable if it is interlocutory It has accordingly been held that an order determining the value of the property to be sold is merely interlocutory and is not appealable (q) An order in the following term let sale proclamation be issued in the meantime I shall hear the objection of the judgment debtor is also interlocutory (r) But an order adjudicating upon a dispute as to the boundaries of the property sold and determining that certain accreted land should be included in the property to be sold is final and is appealable as a decree (s) It may be observed that it is not safe to follow such decisions under the Code of 1882 as they proceeded on points in which the definition of decree differed from that in the present Code

The High Court of Allahabad has also held that an order under this rule determining the value of the property to be sold does not fall within s 47 and is not appealable The reason given is that in such a case the Court judicially decides nothing (t)

In two earlier cases the High Court of Patna held that an order under this rule determining the value of the property to be sold was merely interlocutory and was not therefore appealable (u) In a recent Patna case a Bench of three Judges held that an order of the Court determining any of the particulars to be stated in the sale proclamation under this rule is not a final order and is not appealable It was accordingly held in that case that an order refusing to notify a lease in the sale proclamation was not final and was not appealable (v)

Letters Patent appeal—An order of a single Judge of the High Court sitting on the Original Side refusing to alter the upset price fixed in a proclamation of sale or to direct the sale of the property in lots or to postpone the date of sale is not a judgment

- (l) (1904) 27 Mad 29 *ex pro Pamanathan v Bankota kelam* (19-3) 43 Mad L J 599  
I C 830 (23) A M 619 (order fixing upset price) *Aleemah Arundaram v Chollalaga* (19 0) 56 Mad L J 61 ( 9) A M 506
- (m) *La la v La ki* (19 4) 46 Mad L J 19  
78 I C 89 ( 4) A M 57 *supra*
- (n) *Fareedias v Mhta d So s* (19 4) 46 Mad L J 17 I C 901 ( 4) A M 34
- (o) *Pelata v The Madras Hindu Labh Adh Ltd* (19-3) 45 Mad L J 478 *Ya as mha Subbarayulu* (19 0) 51 Mad L J 135  
*Meenalishu ulam v Chokk i nga* (19 2) 56 Mad L J 61 ( 9) A M 506
- (p) *Th ru enadaram any v Co indaramany* (19 2) 51 Mad L J 65 109 I C 688 ( 3) A M 503
- (q) *Kri h a ao v Arishnarao* (19 8) 5 Bom

- 441 111 I C 89 ( 3) A D 245
- (r) *De kunanda v Bansi S ngal* (191 ) 16 C L W N 1 4 10 I O 371 *Pun h Dwar v M* (191 ) 16 Cal W N 0 0 17 I C 88
- (s) *Jogesh v Heme d a* (19 ) 3 Cal L J 10  
64 I O 547 ( 1) A C 69
- (t) *D wand Nola v Fa la h Cha fa* (19 4 9 GW N 5 6 80 I C 861 ( 5) A C 318
- (u) *Ayul d Prasad v G p Noll* (1917) 39 All 41 39 I C 578 *Shudam i d Z karia v A h i* (19 0) 48 All 60 9 I C 614 ( 26) A C 63
- (v) *Deals d v Pajah Dh Le hwar Prasad* (191 ) Pat L J 13 33 I C 616 *Sauran d noll v M ta j i* (19 0) 5 Pat L J 50 56 I C 45
- (w) *Moful v Thala* (19 ) 4 Pat 731  
83 I C 33 ( 5) A P 500

within the meaning of cl 15 of the Letters Patent but merely an interlocutory order and no appeal lies from it under that clause (u)

**Death of judgment debtor pending execution**—If the judgment debtor has died before issue of notice to him under this rule his legal representatives must be brought on the record. If the legal representatives are not brought on the record the sale would be void (x)

**Non appearance of legal representative and res judicata**—The failure of the legal representative of a deceased judgment debtor to attend pursuant to a notice under sub r (2) [App E form no 23] at the hearing of an application to settle the terms of a sale proclamation does not estop him on the principle of res judicata from contending thereafter that the property attached belongs to him personally and that it does not form part of the estate of the deceased judgment debtor. The notice under sub r (2) is merely to settle the terms of the proclamation it is not for determining questions of title to the property (y)

**Form of proclamation of sale**—For form of proclamation of sale see Appendix E form no 29

**Form of notice under sub rule (2)**—For form of notice under sub r (2) see Appendix E form no 28

**67 [S 289]** (1) Every proclamation shall be made and published, as nearly as may be in the manner prescribed by rule 54, sub rule (2)

Mode of making proclamation

(2) Where the Court so directs, such proclamation shall also be published in the local official Gazette or in a local newspaper, or in both, and the costs of such publication shall be deemed to be costs of the sale

(3) Where property is divided into lots for the purpose of being sold separately, it shall not be necessary to make a separate proclamation for each lot, unless proper notice of the sale cannot in the opinion of the Court, otherwise be given

**Sub rule (1)**—If the property to be sold consists of several villages which are all close together it is not necessary to make proclamation in every village (z)

**Sub rule (3)** property divided into lots for separate sale—This sub rule is new. It incorporates the decision in the undermentioned case (a)

**Non compliance with the rule**—Omission to carry out the provisions of this rule does not render the sale *ipso facto* void. But such omission amounts to a material irregularity within the meaning of r 90 below and the sale will be set aside if the Court is satisfied that substantial injury has resulted from the irregularity (b). See the proviso to r 90 below

**Sub r (2)**—Note that under this sub rule the Court may direct publication of the proclamation it is not incumbent on the Court to do so (c)

(a) *Itaiyab v Mehta & So* (1941) 46 M 1 L J 171 C 901 (4) A M 34

(z) *Chitambar v J. Rao* (197) 49 All 830 101 C 9 (18) A A 4

(y) *Chitambar v Thir* (197) 46 Mad 69 91 C 155 (4) A M 1 (E B)

(x) *Mahesh Bahadur v I C L I* (194) 6 P 1 42 101 C 649 (4) A 1 5

(a) *P. D. v. Jadhav* (1888) 1 Bom 369

(b) *Nan Kumar v Gopal Chander* (1891) 18 Cal 4

(c) *Gopal Chander v Benarn Das* (1919) 1 Lah L J 19



**68 [S 290]** Save in the case of property of the kind described in the proviso to rule 43, no sale hereunder shall, without the consent in writing of the judgment debtor, take place until after the expiration of at least thirty days in the case of immovable property, and of at least fifteen days in the case of movable property, calculated from the date on which the copy of the proclamation has been affixed on the Court house of the Judge ordering the sale

Time of sale

**Non compliance with the rule**—If a sale is held before the expiration of the period prescribed by this rule it is not void but the case is one of material irregularity within the meaning of r 90 and the sale will be set aside if the Court is satisfied that substantial injury has resulted from the irregularity (d)

**69 [S 291]** (1) The Court may, in its discretion, adjourn any sale hereunder to a specified day and hour, and the officer conducting any such sale may in his discretion adjourn the sale, recording his reason for such adjournment

Adjournment or stoppage of sale

Provided that, where the sale is made in, or within the precincts of, the Court-house, no such adjournment shall be made without the leave of the Court

(2) Where a sale is adjourned under sub rule (1) for a longer period than seven days, a fresh proclamation under rule 67 shall be made, unless the judgment debtor consents to waive it

(3) Every sale shall be stopped if, before the lot is knocked down, the debt and costs (including the costs of the sale) are tendered to the officer conducting the sale, or proof is given to his satisfaction that the amount of such debt and costs has been paid into the Court which ordered the sale

**Omission to fix the day of adjourned sale**—Where a sale is adjourned but no day is specified to which it is adjourned the sale is void (e)

**Omission to fix the hour of adjourned sale**—Such an omission amounts to a material irregularity within the meaning of r 90 below (f)

**Omission to issue fresh proclamation**—Such an omission amounts to a material irregularity within the meaning of r 90 below (g) see notes to r 90 Material irregularity in publishing or conducting sale No 7 But it has been held that the

(d) *Ta adluk v Ahm d* (1894) 1 Cal 66 40 I A 1 6 *Aokil v Edal Singh* (1904) 31 C 1 395  
(e) *Motolal v Moham d* (19 4) 40 C L L J 311 84 I C 90 ( 5) A C 91  
(f) *S m J v D k a* (1897) 4 Cal 91 *Mahabir v Dha ukdhari* (1904) 31

Cal 815 818 *Bh kh n v Surja M n* (1901) 6 C W N 43 *B b Ram v Ima dlah* (19 7) 49 All 40 99 I C 9 6 ( 7) A A 11  
(g) *B g l Chander v R me hu* (1891) 18 Cal 496 *Syed A h f v G g B kh* (19 7) 2 Luck 499 100 I C 787 (25) A O 95

property may be kept under hammer for several days without an adjournment and if no a fresh proclamation is not necessary (h)

Sale held on a date other than the one to which it is adjourned—Where a sale is adjourned to a certain date but it is held on a different date the case is one of material irregularity in conducting the sale (i)

Sub rule (3) Sale in execution of a mortgage decree—A mortgagor judgment debtor is entitled to stop the sale of the mortgaged property in execution of a mortgage decree by payment of the debt before the sale actually takes place even after a final decree for sale has been passed (j)

Rateable distribution—Moneys paid into Court under sub r (3) to stop a sale are assets available for rateable distribution within the meaning of s 73 (L)

**70** [Cf S 287, last para] Nothing in rules 66 to 69 shall be deemed to apply to any case in which the execution of a decree has been transferred to the Collector

Execution of decree by Collector—See ss 68 to 72 and Sch III below

**71** [s 293] Any deficiency of price which may happen on a re sale by reason of the purchaser's default, and all expenses attending such re sale, shall be certified to the Court or to the Collector or subordinate of the Collector, as the case may be by the officer or other person holding the sale, and shall, at the instance of either the decree holder or the judgment debtor, be recoverable from the defaulting purchaser under the provisions relating to the execution of a decree for the payment of money

Application of the rule—The rule extends to all sales whether of movable or of immovable property and also to re sales made under the Code whether made in consequence of default of payment of deposit under r 84 or of purchase money under rr 85 and 86 (l) But the re sale should only cover the property sold at the prior sale and any substantial difference of description at the sale and re sale in any of the matters required by r 66 will deprive the decree holder of the right to recover the deficiency of price under this rule Thus where the defaulting purchaser had been induced to bid for the property as unincumbered by reason of the fact that the incumbrances were not mentioned in the proclamation of sale and the re sale was on a proclamation in which the incumbrances were mentioned it was held that he was not liable for the deficiency on re sale under this rule (m) The same was held where the property was described as that of A at the first sale and as that of B at the second (n) The case is different however if the property re sold is substantially the same as that put up for sale at the first sale The reasonable construction to place on rule 71 is that the re sale should be within a reason

- (h) *M. I. Dar v. N. B. Sanyal & M. Pannu* (19) 6 Pat 43 1041 C. 1 ( ) A 1 31  
(i) *Hassan v. Shub. Gopal* (19) 3 Cal L J 140 6 T C 46 (1) A C 597  
(j) *B. v. A.* (1904) 31 Cal 263 *Murphy v. M. v. Lal* (1906) 5 All 1  
(L) *Purshotam v. S. Ajbarthi* (18\*) 6

- Bom 544 559 a decret under s 9 of the Code of 1  
(b) *P. J. d. v. Jayad* (1911) Cal 33  
*J. J. v. H. dha* (1841) J. Lom 5  
(m) *B. J. v. Mohan* (18, 9) 16 Cal 53  
(n) *G. v. F.* (1911) 36 Bom 39 141 C. 7

able time after the first sale and the property re sold should be substantially the same and that any difference will not matter if the difference in the condition of the property or the title thereto is one which would occur in the ordinary course of things having regard either to the nature of the property or the transaction in respect thereof having legal force at the date of sale or was brought about by the first purchaser's default (o). The deficiency may be recovered though the certificate referred to in this rule has not been issued (p).

It is to be noted that on the happening of any of the events that render a re-sale necessary the decree holder is *not bound to have the same property re sold*. He may proceed against any other property of the judgment debtor leaving the latter to his remedy against the defaulting purchaser (q).

**Who may apply under this rule**—The only person who can apply under this rule is the decree holder who brought the property to sale or the judgment debtor. No other person is entitled to apply (r).

**By reason of purchaser's default**—These words cover a default not only in payment of the balance of the price but in making the deposit of 25 per cent as provided by r 84 below (s).

At a Court sale A bid Rs 5000 B bids Rs 6000 and C bids Rs 7000. C dies before his bid is accepted by the Court. Can B be said in the circumstances to be the highest bidder? No. C's bid was revoked by his death before acceptance by the Court. B's bid lapsed on the making of the higher bid by C and A's bid lapsed on the making of the higher bid by B. The property should therefore be put up afresh for sale (t).

**Certificate**—The certificate as to the deficiency can be executed as a decree and can therefore also be attached as a decree (u).

**Interest on deficiency**—A defaulting purchaser is liable for interest on the deficiency from the date on which an order is made against him under this rule and not from the date of sale (v).

**Rateable distribution**—Where a decree holder who has brought the property to sale applies under this rule and attaches the amount of the deposit lying in Court other decree holders who have applied before the amount was deposited in Court are entitled to a rateable distribution of such amount. The amount in deposit in Court represents the assets realised by the Court within the meaning of sec "3 above (w).

**Where defaulting purchaser merely an agent**—The mere fact that the defaulting purchaser acted as the agent of another is no ground for exempting him from liability under this rule unless he informed the officer conducting the sale that he was merely an agent. The fact that the judgment debtor knew that he was merely an agent does not disentitle the judgment debtor to an order under this rule (x).

**Appeal**—An order under this rule allowing or disallowing an application for the recovery of the loss by a re-sale falls within s 47 and is appealable as a decree (y). See notes to s 102. **Execution.**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| (o) <i>Ve Kala Belli naaya v. Vala</i> (1916) 41 Mad 444 43 I C 64 affirm on appeal to P.C. sub nom. <i>Ve Lalit</i> g. j. v. <i>Yank t. H m</i> (19 ) 48 M 1 L J 33 86 I C 33 ( ) A PC 61 | ( ) <i>Abd I. Jibbar v. Sita Pa</i> (19 6) 4 All L J 3 9 I C 103 ( 6) A A 3 9  |
| (p) <i>Tappers Lal v. Deoki</i> (190 ) 19 All -  | (r) <i>F. v. M. h. ayu</i> (19 1) 46 Mad 1 J 131 8 I C 96 ( 4) A M 4 6   |
| (q) <i>Gou Chu de v. Chund v. Coomur</i> (189 ) 8 Cal 91   | (s) (19 3) 49 M. 1 570 97 I C 96 ( 6) A M 8  |
| ( ) <i>S. M. h. t. Praj v. F. j. J. K. t. h. t.</i> (19 6) 49 Mad 50 97 I C 26 ( 6) A M 8  | (t) (19 4) 46 M. d. L J 131 8 I C 96 ( 4) A M 4 6 p a  |
| (s) <i>Sita Pam v. Ja h. Pam</i> (19 ) 44 All 66 1 65 I C 813 ( ) A A 00   | (u) <i>A. B. I. t. e. I. t. h. t.</i> (189 ) 18 Mad 4 J. K. t. h. t. v. G. t. I. r. o. n. t. (18 3) (at 93) R. m. D. a. l. v. J. t. D. a. s. (18 6) 1 All 191 512 F. m. v. J. a. t. t. a. m. (19 ) 44 All 96 65 I C 813 ( ) A A 00 |
| (t) <i>Raja of Bobbi v. S. ya a. ayana</i> (1919) 4 Mad 6 512 I C 805  | (v) <i>erraling Deok v. Tape r.</i> (190 ) 14 All 901 See also <i>Cannad v. E. t. C. aj</i> (191 ) 36 Bom 3 14 I C   |

72 [S 294] (1) No holder of a decree in execution of which property is sold shall, without the express permission of the Court bid for or purchase the property

Decree holder not to bid for or buy property without permission

(2) Where a decree holder purchases with such permission, the purchase money and the amount due on the decree may, subject to the provisions of section 73, be set off against one another, and the Court executing the decree shall enter up satisfaction of the decree in whole or in part accordingly

Where decree holder purchase amount of decree may be taken as payment

(3) Where a decree holder purchases, by himself or through another person, without such permission, the Court may if it thinks fit, on the application of the judgment debtor or any other person whose interests are affected by the sale, by order set aside the sale, and the costs of such application and order, and any deficiency of price which may happen on the re sale and all expenses attending it shall be paid by the decree holder

#### Alterations in the rule —

- 1 The words subject to the provisions of section 73 are new See notes below under the head Amount due on the decree
- 2 The words any other person whose interests are affected by the sale in sub r (3) have been substituted for the words any other person interested in the sale This is merely a verbal alteration

No separate suit — Where a decree holder without leave of the Court buys the property of the judgment debtor at a Court sale the remedy of the latter is by application under this rule and s 4 and not by a separate suit a separate suit is barred under s 47 The question whether the sale should be set aside or not is a question between the parties to the suit relating to the execution of the decree within the meaning of s 4 and it must therefore be decided by the Court executing the decree and not by a separate suit ( ) Note the words may by order set aside the sale in sub r (3)

The Court may if it thinks fit set aside the sale — In *Prin Ratha Krihana v Bihari Sahay* (a) their Lordships of the Privy Council in dealing with the corresponding s 214 of the Code of 1859 said Upon the construction of this section it is evident that a purchase by a decree holder who has not obtained permission is not void nor a nullity but is only to be avoided on the application of the judgment debtor or some other person interested It would be injurious to those interested in the sale if a decree holder who had been forced up in the bidding to give a large sum of money could escape from fulfilling his contract by obtaining the sale and a nullity and it would make all titles under such sales insecure if at a later period they were liable to be treated as nullities A sale is to be set aside upon application and upon cause shown Where a decree holder purchases without the permission of the Court the sale is stated above

(2) Cf *Prin Ratha Krihana v Bihari Sahay* (1901) 3 All 441 (a) (1901) 19 I A 31 1 Pat 33 67 I C 914 ( ) A I C 3

Provided that the Court may direct the sale to be held at the nearest place of public resort, if it is of opinion that the produce is thereby likely to sell to greater advantage

(2) Where, on the produce being put up for sale,—

(a) a fair price, in the estimation of the person holding the sale, is not offered for it, and

(b) the owner of the produce or a person authorized to act in his behalf applies to have the sale postponed till the next day or, if a market is held at the place of sale, the next market day,

the sale shall be postponed accordingly and shall be then completed, whatever price may be offered for the produce

**Place of sale of movable property**—Except in the case of agricultural produce for which provision has been made by this rule a sale of movables in execution of a decree should ordinarily be held at some place within the jurisdiction of the Court ordering the sale. Good and sufficient reasons ought to be shown for directing otherwise. A mere contention that a higher price is likely to be bid in some other place is not a good and sufficient reason (a)

**75 [New]** (1) Where the property to be sold is a growing crop and the crop from its nature admits of being stored but has not yet been stored, the day of the sale shall be so fixed as to admit of its being made ready for storing before the arrival of such day, and the sale shall not be held until the crop has been cut or gathered and is ready for storing

(2) Where the crop from its nature does not admit of being stored, it may be sold before it is cut and gathered and the purchaser shall be entitled to enter on the land, and to do all that is necessary for the purpose of tending and cutting or gathering it

**76 [s 296]** Where the property to be sold is a negotiable instrument or a share in a corporation, the Court may, instead of directing the sale to be made by public auction, authorize the sale of such instrument or share through a broker

**May**—A sale through a broker is permissive and not obligatory (b).

**77 [S 297]** (1) Where movable property is sold by public auction the price of each lot shall be paid at the time of sale or as soon after as the officer or other person holding the sale directs, and in default of payment the property shall forthwith be re sold

Sale by public auction

(2) On payment of the purchase money, the officer or other person holding the sale shall grant a receipt for the same and the sale shall become absolute

(3) Where the movable property to be sold is a share in goods belonging to the judgment debtor and a co owner, and two or more persons, of whom one is such co owner, respectively bid the same sum for such property or for any lot, the bidding shall be deemed to be the bidding of the co owner

Where movable property is sold by public auction—This does not apply to negotiable instruments or shares sold through a broker under r 76 above (c)

Payment of price—The officer holding the sale has a discretion to allow the price to be paid at a reasonable time after the sale (d)

In default of payment—The provisions of r 71 apply to a re sale under this rule (e)

Sub rule (3)—This sub rule is new It give a right of pre-emption to the co owner See as to immovable property r 88 below

**78 [S 293]** No irregularity in publishing or conducting the sale of movable property shall vitiate the sale, but any person sustaining any injury by reason of such irregularity at the hand of any other person may institute a suit against him for compensation or (if such other person is the purchaser) for the recovery of the specific property and for compensation in default of such recovery

Irregularity not to vitiate  
suit by any person injured  
by sale

Scope of the rule—This rule provides for the case of irregularity in publishing or conducting the sale of movable property Rule 90 deals with irregularity in publishing or conducting the sale of immovable property

Irregularity in publishing or conducting the sale—If the sale proclamation warrants a title which fails the injured party may apply to set aside the sale for this is not a case of irregularity (f)

At the hand of any other person—Where movable property not belonging to the judgment debtor is sold at the instance of the decree holder the real owner may sue the decree holder for the value of the property (g)

Money decree—A money decree is not movable property within the meaning of this rule (f) See O 21 r 53

(c) *Hol v H* (1888) 39 Bo 1 519

(d) *Shah Faied v Sh Chru* (18) 4 N W

1 H C R 3

(e) *P mthm v f* 20 1 (1831) Cal 33

(f) *Fram v Horn* 29 (18 8) 2 Bom 8

(g) *Moh d Ahs* 1 (186.) 9 W R 118

(h) *Ming Lu Bye M g P Ngun* (18 3) 1 R N. 360 61 C 6 9 (4) A R 1

**79** [ S 299, 300, 301 ] (1) Where the property sold is movable property of which actual seizure has been made, it shall be delivered to the purchaser

Delivery of movable property debts and shares

(2) Where the property sold is movable property in the possession of some person other than the judgment debtor, the delivery thereof to the purchaser shall be made by giving notice to the person in possession prohibiting him from delivering possession of the property to any person except the purchaser

(3) Where the property sold is a debt not secured by a negotiable instrument or is a share in a corporation, the delivery thereof shall be made by a written order of the Court prohibiting the creditor from receiving the debt or any interest thereon, and the debtor from making payment thereof to any person except the purchaser, or prohibiting the person in whose name the share may be standing from making any transfer of the share to any person except the purchaser, or receiving payment of any dividend or interest thereon, and the manager, secretary or other proper officer of the corporation from permitting any such transfer or making any such payment to any person except the purchaser

**Sale of shares** — A purchaser of shares of a limited Company at a sale in execution of a decree is not entitled as of right to have his name entered in the register of the Company as a shareholder. He is subject to the same rules as those which apply to a private purchaser (1)

**Forms** — See App E forms nos 32 33 and 34

**80** [ S 302 ] (1) Where the execution of a document or the endorsement of the party in whose name a negotiable instrument or a share in a corporation is standing is required

Transfer of negotiable instruments and shares

to transfer such negotiable instrument or share, the Judge or such officers as he may appoint in this behalf may execute such document or make such endorsement as may be necessary, and such execution or endorsement shall have the same effect as an execution or endorsement by the party

(2) Such execution or endorsement may be in the following form, namely —

*A B* by *C D*, Judge of the Court of (or as the case may be), in a suit by *E F* against *A B*

(1) *Ma dal v Co dhan Sp an ng and Mana fact ring Co* (1917) 41 Bom 6 371 C

656 *Tadepalli v Sram* (1901) 45 Mad 53 541 O J C 659 (3) A M 41

(3) Until the transfer of such negotiable instrument or share, the Court may, by order, appoint some person to receive any interest or dividend due thereon and to sign a receipt for the same, and any receipt so signed shall be as valid and effectual for all purposes as if the same had been signed by the party himself

**Execution of deed of transfer of shares**—Where a deed of transfer of shares is executed by a Judge under this rule the company has no option as to registering the shareholder who purchased the shares in execution and if the purchaser cannot obtain the original share certificates from the judgment debtor the company is bound to grant him new share certificates (j)

**81 [S 303]** In the case of any movable property not heretofore provided for, the Court may make an order vesting such property in the purchaser or as he may direct, and such property shall vest accordingly

*Vesting order in case of other property*

### *Sale of immovable property*

**82 [S 304]** Sales of immovable property in execution of decrees may be ordered by any Court other than a Court of Small Causes

*What Courts may order sales*

**83 [S 305]** (1) Where an order for the sale of immovable property has been made, if the judgment debtor can satisfy the Court that there is reason to believe that the amount of the decree may be raised by the mortgage or lease or private sale of such property, or some part thereof, or of any other immovable property of the judgment debtor, the Court may, on his application, postpone the sale of the property comprised in the order for sale on such terms and for such period as it thinks proper, to enable him to raise the amount

*Postponement of sale to judgment debtor to raise amount of decree*

(2) In such case the Court shall grant a certificate to the judgment debtor authorizing him within a period to be mentioned therein, and notwithstanding anything contained in section 64, to make the proposed mortgage, lease or sale

Provided that all moneys payable under such mortgage lease or sale shall be paid, not to the judgment-debtor, but, save in so far as a decree holder is entitled to set off such money under the provisions of rule 72, into Court



33 Provided also that no mortgage, lease or sale under this rule shall become absolute until it has been confirmed by the Court

(3) Nothing in this rule shall be deemed to apply to a sale of property directed to be sold in execution of a decree for sale in enforcement of a mortgage of, or charge on, such property

Alterations in the rule—The words *save in so far as a decree holder is entitled to set off such money under the provisions of rule 72 in sub r (2) have been added to make it clear that where a decree holder is entitled to a set off under r 72 he should not be required to pay in the monies. A similar saving has been introduced into r 84 sub r 2 and r 85*

Postpone the sale for such period as it thinks proper—The postponement of sale under this rule is discretionary with the Court (1). But the postponement should be for a reasonable period (1)

The amount of the decree can be raised—No sale should be postponed and no certificate should be granted under sub r (2) unless the whole amount due on the decree can be raised by mortgage lease or sale (m)

Notwithstanding anything contained in section 64—On compliance with the conditions of this rule a private alienation notwithstanding s 64 becomes absolute not only against the claim of the decree holder but against all claims enforceable under the attachment (n)

Confirmation of sale by Court—Where permission to raise the amount of decree by private sale has been granted to the judgment debtor by two Courts in each of which a decree has been passed against him it is enough if the sale is confirmed by one Court it is superfluous to apply to the other Court for confirmation of the same sale (o)

Guardian and Wards Act 8 of 1890 s 29—A private alienation of property though confirmed by the *executing Court* under this rule is not valid if such alienation is made by a guardian and the sale is not confirmed by the Court by which the guardian was appointed (p)

Decree for the enforcement of a mortgage—This rule does not apply to a sale of property directed to be sold in execution of a decree for the enforcement of a mortgage. The reason is that in the case of a mortgage decree the right of sale does not depend upon the attachment in execution but is confirmed by the decree itself (7)

Rateable distribution—Money paid into Court under the provision to sub r (2) is liable to rateable distribution under s 73 as it is paid under a pending execution application (r)

(k) *Bah man v J d Mortgage Ba I (1884)*  
1 I A 7 10 11 Cal 44 48 V A R  
R M *Cleff v M Smt ja (19 5) 3*  
Bang 13 136 89 I C 300 ( ) A R  
271

(l) *Moh ee v R m Kant (1871) 15 W R 3*  
*Suh j v P m Pershad (18 4) 1 W R*  
146 R m *Jutt v Land Mortgage Bank*  
(187 1) 1 W R 193

(m) *Venkatas mt Girs am v Chaudas ppa*  
(1891) 14 Mad 7

(n) *Sh el gappa v Cha basappa (1906) 30*  
Dom 33

(o) *4nt npa v BA m ao (189 ) 19 Bom*  
539

(p) *Dattar m v Cang ra (1899) 3 Bom 8*  
*Sarj v D at at Judge of Be aras (1909)*  
31 All 378 I C 356 *Se al o D J wdra*  
*v Ma orama (10 ) 49 (al 911 I C*  
990 ( ) A C 150

(q) *Wanda Kh m v Raj Roop (18 8) 3 Cal*  
33 *Fora L v fu ) b al on l Ba k*  
(19 3) 5 *Lah L J 5 5 I C 816 ( 1)*  
A I 344 *Theo el to l Ari Anaj v*  
*M hulev (1901) 5 Bom 104* is no longer  
Good l w

(r) *Tal r v m v J lahma a (1918) 41 Mad*  
616 47 I C 534 *J v r A J mda v q w nj*  
*bi th (188 ) 8 Bom 544*

**Revision** —No appeal lies from an order refusing to postpone a sale under this rule

**84** [S 306] (1) On every sale of immovable pro-

chaser shall pay immediately after such declaration a deposit of twenty five per cent of his purchase money to the officer conducting the sale and, in default of such payment the property shall forthwith be re sold

(2) Where the decree holder is the purchaser and is

**Declared to be the purchaser** —An execution sale is not complete until the

**Material Irregularity**—It has been held by the High Courts of Calcutta

Sub rule (2)—This sub rule is new. See notes to r 93. Alterations in the rule

85 [s 307] The full amount of purchase money pay

The full amount of purchase money payable shall be paid by the purchaser into Court before the Court closes on the fifteenth day from the sale of the property

Provided that, in calculating the amount to be so paid

On the fifteenth day from the sale—The purchaser is bound to see that the

**Material Irregularity**—The time for payment cannot be extended with

|  |   |
|--|---|
| (a) \ h H I M Chetty \ b a j a (19' 3) S<br>R a 13 13 1 300 ( ) A R            | R gam v f i a t o f t p p e I n d a L t d (1909)<br>20 A n l = 3                        |
| (f) J a b e t r v M t e d i a (19' 3) - P a t 549<br>761 \ 113 ( ) 3 A 1 5     | (w) S t e R a m J H F m (19-- ) 44 A n l. 66<br>1 C 813 ( ) A A ' 900 [F B]             |
| (u) B h a m N a r a i (1889) 1 a n 33 1 e l a t e<br>N a m i (1891) 14 M a d ? | ( ) P a m i c h a d r a v D e l a y (1909) Z. B o m 415                                 |
| (i) I t a m a v N a r a i (1' 3) 3 A n l 316 4 m u r                           | (y) S u b r a m y a m J y u d a n a (19' ) 43 M a d.<br>L J 4 7 691 C 1001 ( ) 3 A M 48 |

Where the Court or office is closed on the fifteenth day—In such a case the payment may be made on the next day on which the Court or Office is open  
See General Clauses Act 10 of 1897 s 10

Proviso —The proviso is new See notes to r 83 above Alterations in the rule

**86 [S 308]** In default of payment within the period mentioned in the last preceding rule, the deposit may, if the Court thinks fit, after defraying the expenses of the sale, be forfeited to the Government, and the property shall be re sold, and the defaulting purchaser shall forfeit all claim to the property or to any part of the sum for which it may subsequently be sold

Procedure in default of payment

Alteration in the rule—The words may if the Court thinks fit have been substituted for the word shall See notes below

Forfeiture of deposit to Government—The old section provided that the deposit shall be forfeited to Government This provision led to hardship in certain cases (s) To obviate the hardship the words may if the Court thinks fit have been substituted for the word shall It is no longer obligatory upon the Court to forfeit the deposit

**87 [S 309]** Every re sale of immovable property, in default of payment of the purchase money within the period allowed for such payment, shall be made after the issue of a fresh proclamation in the manner and for the period hereinbefore prescribed for the sale

Notification on re sale

Fresh notification—A fresh notification is only necessary where the re sale is in default of payment of the purchase money within the time allowed by r 80 No fresh notification is necessary for a re sale in default of payment of the 25 per cent deposit required by r 84 (a)

**88 [S 310]** Where the property sold is a share of undivided immovable property and two or more persons, of whom one is a co sharer, respectively bid the same sum for such property or for any lot, the bid shall be deemed to be the bid of the co sharer

Bid of co-sharer to have preference

See as to movable property r 77 sub r (3) above

Co sharer — A defeasible title to a share is not sufficient to support a claim for pre-emption under this rule (b) The Allahabad High Court has held under the rule framed under s 70 of the Code that where a sale is confirmed by the Collector in favour of one bidder in default of appearance of the other bidder of the same sum claiming a preferential right as a co sharer he is not entitled to maintain a separate suit to set aside the sale by virtue of a right of pre-emption (c)

(a) See *Samba (ra v) Tydinadasami* (1900) 25 M d 535

(a) *Tall bha v Pangu* (1899) 19 Mad 454

(b) *Kamla Prasad v Mohan* (1910) 3 AIL 45

3 I C 8 *Abdul Chaf r v Ghulam*  
(1913) 33 All 906 18 I C 959  
(c) *Badli S gh v T In Pam* (1913) 4 All  
-03 9 I C 8 (-3) A.A. 196

89 [S 310A] (1) Where immovable property has O

Application to set aside  
sale on deposit

been sold in execution of a decree, any person, either owning such property or holding an interest therein by virtue of a title acquired before such sale, may apply to have the sale set aside on his depositing in Court,—

(a) for payment to the purchaser, a sum equal to five per cent of the purchase money, and

(b) for payment to the decree holder, the amount specified in the proclamation of sale as that for the recovery of which the sale was ordered, less any amount which may, since the date of such proclamation of sale, have been received by the decree holder

(2) Where a person applies under rule 90 to set aside the sale of his immovable property, he shall not, unless he withdraws his application, be entitled to make or prosecute an application under this rule

(3) Nothing in this rule shall relieve the judgment-debtor from any liability he may be under in respect of costs and interest not covered by the proclamation of sale

#### Alterations in the rule —

1 The words any person either owning such property or holding an interest therein by virtue of a title acquired before such sale have been substituted for the words any person whose immovable property has been sold under this Chapter See notes below Who may apply under this rule

2 The words unless he withdraws his application and the words or prosecute in sub r (2) are new See notes below under the head Sub rule (2)

**Immovable property**—This rule applies only to sales of immovable property A simple mortgage bond is movable and not immovable property The provisions of this rule do not therefore apply to a sale of such a bond in execution of a decree (d)

**This rule applies to sales under money and mortgage decrees**—This rule obviously applies to sales in execution of decrees for the payment of money The transfer into this Code (see O 34) of the sections of the Transfer of Property Act as to decrees in suits on mortgage shows that the provisions of the present rule apply to sales under mortgage decrees Hence a mortgagor whose immovable property has been sold in execution of a decree for the sale of the mortgaged property may apply under this rule to set aside the sale (e) As to the application of this rule to sales under money decrees it was doubtful whether its provisions applied to mortgage decrees (f) H—

(d) L 11 Um 200, L 11 S 11 (19 3) 10 All L J | (e) Fyfe vs. Deane & Co. (1890) 15 Q.B. 69  
S10 S01 C 890 ( 1 ) L 96 Cal 69 60 I C 104 (1891) 10

Calcutta holding that they did not (f) while the other Courts holding that they did (g) The Calcutta decisions are no longer law In a Calcutta case it was held that the present rule applies also to sales under a mortgage decree on the original side of the Calcutta High Court (h) In a recent case it was held that this rule though well adapted to mofussil practice is not in terms applicable to the practice of the Court on its original side inasmuch as no amount is specified in any proclamation of sale as that for the recovery of which the sale was ordered nor are sales ordered for recovery of the amount of costs before they are taxed A mortgagor can therefore apply to set aside the sale on deposit of a sum equivalent to 5 per cent of the purchase money and the amount of the decree (i)

Whether the rule applies to other sales—This rule has been held to apply when the sale is under a decree passed in terms of an award made on an order of reference in a partition suit (j) The High Court of Madras has held that this rule does not apply to a sale by a receiver of partnership property for realising the partnership assets (k)

Who may apply under this rule—Under the old section the application to set aside a sale could only be made by any person whose immovable property has been sold under this Chapter that is the Chapter relating to execution The new words it was held included—

- (1) the judgment debtor
- (2) any person though not a party to the suit or decree (l) whose interests were affected by the sale

A person whose interests were not affected by the sale could not it was held apply under that section (m)

Under the present rule the application to set aside a sale of immovable property held in execution of a decree may be made by—

- (1) any person owning the property or
- (2) any person holding an interest in such property by virtue of a title acquired before the sale

Any person either owning such property or holding an interest therein by virtue of a title acquired before such sale—Under the old section the application to set aside a sale on deposit could be made by any person whose immovable property has been sold Under the present rule the application may be made by any person either owning such property or holding an interest therein by virtue of a title acquired before such sale There is no doubt that a judgment-debtor whose immovable property has been sold may apply under this rule as a person owning such property But what if the judgment debtor has transferred his interest in the property? Now a judgment debtor may transfer his interest in the property before the Court sale or he may do so after the Court sale Is he entitled after a transfer in either case to apply under this rule? Is the transferee from the judgment debtor entitled to apply under this rule? The cases give the following answers to these questions

First as regards transfers before Court sale—Under the old section there was a conflict of decisions whether if the judgment debtor had transferred his interest in the property before the Court sale the transferee could apply under that section to have

|  |  |
|--|--|
| (f) <i>Fetis v. Nath v. Lal Ch. m.</i> (1893) 4 C 103      | (i) <i>A. I. Hart</i> (1900) 56 C 1477 (1) |
| (g) <i>P. J. v. Iam v. Chinn Lal</i> (1890) 19 All. O. 401 | (j) <i>N. v. A. C. 71</i>                  |
| <i>101 M. H. J. v. M. d. e. (1901) 51 Com. 101</i>         | (k) <i>N. v. A. C. 466</i>                 |
| <i>5 M. d. 11</i>  | (l) <i>T. J. v. I. J. 46</i>               |
| (h) <i>S. J. v. Da. v. B. v. Lal</i> (1911) 43 C 169       | (m) <i>P. v. I. J. 46</i>                  |
| <i>101 M. H. J. v. M. d. e. (1901) 51 Com. 101</i>         |  |
| <i>5 M. d. 11</i>  |  |
| (i) <i>S. J. v. Da. v. B. v. Lal</i> (1911) 43 C 169       |  |
| <i>101 M. H. J. v. M. d. e. (1901) 51 Com. 101</i>         |  |
| <i>5 M. d. 11</i>  |  |
| (j) <i>N. v. A. C. 71</i>                                  |  |
| (k) <i>N. v. A. C. 466</i>                                 |  |
| (l) <i>T. J. v. I. J. 46</i>                               |  |
| (m) <i>P. v. I. J. 46</i>                                  |  |

the same set aside. In *Srinivasa v Ayyathorai* (n) for instance it was held that the transferee could apply while the contrary was held in *Ramchandra v Rakhmabai* (o). Under the present rule it is clear that a transferee acquiring title before the Court sale is competent to apply to have the sale set aside. Further it was held under the old section that a judgment debtor who had effected a private sale of his property subsequently to the attachment and prior to the Court sale was entitled to apply under that section to set aside the sale (p). This ruling is still good law (q).

*Next as regards transfers after Court sale.* A obtains a decree against J. In execution of the decree certain immovable property belonging to J is sold to C for Rs 166. After the sale to C but before its confirmation under r 92 J sells the property to P for Rs 500. It is clear that if J could apply under this rule to have the sale set aside on payment of the amount mentioned in the rule the pecuniary benefit to him would be great for while the property was sold at the Court sale for Rs 166 it fetched Rs 500 at the private sale. Is J the judgment debtor entitled to apply under this rule to have the sale set aside? Is P the purchaser at the private sale entitled to apply under this rule? It was at one time held by the Allahabad High Court (r) that neither the judgment debtor nor the subsequent purchaser was entitled to apply under this rule the reason for the decision being that the present rule gives the judgment debtor a last chance of saving the property for himself and that it was no part of the intention of the Legislature that the property should be saved for persons to whom it might be privately sold after the Court sale had taken place. The Madras High Court held in its early decision that the judgment debtor is not entitled to apply (s) but that the subsequent purchaser is entitled to apply (t). The ground of these decisions was that the judgment debtor having parted with his interest in the property before the application under this rule and so *having no interest in the property at the date of the application* he was not entitled to apply under this rule unless the sale to the subsequent purchaser was by an unregistered document in which case the judgment debtor would continue to be the owner of the property and could as such owner apply under this rule (u). On the other hand the High Court of Bombay held that the judgment debtor is entitled to apply under this rule but that the subsequent purchaser is not so entitled (v). The ground of the Bombay decision is that as the sale to the auction purchaser has not been confirmed the judgment debtor remains the owner of the property and that he is therefore entitled to apply as a person owning the property within the meaning of this rule. As regards the Allahabad decision the Bombay Court said that the object of the present rule was not only to preserve the property in the hands of the judgment debtor but also to save the judgment debtor from monetary loss that might be occasioned to him if the property was sold at the auction sale at an inadequate price. As regards the reasoning of the Madras High Court in its earlier decisions the Bombay Court observes that it was not necessary for the purposes of this rule that the judgment debtor should own or have an interest in the property *at the date of the application* under this rule and that it was sufficient if he owned the property or had an interest in it *at the date of the Court sale*. The High Court of Patna has followed the Bombay decision (w). In a recent case a Full Bench of the Madras High Court overruled its earlier decision and agreeing with the Bombay and Patna decisions held that the judgment debtor was entitled to apply but

( ) (1 94) 1 Mal 413 (Srinivasa v Ayyathorai)  
(o) (1 99) 3 Bom 40 (Ramchandra v Rakhmabai)  
(p) 11 J. L. C. 111 (1901) — Bom 631  
(q) 11 J. L. C. 111 (1901) 44 Mad 554  
63 J. L. C. 937 (1) 4 M. 15 (1 B)  
11 J. L. C. 111 (1901) 5 Mal 11  
157 100 J. L. C. 8 (7) 4 M. 44  
(r) 11 J. L. C. 111 (1901) 34 All 196  
11 J. L. C. 111 (1901) 34 All 196  
(19 3) 4 All 111 (1901) 34 All 196  
(s) 11 J. L. C. 111 (1901) 34 All 196  
(t) 11 J. L. C. 111 (1901) 34 All 196  
(u) 11 J. L. C. 111 (1901) 34 All 196  
(v) 11 J. L. C. 111 (1901) 34 All 196  
(w) 11 J. L. C. 111 (1901) 34 All 196

38 Mad 77 I C 193  
(t) 11 J. L. C. 111 (1901) 34 All 196  
11 J. L. C. 111 (1901) 34 All 196  
11 J. L. C. 111 (1901) 34 All 196  
(u) 11 J. L. C. 111 (1901) 34 All 196  
(v) 11 J. L. C. 111 (1901) 34 All 196  
(w) 11 J. L. C. 111 (1901) 34 All 196

89 that the subsequent purchaser was not entitled to apply under this rule (x) The Allahabad High Court also has overruled its earlier decisions and held that the judgment debtor can apply but not the purchaser (y) The High Court of Calcutta has held that the subsequent purchaser is not entitled to apply under this rule The reason given is that the interest if any which he held in the property was not by virtue of a title acquired by him before the execution sale and consequently he is excluded by the very terms of the rule ( ) Where two applications are made one by the judgment debtor and another by a mortgagee from him after the sale and each applicant deposits a portion of the aggregate amount required by this rule the deposits and the applications may be treated as made by the judgment debtor and therefore within this rule (a)

**Miscellaneous cases**—Under the old section it was held that a Mahomedan co heir was not entitled to apply to set aside the sale (b) This would seem to be the law under the present rule But it was held that a co sharer was entitled to apply (c) It is doubtful whether a co sharer is a person entitled to apply under this rule A coparcener in a joint and undivided Hindu family can apply for he has an interest in the whole of the property (d) It has been held under the old section that a durmukaridar can apply (e) The purchaser of a portion of a non transferable occupancy is entitled to apply although the landlord is the auction purchaser (f)

A person who has obtained a mortgage of the property before the Court sale may apply under this rule (g) So also a usufructuary mortgagee in possession (h) But a person who has merely agreed to purchase the property cannot apply under this rule for a mere agreement for sale of immovable property does not of itself create any interest in the property (i) Similarly a person who is out of possession of the property and is litigating to establish his right thereto is not entitled to apply under this rule (j) A lessee subject to whose interest the property is sold is entitled to apply under this rule (k)

**Unsuccessful application to stop sale**—The mere fact that the applicant had already unsuccessfully applied to stop the sale on payment of the decretal amount and had also put in a claim petition under r 58 above does not preclude him for applying under this rule (l)

**Deposit without application**—An application is necessary before the Court can act under this rule Mere deposit of the required amount is not enough (m) See notes below Limitation

**Deposit of five per cent**—The deposit of 5 per cent must be made even though the purchaser may be the decree holder The 5 per cent is intended as a compensation to the purchaser for his trouble and disappointment for the loss of that which was perhaps a good bargain (n)

**Mistake in calculating amount to be deposited**—No sale will be set aside under this rule unless the whole amount specified in sub r (1) is deposited by the applicant

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>(x) <i>Sundaram v Madan</i> (1931) 48 Mad 54 63<br/>1 C 937 (11) A M 157 (F B) <i>Gopal v<br/>Srinath</i> (1920) 32 M d L J 84 58<br/>1 C 86 (mortg g)</p> <p>(y) <i>Fatma ul Harna</i> <i>Bida v ha</i> (1906)<br/>48 All 188 91 I C 71 (6) A A 704</p> <p>(z) <i>Srinath v Srinath</i> (1919) 49 (al) 454 68<br/>1 C 249 ( ) A C 71</p> <p>( ) <i>Maharaj v Bhaik</i> (19 ) 49<br/>All 839 10 I C 471 (27) A A 61</p> <p>(b) See <i>Shri v Mahay</i> (1903) 30 (al) 4—</p> <p>( ) <i>Tahim v Lall</i> (1900) 30 All 19<br/>10 196</p> <p>(d) <i>Jamhad v as</i> (1931) 51 M d<br/>46 100 I C 937 ( ) A M 330</p> <p>( ) <i>Narayana v end</i> (1911) 3 C 1107</p> <p>(f) <i>Laksh v Bhaik</i> (1917) 5 Cal<br/>108 106 I C 143 ( ) A C 81</p> | <p>(g) <i>Sundaram v Appan</i> (1904) 1 Mad. 416</p> <p>(h) <i>Ben Madhav v Ward</i> (1900) 10 All. L J<br/>4 64 I C 918 (13) A A 17</p> <p>(i) <i>Mahav v Srinath</i> (1900) 3 Bom 121</p> <p>(j) <i>Narayana v Parao</i> (191 ) 2 Pat.<br/>L J 676 4 I C 839</p> <p>(k) <i>Adana v Srinath</i> (1931) 51 Mad 70 109<br/>1 C 166 (13) A M 1191</p> <p>(l) <i>Dhan v Srinath</i> (1931) 44 Mad<br/>L J 33 7 I C 333 ( ) A M 447</p> <p>(m) <i>Laksh v Srinath</i> (1931) 44 Mad<br/>L J 40 87 I C 437 (13) A M 639</p> <p>( ) <i>Trem v Srinath</i> (1900) 1 Mad.<br/>108 106 I C 143 ( ) A C 81</p> |
|--|--|

within thirty days from the date of sale. If the full amount is not deposited within the aforesaid period, even though the default was due to a mistake of an officer of the Court in calculating the amount, the sale cannot be set aside. But it will be set aside if the officer was charged by the Court to make the calculation and to inform the parties as to the amount to be deposited (o). See notes below. Limitation.

**Less amount received by decree holder**—The term received contemplates an actual receipt of the amount by the decree holder. A mere payment into Court of the sale proceeds does not constitute receipts within the meaning of this rule (p).

In determining what amount has been received by the decree holder the Court should not give credit to the judgment debtor for any amount paid by a co judgment debtor who has not joined in the application under this rule (q).

**Failure to deposit full amount**—Where a judgment debtor brought into Court not the amount for the recovery of which the sale was ordered, but only the amount realized by the sale plus five per cent with an undertaking to pay the balance, it was held that he had not complied with the provisions of this rule and the Court refused to set aside the sale (r). In a Pangoon case the deposit was one day late and a few rupees less than the full amount and the Court said that the small shortage did not vitiate the deposit but that the delay could not be excused (s).

**Conditional deposit**—A deposit under this rule must be unconditional (t).

**For payment to the decree holder**—Rateable distribution—The expression decree holder in sub sec (1) (b) refers only to the decree holder for satisfaction of whose decree the sale has been ordered. It does not include other decree holders who would have a right to claim rateable distribution out of the sale proceeds under sec 73. It is therefore enough if the judgment debtor deposits such amount as is sufficient to satisfy the claim of the decree holder at whose instance the property was sold. It is not necessary that the amount deposited by him should be sufficient to satisfy decrees held against him by other decree holders also (u). Again, when a judgment debtor deposits in Court a sum sufficient to satisfy the claim of the person for satisfaction of whose decree the property was ordered to be sold, the other decree holders are not entitled to a rateable distribution thereof under s 73 (i).

**Sub rule (2)**—Where a judgment debtor applies to set aside a sale under this rule and subsequently applies under r 90 also, he is not entitled to prosecute the application made by him under this rule (w). But the Court should in such a case put the judgment debtor to his election whether he would withdraw the application under r 90 and if he refuses to do so, it should dismiss the application made under this rule (x). An application, though purporting to be made under r 90, may not really be one under that rule, but one under s 47; the provisions of sub r (2) do not apply to such a case (y).

**Court**—The word Court in this rule means the Civil Court and not in the case of decrees transferred to the Collector for execution the Collector ( ). Hence an

- (o) *Chand Chav v B. Lakshmi* (1899) 6 Cal 440; *ditto* *Gulabhai M. Bhoole v. Lakshmi* (1904) 10 Cal 609; *L. v. Lakshmi* (1901) 18 Cal 555. See also *ditto* *L. v. Lakshmi* (1903) 11 All L J 16; 160, 167; 711 C 1018 (3) A 318.
- (p) *Trimbak v. P. Chandu* (1899) 23 Bom 73; *Arun v. A. R.* (1916) 39 Mad 429; 271 C 9; *Tota v. Chhotaram* (1903) 10 Bom L R 446; 731 C 44 (3) A B 39.
- (q) *Karnat v. K. R. A.* (1916) 39 Mad 429; 271 C 9; *M. v. M.* (1916) 39 Mad 429; 271 C 9; 71 C 1 (1903) 2 A 34.
- (r) *M. v. A. R.* (1903) 46 Bom 171; 63 C 39 (3) A B 193.
- (s) *Mah v. D. C.* (1903) 6 Pang

- 490 C 1 (3) A R 208.
- (t) *D. v. B. Lakshmi* (1911) 10 C 880; *S. v. S. Lakshmi* (1913) 10 C 534; 71 C 907 (3) A 1; 418; *Raghu v. Lakshmi* (1913) 71 C 30; 1 C (3) A 1; 193; *A. v. S. Lakshmi* (1913) 45 Com 1094; 61 C 104 (1) A B 169.
- (u) *G. v. S. Lakshmi* (1913) 37 Bom 387; 191 C 45; 1 C (3) A 1; 193; 31 Com 20.
- (v) *H. v. S. Lakshmi* (1913) 40 Cal 619; 191 C 339.
- (w) *F. v. S. Lakshmi* (1916) 23 Cal 903.
- (x) *S. v. S. Lakshmi* (1916) 47 All 850; 1 C 500 (3) A A. 3.
- (y) *H. v. S. Lakshmi* (1909) 33 Bom. 698; 41 C 1 (3) A A. 3.
- (z) *F. v. S. Lakshmi* (1918) 40 All 425; 43 C 1



39 application under this rule must be made to the Court and not to the Collector. If the judgment debtor applies to the Collector he cannot stop limitation running against him. It is the duty however of the Collector in such a case to return the application to the applicant and tell him that the application should be made to the Court (a). See notes Limitation below.

**Sale of property by separate lots**—Where property is sold in separate lots in execution of a decree it is not open to the judgment debtor to apply under this rule to set aside the sale of some only of such lots. The application must be to set aside the sale of all the lots (b).

**Necessary parties**—The auction purchaser as well as the decree holder are necessary parties to an application under this rule (c). See the proviso to r 92 sub r (2).

**Limitation**—The application under this rule must be made within 30 days from the date of sale [Limitation Act 1908 Sch I art 106]. The Court has no power to extend the time under s 148 (d). The words date of sale means the date on which the property is put up for sale and knocked down to the highest bidder and not the date on which the sale is confirmed by the Court [r 92] (e). At the same time it is to be remembered that if for any reason the final bid remains unaccepted for some days by the sale officer the period of 30 days does not begin to run until such bid is accepted by him (f).

The words may apply to have the sale set aside on his depositing in Court etc show that not only the application but also the deposit should be made within 30 days from the date of sale. It is not enough to make the application within 30 days (g). Nor is it enough to make the deposit within 30 days (h). Both the application and the deposit must be made within 30 days from the date of sale.

The law does not impose any period of limitation for the issue to the parties of notice of the deposit (i).

**Appeal**—The law as regards appeal from an order setting aside or refusing to set aside a sale passed on an application under the present rule is quite different from what it was under the Code of 1882. Such an order under the Code of 1882 [s 310A] was not appealable as an order for it was not included in the list of appealable orders given in s 539 of that Code [now O 43 r 1]. But the order being one made in proceeding in execution (j) it was appealable as a decree if the question as to whether the sale should be set aside or not was one between the parties to the suit or their representatives within the meaning of s 244 [now s 47] (k) and in such a case a second appeal also lay from the order passed in first appeal. And it was held that if the question was one between the judgment debtor and the decree holder in other words between the parties to the suit it did not cease to be so merely because the auction purchaser (not a party to the suit) was interested in the result (l). But where the question was one between a party to the suit on the one hand and the auction purchaser on the other there was a conflict of

- (a) *T pongarda v Lam ga da* (19 0) 44 Bom 50 54 L C 50 0 *Sha tau st v Si day m* (19 1) 45 Bom 113 6 L C 113 1 (1) A B 709 See also *ad g ppa v Sh day pa* (19 4) 48 Bom 639 88 L C 155 (1) A B 49
- (b) *Kr pa th v Lam L k m* (1907) 1 L W 703
- (c) See *M s mm t B d v I a a v th* (1923) 1st 800 75 L C 430 (1) A 1 37
- (d) *Ch dhry Lam shw v Ch dhry v r k w* (1917) 1st L J 184 39 L C 664
- (e) *Ch dhry Ketti v C s P o j* (190 1) 7 L C 6 6 31
- (f) *M k Lal v Pam v r n* (1913) 3d All 65 17 L C 743
- (g) *M Ahmed kbar v S ladeo* (1911) 13 Cal L J 467 101 L C 51 *M a I v J dha A k n* (1915) 37 All 91 30 L C 186

- See O 1 r 9 (1)
- (h) *P o j v Ba tal* (1910) 43 Bom 3d 53 L C 135
- (i) *Mu ammat B b v I ras v th* (19 3) Pat 800 75 L C 430 (1) A 1 37
- (j) *I t v Ch I I* (1907) 31 Bom 07 11
- (k) *M l d h v 4 a d a* (1901) 1st Bom 418 1st 800 75 L C 430 (1) A 1 37
- (l) *I t v Ch I I* (1907) 31 Bom 07 11
- (m) *I t v Ch I I* (1907) 31 Bom 07 11
- (n) *I t v Ch I I* (1907) 31 Bom 07 11
- (o) *I t v Ch I I* (1907) 31 Bom 07 11
- (p) *I t v Ch I I* (1907) 31 Bom 07 11
- (q) *I t v Ch I I* (1907) 31 Bom 07 11
- (r) *I t v Ch I I* (1907) 31 Bom 07 11
- (s) *I t v Ch I I* (1907) 31 Bom 07 11
- (t) *I t v Ch I I* (1907) 31 Bom 07 11
- (u) *I t v Ch I I* (1907) 31 Bom 07 11
- (v) *I t v Ch I I* (1907) 31 Bom 07 11
- (w) *I t v Ch I I* (1907) 31 Bom 07 11
- (x) *I t v Ch I I* (1907) 31 Bom 07 11
- (y) *I t v Ch I I* (1907) 31 Bom 07 11
- (z) *I t v Ch I I* (1907) 31 Bom 07 11

opinion as to whether an appeal lay from the order (m) In those cases however in which it was held that no appeal lay from the order it was held that the party aggrieved might apply to the High Court for a *revison* of the order (n) Under the present Code however an order setting aside or refusing to set aside a sale [r 92] passed on an application under this rule [r 89] is appealable as an order for it is included in the list of appealable orders given in O 43 r 1 [see cl (j)] The result is that under the present Code only one appeal lies from such an order (o) [see s 104 sub s (1) (i) and sub s (2)] An auction purchaser also can now appeal from an order under this rule Only one appeal is allowed in his case also (p)

**Dismissal of application for default**—Where an application under this rule is dismissed for default of appearance and the Court refuses to restore it to the file no appeal lies from the order refusing to restore the application (q)

**Revision**—The High Courts of Patna (r) and Madras (s) have held that the High Court can interfere in revision if an application under this rule has been dismissed on the ground that it was made by a person who was not entitled to apply the reason given being that the decision in such a case is the very foundation of jurisdiction and that the action of the lower Court in refusing to deal with the application in such a case amounts to a refusal to exercise jurisdiction within the meaning of s 115 On the other hand the Allahabad High Court has held that no revision lies in such a case the reason given being that the Court has jurisdiction to decide whether or not the applicant was entitled to apply to set aside the sale and a decision arrived at in the exercise of jurisdiction though wrong is no ground for interference in revision (t)

No revision lies from a decision that an application under this rule was made within time (u)

**90 [S 311]** (1) Where any immovable property has been sold in execution of a decree, the decree holder, or any person entitled to share in a rateable distribution of assets, or whose interests are affected by the sale

Application to set aside sale on ground of irregularity or fraud

may apply to the Court to set aside the sale on the ground of a material irregularity or fraud in publishing or conducting it

Provided that no such sale be set aside on the ground of irregularity or fraud unless upon the facts proved the Court is satisfied that the applicant has sustained substantial injury by reason of such irregularity or fraud

**Alterations in the rule —**

- 1 The words "or any person entitled to share in a rateable distribution have been added to give effect to decisions under the old section See notes below Who may apply under this rule

(m) K h a v s t i s (1908) 31 M d 177  
M a n i l a D o s h i (1901) 30 Bom 631  
J h I D a J h g h (1907) 19  
All 140 4 a t A t 4 3 11 a  
t h (1908) 30 All 39  
( ) J i r a l l D o s h i (1901) 30 B o 631 P m  
s j h s i g l i m (1906) 4 All 84  
( ) A t i s d a i (1911) 34 Cal 339 10  
I C 34  
(i) A h v T r m b a t (19 0) 44 Bom 47 56  
I C 507 S e o a l o G i g p j v y h d  
p j (19 4) 44 Bom 634 3 I C 155  
( ) 4 A B 40

( ) G h a t B b v A b i t d (1907) 29 All  
536  
( ) D h a r a t v S h e o S h a n k r (1919) 4 Pat  
L J 340 511 C 8 3 A h d J i v A b i t  
(19 3) 21 at 15 4 I C 10 ( 3 ) A P  
490  
( ) S i a m v M a (19 1) 44 M a 1 5 4 63  
I C 93 (21) A M 1 (1 B)  
(i) 3 d P a m v S i r v g h (1923) 4 All 4  
74 I C 74 (23) 4 32 (1 B)  
( ) M m m t B h v I r a v t h (1923) 2 Pat  
400 I C 410 ( 4 ) A B 3

90

- 2 The words any person whose interests are affected by the sale have been substituted for the words any person whose immovable property has been sold under this chapter. The expression now substituted is what the Courts held in several cases was the meaning of the expression any person whose immovable property has been sold. See notes below. Who may apply under this rule.
- 3 The words or fraud have been added after the word irregularity. The addition of these words affects the *right of appeal* as will be seen from the notes below under the head Fraud in publishing or conducting sale.
- 4 The word unless upon the facts proved the Court is satisfied have been substituted for the words unless the applicant proves to the satisfaction of the Court. This alteration has been made with a view to set at rest the doubts raised under the old section as to the evidence upon which the Court could act. See notes below. Unless upon the facts proved the Court is satisfied etc.

Who may apply under this rule—The only persons that may apply under this rule are—

- (1) the decree holder
- (2) any person entitled to share in a rateable distribution of assets under s 73
- (3) any person whose interests are affected by the sale—an expression obviously of a wider import than the expression a person holding an interest in the property sold used in r 89 above (1)

The words any person entitled to share in a rateable distribution of assets did not occur in the old section but it was held that the expression decree holder included such person (u)

The expression any person whose interests are affected by the sale has been substituted for the expression any person whose immovable property has been sold which occurred in the old section. The latter expression was construed as meaning any person whose interests are affected by the sale in the Full Bench case of *Ammu Sunnissa Begum v Ashruff Ali* (x) and this interpretation has now been substituted for the original expression. Where an application therefore is made by a person other than a decree holder or one entitled to share in a rateable distribution of assets such person must be one whose interests are affected by the sale. It cannot be said of a person claiming by title paramount to the judgment debtor that his interests would be affected by the sale inasmuch as his title to the property cannot be effected by the sale whether it were regular or irregular. Hence a person who claims to be a purchaser of immovable property from the judgment debtor prior to the attachment cannot apply under this rule for the sale being prior to the attachment his interest cannot be legally affected by the sale (y). It has similarly been held that where joint Hindu family property is sold in execution of a decree against a member of the joint family another member claiming the whole property on the death of the judgment debtor by survivorship is not entitled to apply under this rule (z). A co-sharer cannot apply under this rule for his share does not pass under the sale (a). But a reversioner entitled to succeed on the death of a

(v) *Abd Idris v Tafa Iddi* (1914) 19 C.W.N. 363 & 431 C. 839

(w) *Lakshmi v Anil* (1904) 10 Mad 5  
*Chakrapani v Dha* (1901) 4 Mal 311  
*I. Jov. S. S. v. J. K. M. Ch. S.* (1907) 9 Cal 549  
*I. J. S. S. v. J. K. M. Ch. S.* (1907) 9 Cal 549  
*Lall* (1893) 15 All 318

(x) (1888) 15 Cal 483 490  
 (y) *Ammu Sunnissa Begum v Ashruff Ali* (1899)

15 Cal 483 491 49  
 (z) *S. Idris v. Tafa Iddi* (1893) 16 Mad 46

(a) *P. A. A. v. H. R. S. S. S.* (1883) 5 All 4  
*A. J. S. S. v. I. D. S. S.* (1907) 9 Cal 5  
 5 (1907) A.C. 2  
*As to members of a joint Hindu family see* *M. S. S. v. A. S. S.* (1903) 1st 36 83  
 I.C. 1014 (3) A.I. 431

Hindu widow has been held to be entitled to apply under this rule (b) A person who claims to be the purchaser of a *tenure* prior to attachment from the judgment debtor whose interest in the tenure has been sold in execution of a decree for *its own arrears of rent* is entitled to apply under this rule for his interests are affected by the sale (c) Where immovable property has been sold in execution of a decree against the ostensible owner as his property a person claiming to be the beneficial owner is entitled to apply under this rule (d) unless his right to the property is in dispute and a suit by him for a declaration of his right is still pending at the date of the application (e)

It has been recently held by the High Court of Calcutta that the expression persons whose interests are affected by the sale is not limited to persons whose *proprietary* or *possessory* title is affected by the sale and that it includes persons whose *pecuniary* interest is affected by the sale Hence it has been held that a decree holder who has attached the property of the judgment debtor in execution of his decree has such interest as would entitle him to apply under this rule to set aside a sale of the property held in execution of a decree obtained by another creditor (f) But a plaintiff who has obtained an attachment before judgment is not entitled to apply under this rule (g)

**Auction purchaser**—In a case under s 311 of the Code of 1882 their Lordships of the Privy Council held that an auction purchaser was not entitled to apply under that section as he was not a person whose immovable property has been sold within the meaning of that section (h) There is a conflict of opinion whether an auction purchaser is entitled to apply to have the sale set aside under the present rule He is so entitled if he is a person whose interests are affected by the sale within the meaning of this rule The High Court of Madras has held that he is entitled to apply under this rule The Court said If an auction purchaser's interests are affected by an order setting aside the sale it is difficult to see why his interests are not also affected by the sale (i) The High Court of Patna has dissented from this view and held that an auction purchaser is not entitled to apply under this rule In the view taken by that Court the expression interests affected by the sale means interests in the property existing before the sale (j) The Allahabad High Court has declined to follow the Patna decisions and has held that an auction purchaser is entitled to apply under this rule The Court said In the ordinary use of the word [ interests ] in the English language it is a term covering every sort of interest recognized by law such as in the case of an auction purchaser liability to pay the money liability to complete and take a transfer of the property, and from his own point of view the necessity of finding the necessary funds and also the necessity of carrying through to fruition the provisional contract into which he has entered If the expression were interests in the property it would of course be confined to an interest in the property sold antecedent to the sale If the word were merely interest without the plural and without the words in the property it might be possible to hold that the word interest was confined to interest in the thing itself at the time of the sale But that is not the expression (k) The High Court of Rangoon has held that an auction purchaser is not entitled to apply under this rule (l)

- (b) *B j A sha e v P t b* (1919) 41 Ind L J 360 511 C 39 *Iankh bti v Van Lal* (1914) 19 Cal L J 11 C 97  
(c) *Aubhaya Das v Iudmo Lochun* (189 ) Cal 80  
(d) *Abd i Ga v D e* (1893) 9 C 1 418 *T mmana v Mahabnia* (1896) 19 M d 167  
(e) *Ha de v Lal v S lamatu i A Khan* (1916) 38 All 354 341 C  
(f) *Dh e d a v th v Aam* (19 ) 51 Cal 495 811 C 119 4 A C 86  
(g) *Joge d a v M m tha* (1913) 1 C W 80 15 I C 663 *Hat v rada* (19 ) 5 4° Cal L J 3 89 I C 683 ( 5 ) A C 1103

- (A) *B r j f Aun v F v Uma Nath* (1893) 90 Cal 8 19 I A 154  
(i) *G p lakrish ayya v Sanj* a (1900) 33 M d L J 3 55 I C 333  
(j) *KA tra M hon v She kh* (1914) 3 Pat L J 516 46 I C 614 *A r k CA ndr v Nay adra Nath* (19 ) 3 4 I C 60 ( 21 ) A I 349  
(k) *Pare d am v Jago ath* (19 ) 47 All 49 87 I C 28 ( 5 ) A A 459 followed in *S v R v S broman v v L M Chetty v* (19 ) 5 Ran 516 10 I C 465 ( ) A F 301  
(l) *K i 6 L Chettyar Firm v Maricar* (19 ) 6 Rang 61 114 I C 338 (29) A R 33.

**Persons entitled to rateable distribution**—It is expressly provided by this rule that a person entitled to share in a rateable distribution of assets under s 73 is entitled to apply under this rule. Hence a person who is not entitled to a rateable distribution as where the application for execution is not made until after the receipt of assets by the Court cannot come in under this rule as a person whose interests are affected by the sale. (m)

**Conditions of applicability of the rule**—A sale held in execution of a decree can be set aside under this rule only if the following conditions concur—

- 1 There must be a material irregularity or fraud
- 2 The material irregularity or fraud must be in publishing or conducting the sale
- 3 The applicant must have sustained substantial injury
- 4 Such injury must have been caused by reason of the material irregularity or fraud

**Material irregularity in publishing or conducting sale**—The following are instances of material irregularity in publishing or conducting a sale in execution—

- 1 Service of notice under O 21 r 22 upon a wrong person as legal representative see notes to O 21 r 22. Notice to wrong person as legal representative
- 1A Omission to specify in the proclamation of sale the extent of the property to be sold or the revenue assessed on it (n) or the amount of income derived from it or the incumbrances to which the property is subject (o). But it has been held that where a sale is held at an earlier hour than that stated in the proclamation (p) or at a place different from that specified in the proclamation (q) the case is not merely one of material irregularity within the meaning of this rule but that the sale is void altogether. See r 66 of this Order
- 2 Misstatement of the value of the property or of Government revenue in the proclamation of sale such as is calculated to mislead intending bidders (r). See r 60 of this Order
- 3 Omission to affix a copy of the sale proclamation as required by r 67 of this Order (s)
- 4 Omission to have a drum beaten as required by r 67 of this Order read with r 54 (t)
- 5 Holding a sale of immovable property before the expiration of 30 days from the date on which the copy of the proclamation has been affixed on the Court house of the Judge ordering the sale (u). See r 68 of this Order
- 6 Non specification of the hour to which a sale is adjourned (v). See r 69 of this Order

(m) *Kath* v *Paanam* (1914) 11 M 1 L  
 J 30 61 C 93  
 ( ) *Ala pp* v *J m k r i h* (1895) 11 M 1 L 51  
*M d* v *J l app* (1900) 3 M d  
 64 *H l a s s* v *J h a m g l a s* (19 3)  
 43 *N l l J* 403 51 C 546 ( 3)  
 A 1 C 93 [1 C ]  
 (o) *M l La l v Bhaw* (1907) 6 C W N 836  
 (p) *Ba k t U i v L m o C h* (18 9) 16 Cal  
 91 *N l o J b J m J m U h*  
 (19 ) 49 All 40 92 I C 96 ( ) A A  
 11  
 (q) *J v m v J e d h g* (19 1) 41 M 1 L 3  
 91 C 16 *J m A M b s e c 2 J l s m*  
*J m h d* (19 1) 41 M 1 L 3 46  
 61 C 916 ( ) A M 4 8 [ v e l y  
 02 Lal R ( r e c ) l i c o r s e k n o t p e c i d  
 ed in proclamation & id not irregular]

(r) *Spad m J v P h l A u a r* (1894) 0 All  
 41 51 A 146 *M a g h v J f a h r*  
*J r h a i* (1893) 9 C 1 6 6 10 I A 5  
 ( ) *L a s g h H u d v* (18 6)  
 6 W R 44 31 A 30 *L m l v v r*  
*J j a l l J t l* (191 ) 34 M 1 L 1  
 1 C 3 9  
 ( ) *N a h m r v ( o l m h n d r* (1891) 1  
 C 1 4  
 (t) *T e m b a k v N a a* (1895) 10 Bom 504 *C o p*  
*C h a n d v B a s P s* (1910) 1 Lah L J  
 19 199 00  
 ( ) *T a d d k v J l m J* (1891) 1 C 1 64 0  
 1 A 1 6 *J j s H* *B A k r i J a m*  
 (19 3) 1at J 641 C 363 ( 3) A J  
 4  
 ( ) *N a o J f o r e v B l A a* (1 2 ) 4 C 1 21  
*H A h a v J J o l* (1901) 6 C W N  
 43

6A Holding a sale on a day other than the one to which it is adjourned (w) O 2  
See r 69 of this Order

7 Omission to issue a fresh proclamation where a sale is adjourned (x) unless the proclamation has been waived (y) Where a sale proclamation had been issued at the instance of the judgment debtor six times and a fresh proclamation was subsequently issued notifying that in the absence of any order of postponement the sale would be held at the monthly sales commencing on 13th July 1903 at Monghyr but the monthly sales did not begin until 17th July owing to the absence of the presiding officer from the station and the sale in question was held on 20th July in the course of the monthly sales without a fresh proclamation their Lordships of the Privy Council expressed the opinion that in holding the sale on 20th July the Court did not act in contravention of the provisions of the Code and that there was no irregularity in publishing the sale and held that assuming there was irregularity there was no evidence of substantial injury and that the sale was therefore valid ( ) See r 69 of this Order

8 Default in payment of the deposit of 25 per cent as required by r 84 of this Order (a) See notes to r 84

8A Extending time for payment of purchase money (b) See notes to r 85

9 Omission on the part of the plaintiff to have a *guardian ad litem* appointed of a defendant where *after* decree but before sale the defendant has been adjudged to be of unsound mind (c) See O 32 r 15

10 In a case that went to Privy Council the following irregularities occurred (1) property belonging to a judgment debtor was attached and the judgment debtor died pending the attachment leaving a widow and a minor son but no notice of the subsequent proceedings in attachment was served on any person representing the minor (2) though the property consisted of 109 mouzahs the proclamation of sale was read out without beat of drum in one only of the mouzahs and affixed to a tree in that village and (3) the proclamation did not specify the encumbrances to which the property was liable but stated merely the annual profit income and the value of the property with the result that the property was sold at a gross undervaluation Their Lordships of the Privy Council held that the above irregularities were all material irregularities and they accordingly set aside the sale (d)

It is to be noted in this connection that if the act or omission complained of amounts to a *material irregularity* the sale is not void but voidable. Being voidable it is liable to be set aside under this rule on the application of any of the persons mentioned in the rule but it cannot be set aside unless it is proved that *substantial injury* has resulted from the irregularity see the proviso to the rule. But where the act or omission complained of amounts to an *illegality* it renders the sale void ab initio and no proof of injury is required. In cases (3) (5) (b) and (9) above it was contended that the omission complained of amounted to an *illegality* and that the sale was therefore void ab initio and that it should therefore be declared void without proof

(w) *Har Sadh v Shab (p l (19) 3 Cal*  
1 J 140 6 I C 46 (21) A C 59  
(x) *Gopas Nath v Jit Lal (1888) 3 Cal 64*  
Sat Lal v Jit Lal as (1888) 31 Cal  
658 B J L (Cher v Jit Lal) (1891)  
18 C 1436  
(y) *Bip Beh v Muri v Jit Lal (1910)*  
3 C 189 6 I C 813  
(z) *Priya Lal v Jit Lal (191) 30*  
Cal 634 A C 100 1 C 14

( ) *Ahmad Rakh v Lalia (1906) 8 All 233*  
*Bhim Singh v Sarwan (1884) 16 Cal 33*  
(b) *Singh v Singh v Tytla da (19) 43 Mad*  
L J 4 69 I C 1001 (3) A.M. 48  
(c) *Nayak v K. Hanasur dar m (1896) 19*  
Mad 19 See *Kal pada v H (191)*  
44 Cal 6 30 I C 56  
(d) *Kishor Lal v Vatsa d (1913) 40*  
C 163 40 I A 110 19 I C 96

r 90 of substantial injury. But it was held that the omission amounted to a *material irregularity* only and that the sale was not void but voidable only and it could not therefore be set aside unless *substantial injury* was proved. For instances of sales void *ab initio* see notes to a *Good Sale*, when void and when voidable. See also notes to O 21 r 22. Omission to give notice and Notice to wrong person as legal representative.

**No material irregularity**—No notice of a sale need be given to a receiver who is not in possession of the property sold. A sale therefore without notice to him is not irregular (c)

**Publishing or conducting the sale.**—Where property not covered by the decree has been proclaimed and sold the case is one of material irregularity in publishing and conducting the sale within the meaning of this rule (f). So is an irregular preparation of the proclamation of sale (g).

The expression conducting the sale refers only to the action of the officer who holds the sale. The expression does not apply to anything done antecedent to the order of sale (A)

Omission to attach property before sale—The question whether an irregularity in attaching the property as where the attachment is not properly notified effects the sale or is merely an irregularity in conducting the sale within the meaning of this rule was left open by the Judicial Committee in the undermentioned case (i) in *Mahadeo v Bhola Nath* (j) a full Bench of the High Court of Allahabad held that regularly perfected attachment is an essential preliminary to sales in execution of simple decrees for money and when there has been no such attachment the sale is not merely voidable but void. In a later case (k) however the same High Court held that the omission to attach immovable property prior to sale amounted to a material irregularity in conducting the sale within the meaning of this rule. An attachment it was said is a step towards the sale of the judgment debtor's property. As to *Mahadeo's* case the Court said that it could no longer be treated as good law since the decision of the Privy Council in *Tasaddul v Ahmad* (l) where it was held with reference to a proclamation of sale issued in violation of the provisions of O 21 r 68 that it was nothing more than a material irregularity and did not *ipso facto* vitiate the sale. On the other hand in a case decided under the Code of 18 0 the High Court of Calcutta expressed the opinion that an attachment is not an essential preliminary in sales in execution of decrees it is merely a measure for the protection of the decree holder and the purchaser of the property and the absence of attachment is not therefore an objection which the judgment debtor is competent to raise (m). This view was adopted by the same High Court in later cases where it was held that after a sale had been confirmed the sale was not to be considered a nullity merely by reason of the absence of attachment (n). The same High Court has held that where an objection that the property proclaimed for sale has not been attached is taken before the sale it is the duty of the Court not to proceed with the sale and to direct an attachment (o). In the more recent case of *Tanchan v Kuma* (p) decided in 1917 the High Court of Calcutta held that the Court had no jurisdiction to sell property in execution which had

- ( ) M J O h n T i n v J R M I 9 R M  
(A t t e y F i r m (1979) 7 R a n g 4 ( J )  
A R 311  
(f) I m t a . 5 i a n v C h n L a l (1978) 47 A l  
304 84 1 16 ( ) A A 36 1 i t a r e  
( p v J m l r a (1979) 3 A l I J  
( x n s i ) 313 ( ) A 5 1  
(g) J 1 1 t h v J i a d (1979) 6 L a h 43  
45 1 103 ( ) A 1 9  
(h) I m e l b a v J e r k u ( ) 7 A l 84 64  
(i) J l a n n u j v M a h 11 1 e J a l (1973) 9  
c a l 6-8 660 101 A 23

- (f) (1892) All. 86  
(k) 5A *odhy* v *Shola* (1892) 1 All 311  
(f) (1893) 1 Cal. 65 91 A 26  
(m) *Shardul Ji* v *Ilooma Moyes* (186)  
8 W R 10  
( ) *Ki hery Shoh* v *M hom d* (1891) 18 Cal  
1895 T 0 5 v *Saib (A nd a (1861)*  
( 1 633 v *ma v Ji A ba* (1911)  
12 Cal 2 3 33 v 1 518  
( ) *Se ama v Sharan* (1911) 13 Cal 2 J  
43 -19- u 91 C 918  
(p) (1917) 4 1 C v

not been duly attached and that omission to attach rendered the sale void *ipso facto*. This decision it is submitted is not good law. In a Bombay case where the property was sold without previous attachment the sale was set aside the case being treated as one under s 47 (g). The High Court of Pangoon has held that though the absence of attachment is an irregularity it does not render the sale absolutely void but merely voidable and further that the objection as to the absence of attachment does not come within this rule but within s 47 the substantial question involved being one of notice to the judgment debtor (r). The High Court of Patna has taken the same view as was taken in the earlier Calcutta decisions and refused to follow the decision in *Parchanaz* case. In the Patna case the application to set aside the rule was made before the sale was confirmed while in the Calcutta cases the application was made after the sale was confirmed. As to this the Patna Court said that it did not make any difference because if the sale was in fact a nullity by reason of the absence of attachment its subsequent confirmation could not make it valid (s). The High Court of Madras has held that a sale without an attachment is an irregularity within this rule (t).

**Fraud in publishing or conducting sale**—The words or fraud are new. The present rule requires that an application to set aside a sale on the ground of fraud in publishing or conducting the sale should be made *under this rule*. In the absence of these words in the corresponding s 311 of the Code of 1882 it was held that an application to set aside a sale on the ground of fraud could only be made under s 244 [now s 47]. Had it not been for the newly added words or fraud in this rule such applications would have to be made under s 47 of this Code. The result would then have been as under the Code of 1882 that a *second appeal* would lie from an order made on such application for an order made under s 47 has the force of a decree (s 2) and every decree is open to second appeal subject of course to the provisions of ss 100 102 (u). The effect of adding the words or fraud into the present rule is to transfer applications setting up fraud in publishing or conducting the sale from s 47 to the present rule. The result is that no *second appeal* will now lie from an order made on such application whether the order be one setting aside the sale or refusing to set aside the sale for the order is no longer one under s 47 but one under r 92 and only one appeal lies from an order made under r 92 (v) [see O 43 r 1 cl (j) and s 104 sub s (2)]. It will thus be seen that the object of the Legislature in requiring applications to set aside a sale on the ground of fraud in publishing or conducting the sale to be made under the present rule instead of under s 47 is to exclude the right of second appeal from orders made on such applications with a view to bring proceedings on such applications to a speedy termination. But though only one appeal is allowed an appeal now lies in every case from an order made under this rule and r 92 even at the instance of an auction purchaser though he may not be a party to the suit in which the sale was held. See notes to s 7 Execution purchaser ill (1), p 159.

It may here be observed that in a large majority of reported cases in which applications were made to set aside a sale on the ground of fraud in publishing or conducting the sale the applicant was the judgment debtor and the fraud alleged was that the decree holder had fraudulently kept him in the dark by omitting to serve him with the writ of attachment (r 54) and that no copy of the proclamation of sale was affixed on the

- (g) *S r bji v Fala* (191) 36 Bom 156 1  
I C 911 Dec al o Fala t v May  
th (19 0) 44 Bom 860 69 8 I C  
17  
(r) *M J ra v Mahomed* (19 3) 1 Ran. 533  
I C 364 ( 3) A R 14  
( ) *Faj Hazir v Bhl* s F m (19 3) 2 Pat 0  
68 I C 363 ( 3) A R 45  
(t) *Sil mania v Arish a* (19 6) 51 Mad L J  
17 9 I C 433 (-6) A M 11

- (u) *Vemas Chand v De o Nath* (1892) 2 C W N  
691 *Bhubon Moh v Pal v N nda L I*  
(1899) 26 Cal 34 *H ra Lal Gho e v*  
*Cw dra K to Ghose* (1899) 6 Cal 539  
In all these cases it was held that a second  
appeal would lie  
(v) *She la Ma la Bur v Ragh ba* (1918) 3  
Pat L J 615 43 I C 560 *Sheo Prasad*  
*v Premna K nwar* (1918) 40 All 1-2  
43 I C 5 *J gan Nath v Da d* (19 3)  
4 Lah 43 5 I C 103 (-3) A L 59



10 property so as to inform him of the execution proceeding. In all these cases it was also alleged that the fraud first became known to the judgment debtor when the auction purchaser instituted proceedings to recover possession of the property. In some of these cases again the auction purchaser was charged with collusion with the decree holder in perpetrating the fraud upon the judgment debtor (w). The observations of their Lordships of the Privy Council in *Lalla Bunsseedhur v. Koonwar Bindeesree* (x) have a material bearing on the question now under consideration (y). In that case their Lordships said that where a sale is impeached on the ground of fraud a difference must be made between an innocent purchaser and one tainted by the fraud which has brought about the execution sale. The question is in the former case which of two innocent parties shall suffer in the latter whether he who has wronged the other party shall be allowed to enjoy the fruits of his wrong doing. A Court exercising equitable jurisdiction may withhold its hand in the one case and yet set aside the sale with or without terms in the other.

A charge against a decree holder that he and those who acted in concert with him have acted in such a manner as to prevent the best price from being obtained *does not of itself* amount to a charge of fraud within the meaning of this rule. A obtains a decree against B and obtains leave to bid at the auction sale. A then enters into an agreement with a third person that if that person would not bid at the sale A would sell the property to him if A should become the purchaser. The property is put up for sale and purchased by A. The agreement does not constitute a fraud within the meaning of this rule though it may have discouraged competition at the auction ( ). In a recent case Sir Lawrence Jenkins CJ said. The word fraud is very loosely used in this class of cases that is cases under r 90. any irregularity is taken to be fraud with the consequences that such a finding involves. But a finding of fraud should be reserved for that which is dishonest and morally wrong and it is not sufficient to come to a *verdict* finding of fraud. actual fraud must be established. (a) The Patna High Court has recently held that where after the publication of the sale proclamation the decree holder agrees with the judgment debtor not to hold the sale if payment was made within a specified time and he then proceeds to sell the property in contravention of the agreement at amounts to fraud in the matter of the conduct of the sale within the meaning of this rule (b).

In a recent case (c) their Lordships of the Privy Council said "Charges of fraud and collusion—must no doubt be proved by those who make them—proved by established facts or inferences legitimately drawn from those facts taken together as a whole. Suspicion and surmises and conjecture are not permissible substitutes for those facts or those inferences but that by no means requires that every puzzling artifice or contrivance resorted to by one accused of fraud must necessarily be completely unravelled and cleared up and made plain before the verdict can be properly found against him. If this were not so many a clever and dexterous knave would escape."

- ( ) Golam ihad \ Ji Haste (1903) 30 Cal 14  
 153 Lurga Ch ran \ Kali P san a (1899)  
 26 Cal 7 2 W t d un nis a \  
 Gird? (190 ) All 0 03 (appli-  
 cation to a t aside a on ground of frud  
 after confirmat f sale) Venai Cha d  
 v D o \ath (1895) - ( W \ 691  
 Bh bon Mahun Pal \ \ da Lal (1899)  
 6 Cal 3 4 Hi Lal (ho v Ch dra  
 Ja tof ho (1899) 6 C 1 539 (e se arak  
 in que tion of seco d app l from ord r  
 on appli tion to set a lile sal o ground  
 of frud) P os o ka ar k d D  
 (189 ) 19 Cal 643 19 1 \ 168 S dho  
 v Abhen dra (1904) 6 All 101  
 Gaya P f \ R dh r S ga (1906)  
 8 All 681 Moth a Das v Lachma

- (190 ) 4 All 239 Durg P want Bal  
want (1901) 23 All 4 8 (r para 1 q e  
tion of a reg l s f to et a id u l c  
g ou n l of fraud)
- (x) (1866) 10 B I 4 454 4 3 474
- (y) Paresi Nath v H R Ch in (1911) 38 Cal  
6 6 6 10 I C 361
- (z) M hane d Wira Na uther S ras 1 j i v t  
Raghunatha (1900) -3 Mad 7 I 4 1
- (a) Pore h v th v Hore Ch ra (1911) 38 C I  
6 6 6 10 I C 361
- (b) SI u W u la B r F gh bir (1918) 3 Pat  
L J 645 48 I C 560
- (c) Bo B har v Satuch Ka tha (19 4) 39 Cal  
L J 163 1 1 3 I C 31 ( 3) A F C 3

**Substantial injury** Material irregularity or fraud standing by itself is no ground for setting aside a sale. There must be *substantial injury occasioned* by the irregularity or fraud. If the Court fails to find *both* irregularity and injury occasioned thereby it is bound to dismiss the application. In other words if there be material irregularity or fraud in publishing or conducting the sale but no substantial loss is occasioned by the irregularity or fraud the applicant is not entitled to have the sale set aside (d). The substantial injury alleged by the applicant must be *proved*; it cannot be *assumed* from the mere fact that there was a material irregularity or fraud in publishing or conducting the sale. The mere fact that there was a material irregularity or fraud in publishing or conducting the sale will not justify the Court in assuming that substantial injury has thereby been caused. Hence although an applicant under this rule may prove material irregularity such as non specification of Government revenue in the proclamation of sale (e) or inadequate description of the property sold (f) or the holding of the sale before the expiry of the period prescribed by r 68 above (g) the sale will not be set aside unless it is *proved* that had it not been for the irregularity the property would have realized a substantially larger price than what it did at the sale. The same rule applies where the sale is impeached on the ground of fraud in publishing or conducting the sale.

Unless upon the facts proved the Court is satisfied that the applicant has sustained substantial injury by reason of such irregularity or fraud — These words form part of the proviso to the rule. The language of the proviso to this rule differs from the language of the proviso to the corresponding section 311 of the Code of 1882 which was as follows —

But no sale shall be set aside on the ground of irregularity *unless the applicant proves to the satisfaction of the Court* that he has sustained substantial injury by reason of such irregularity.

The words *unless upon the facts proved the Court is satisfied* have been substituted for the words *unless the applicant proves to the satisfaction of the Court*. The object and effect of these alterations will now be explained.

If an applicant under this rule proves *material irregularity* or *fraud* and if he also proves *gross inadequacy of price realised at the sale* in other words if he proves *substantial injury* — is this sufficient to entitle him to succeed under this rule? The answer is that it is not. He must also prove that the inadequacy of the price has been caused *by reason of* the material irregularity or fraud. Now there are two possible modes in which this may be proved namely —

- (a) by *direct evidence* that is by evidence connecting the material irregularity or fraud with the inadequacy of price as cause and effect or
- (b) by *circumstantial evidence* that is by evidence of circumstances which will warrant the necessary or at least reasonable inference that the inadequacy of price was the result of the irregularity or fraud complained of.

In *Tasadduk v. Ahmad* (1) where a sale was sought to be set aside under the corresponding s 311 of the Code of 1882 on the ground that it was held before the expiration of 30 days from the date of the proclamation (r 68) their Lordships of the Privy Council after referring to that section said —

In the application of that section [that is s 311] it was incumbent on the [applicants] to have proved that they sustained substantial injury by reason of such irregularity. They gave no such evidence and it would be extremely improbable that injury

(d) *Harb v. L. v. K. v. N. L. I.* (1899) 1 A.H. 140

(e) *M. v. gite v. Mah. b. r. er. hod* (1843) 9 Cal.

(f) *q. v. 101 A.*

(g) *Ar. v. act. II v. v. Ar. na. hell v.* (1889) 1

(d) *Mal. 10 I. 1 A. 11*

(e) *Ta. ad. v. v. J. (194) 1 C. L. 66 201 A.*

(f) *16*

(g) *(194) 1 C. L. 66 01 A. 1 n.*

could have happened from the non compliance with the strict letter of s 290 [now r 68] Their Lordships cannot accept the judgment of the Judicial Commissioner that loss is to be inferred from the mere fact that a sale was held without full compliance with the provisions of s 290 [now r 68] The section [that is s 311] clearly contemplates *direct evidence* on the subject

Relying on the above passage the High Court of Allahabad held that to succeed under that section the applicant must prove that the inadequacy in the sale price was the result of a material irregularity and that the co existence of an irregularity and an inadequacy however gross in the sale price was not sufficient in the absence of *direct evidence* to establish a casual connection between the one and the other In other words the applicant must connect the irregularity with the inadequacy of price as cause and effect by means of *direct evidence* (1) On the other hand it was held by the High Courts of Madras (2) and Calcutta (3) that the fact that the inadequacy of price fetched at the sale was the result of the irregularity complained of might be established either by direct evidence or might be inferred when such inference was reasonable having regard to the nature of the irregularity and the extent of the inadequacy As regards the words *direct evidence* the High Court of Calcutta said that their Lordships meant by that expression that there must be evidence showing that substantial injury was the necessary result of the irregularity complained of (4)

The distinction between the Allahabad decisions on the one hand and the Madras and Calcutta decisions on the other may be explained by an illustration In execution of a decree obtained by A against B B's one fourth share in certain property is sold for Rs 200 B seeks to set aside the sale alleging that the property was sold at an adjourned sale that no hour was fixed for the sale as required by r 60 that consequently there were only three bidders at the sale and that owing to that circumstance the property fetched the grossly inadequate price of Rs 200 It is proved that the hour to which the sale was adjourned was not fixed in other words *material irregularity* is proved *Substantial injury* is also proved by evidence of the sale of a share smaller than one fourth of the same property for Rs 4000 The fact that there were only three bidders is also proved In such a case the High Courts of Madras and Calcutta would under the old section set aside the sale on the ground that the paucity of bidders could reasonably be ascribed to the non specification of the hour and the low price could reasonably be inferred from the fact of the paucity of bidders (5) The High Court of Allahabad however would not set aside the sale on such an inference That Court would require *direct evidence* to show that the paucity of bidders was due to the non specification of the hour and that the inadequacy of price was due to paucity of bidders

The words unless upon the facts proved the Court is satisfied have been substituted in the proviso to give effect to the Madras and Calcutta decisions What is necessary under the proviso is that the Court should be satisfied that the applicant has sustained substantial injury by reason of the irregularity or fraud complained of and if the facts proved do so satisfy the Court that is sufficient It is no longer necessary to connect the irregularity or fraud with the inadequacy of price as cause and effect by means of *direct evidence* The result is that a sale will be set aside under the present rule if there be either direct evidence connecting the irregularity with the inadequacy of price or evidence of circumstances which will warrant the necessary or at least reasonable inference that the inadequacy was the result of the irregularity complained of and the

(1) *Jagan Nath v. Makunt* (1896) 18 All 37  
*Shri v. Agha Ali Khan* (1898) 18 All 141  
 (2) *Venk. t. bhar ja v. Zem. dar of I. areti nag r* (1891) 9 Ma 119  
 (3) *Shooriton v. L. H.* (1903) 30 Cal 1  
*Mahabir Pershad v. Dia. kda t* (1901)

31 Cal 815  
 (4) *S. no. Mojee v. Dakh na* (1897) 4 Cal 91  
 (5) *S. no. Mojee v. Dakh na* (1897) 4 Cal 91  
*1. n. d. m. b. a. j. v. Zam. dar of Kharre t. ang* (1897) 20 M. J. 19 See also *Mah. b. r. e. d. v. D. h. n. d. h. a.* (1904) 31 Cal 815

Allahabad High Court now follows this rule (n) If there be no such evidence the sale must be confirmed (o)

The mere fact that the property realised at the auction sale only one half of the value entered in the proclamation of sale is no ground for setting aside the sale under this rule (p)

**Necessary parties**—The decree holder is a necessary party to an application under this rule (q) Under the Code of 1882 there was a conflict of opinion whether an auction purchaser was a necessary party to an application under the corresponding s 311 (r) Under the present Code he is clearly a necessary party see the proviso to r 9 sub r (2) Where property is bought at a Court sale by A in the name of B A the beneficial owner is not a necessary party to an application under this rule Hence if an order is made setting aside the sale in a proceeding to which B was a party it will bind A though A was not joined as a party to the proceeding (s)

**Bona fide purchaser for value without notice**—If the conditions of this rule are satisfied the sale will be set aside though the purchaser may be a bona fide purchaser for value without notice of the irregularity or fraud in publishing or conducting the sale (t)

**Waiver and estoppel**—If the judgment debtor knowing of an irregularity or fraud lies by and allows the sale to proceed without objection he will be estopped from impeaching the sale on the ground of irregularity or fraud though substantial injury has been caused In *Arunachellam v Arunachellam* (u) their Lordships of the Privy Council said It would be very difficult indeed to conduct proceedings in execution of decrees by attachment and sale of property if the judgment debtors could lie by and afterwards take advantage of any misdescription of the property attached and about to be sold which they knew well but of which the execution creditor or decree holder might be perfectly ignorant that they should take no notice of that allow the sale to proceed and then come forward and say the whole proceedings were vitiated In *Girdhari Singh v Hurdeo Narain* (v) the notification of sale had stated the Government revenue to be Rs 3 146 instead of Rs 8 146 the sale being fixed for the 5th of August 1872 The judgment debtor applied for a postponement of sale and stated that he wished to raise money to pay off the decree holder and in his petition he added Under such circumstances it is prayed that a postponement of one month be granted the attachment and the notification of sale being maintained Upon that petition the sale was postponed for one month without the issue of a second notification The decretal amount not having been paid the property was put up for sale The judgment debtor applied to set aside the sale on the ground that the Government revenue was not correctly stated and that the property therefore fetched a very low price Upon these facts their Lordships of the Privy Council held that though the misstatement of the Government revenue amounted to a material irregularity in publishing the sale

( ) B b R m v Inamull h (19 ) 49 All 40  
99 I C 96 ( ) A A 41

(o) Mah bur le A d v Dhan idh rs (1904) 31  
Cal 815 819 80 v or Mahamm d v  
Aoor M h mimad (19 3) 5 Lah L J 30  
1 I C 730 ( 3) A I 13

(p) F jhanav Askar h (19 ) 11 All 14 75 I C  
185 ( ) A I 550

(q) Al Gath r v Ba idhar (1893) 15 All 40

(r) Kara s v M r Ali (1891) 11 All W v 11  
Sure d Moh m v Am e h Cha dra  
(191 ) 39 Cal 647 141 C 6 Menayudd  
v Toom Ma d l (191 ) 39 Cal 681 151 C  
16

(s) Ba ad v CH ler Kanta (190 ) 9 Cal 63  
685 65

(t) F rear v Panch Ae rs (19 ) C W N  
58 41 C 9 5 ( 3) A C 333 Dhingulsh

Chulambar v K h ppm (1902) 6 Bom  
543 (fraudulent s g decree—inadequacy  
of price at Court sale—bona fide pur  
chaser—sale not set aside)

(u) (1889) 1 Mad 19 151 A 171 Um div dr  
Forn 1st vol (1915) 28 Mad 33 1  
I C 339 B h v s gh v M kat s nph  
(1906) 8 All 2 3 Lham Cha dr v  
A A t a v th (190 ) 9 Cal 5 M h m  
Lat v A l CA (19 ) 49 All 88  
10 I C 16 ( 7) A A 513 M ha af  
Bahador s ng v Chandra Nath (1907)  
3 C W N 309 ( 3) A C 333 M ng  
Olm Tan v I I M I S R M Chatter  
F rm (1909) 7 Ra s 45 (29) A R 311  
H rda Lat v I m Nath (1909) 27  
All L J 619 116 I C 418 ( 29) A A  
04

(v) (18 6) 3 I A 30

the judgment debtor was not entitled to have the sale set aside as the petition amounted to an admission on his part that the notification was correct or that at any rate there was no such mistake or irregularity as would be likely to mislead. But it is different where an application for a postponement of sale does not contain any such admission and moreover it is refused. In such a case there is no estoppel (w). The objection as to irregularity in publishing or conducting the sale cannot be taken for the first time in the Court of appeal (x) but it may be so taken if no fresh evidence is necessary (y).

Where no application is made under this rule—If no application is made to set aside a sale under the present rule an order will be made confirming the sale see r 92 below.

Questions outside the scope of this rule—The question whether the decree in execution whereof the property was sold was obtained without service of summons on the judgment debtor (z) or whether the decree was obtained by fraud (a) or whether the Court had jurisdiction to sell the property (b) or whether the sale was brought about by the fraud of the decree holder the auction purchaser and others (c) is outside the scope of this rule. See note below application to set aside sale on other grounds.

Objections not raised in the application—The Court should not under this rule consider objections not expressly taken in the application (d).

Compromise of proceedings under this rule—It has been held by the Patna High Court that a proceeding to set aside a sale under this rule is not a proceeding in execution within the meaning of O 23 r 4 but that it is a proceeding in the suit itself. A compromise therefore of proceedings under this rule may be recorded under O 23 r 3 (e). But this decision is of doubtful authority.

Whether O 9 applies to applications under this rule—The provisions of O 9 do not apply to proceedings in execution and therefore do not apply to an application under this rule (f). See notes to O 9 r 9 and O 9 r 13. Whether this rule applies to proceedings in execution. See also notes below Appeal.

Suit to set aside sale on ground of material irregularity—Where an application made by a judgment debtor under this rule to set aside a sale on the ground of material irregularity in publishing or conducting the sale is disallowed and the sale is confirmed under r 92 (1) he is precluded by virtue of the provisions of r 92 (3) from bringing a suit to set aside the sale on the same grounds (g). But this rule does not apply in the case of revenue sales in Madras (h).

Limitation—An application under this rule must be made within 30 days from the date of sale [Limitation Act 1908 Sch I art 166]. But where the irregularity affecting the sale has by the fraud of the decree holder or other parties to the sale been kept concealed from the judgment debtor he is entitled to apply under this rule whether

- (c) *Thakor v Lelanunt* (1891) 7 C L 613  
*Jaman v Au Hajan* (1894) 17 M d 304  
 (x) *Olpherts v M f b Lehad* (1889) 10 I A 530  
 9 Cal 656 661 *Mahadeo Dhad* (1933) 1 at 916 918 41 C 839 (3)  
 A L 83  
 (y) *Se Mah d Meera v Sarr n* (1900) I A 1 at p. Tekat K h a v M f C h d (1913) 40 I A 140 14 40 C L 63 191 C 96  
 (z) *Nel Luv v He kh K reen* (1896) 3 C L 606 689  
 ( ) *Khayndra v Pran Nath* (1907) 9 C L 39 9 I A 99  
 (b) *Sah n v Agha Ali* (1896) 18 All 141 14  
 (c) *Bhajura D v N j l ad* (1934) 47 All 1 84 I C 1031 ( ) A A 146

- (d) *Harbans v Fundt* (1899) 1 All 140  
*Topi hand v B n r l D* (1910) 1 Lah L J 19  
 (e) *Cho dh ry v Cho dt y* (1911) 8 P t 1 J 3 6 1 C 608 ( ) A L 10  
 (f) *Bhar t Chand a Ia n v rkar* (1911) 1 C L W N 99 41 I C 546 B a t Bah v R azuddi (1906) 53 Cal 69 96 I C 05 (6) A L 3  
 (g) *B hama yya v App yya* (1911) 44 Mad 31 6 I C 203 (1) A M 11 M a s a v Ma ng Ky m (1904) 5 Kane 606 10-1 C L 706 ( ) A R 19 V and K h o e B (1906) 7 Lah 1 93 I C 1007 ( ) A L 16  
 (h) *Jagu atha v A th p r m l* (1911) 1 M d 6 10 I C 84 ( ) A M 101

the sale has been confirmed or not and the time for making the application is to be computed from the date when the fraud first became known to him (i)

The point of distinction as regards limitation between the old law and the new law is this that while under the Code of 1882 the application to set aside a sale on the ground of fraud in publishing or conducting a sale had to be made under s 244 (now s 47) and the period of limitation for the application was 3 years from the date of sale (j) such application must now be made under the present rule and the period of limitation is 30 days from the date of sale See notes below Application to set aside sale on other grounds

**Application to set aside sale on other grounds**—When the auction purchaser is the decree holder himself and when an application is made to set aside the sale on a ground other than that covered by the present rule and no application has been made under r 89 the case falls within s 47 and hence there is a second appeal (k) Similarly where a judgment debtor applies to have a sale set aside not only on the ground of material irregularity in publishing and conducting the sale but also on the ground that no notice of the application for attachment and sale was given as required by O 21 r 22 the case falls within s 47 and hence there is a second appeal (l) Neither this rule nor r 92 applies to such cases It must however be noted that where an application really comes under the present rule, the mere mention of s 47 in the application will not make it an application under s 47 for the purposes either of an appeal or of limitation (m) See note above Question outside the scope of this rule

**Joinder of claim under this rule with claim under sec 47**—A claim to set aside a sale on the ground of material irregularity under this rule may be combined with a claim for a declaration that the sale is a nullity as the decree was passed after the death of the judgment debtor (n)

**Whether sale can be challenged by way of defence in a suit for possession**—See notes to r 92 below under the same head

**Appeal**—An appeal lies from an order under this rule and rule 92 setting aside or refusing to set aside a sale [O 43 r 1 cl (j)] But no second appeal lies from the order of the first appellate Court (o) See s 104 subsec (2) and notes above Fraud in publishing or conducting sale Nor does an appeal lie under the Letters Patent from the order of the first appellate Court (p) See notes above Application to set aside sale on other grounds

It has been held by the High Court of Calcutta that an appeal lies from an order dismissing an application under this rule for default the reason given being that the effect of such an order is to confirm the sale under r 92 (q) A fortiori it is so if the order dismissing the application for return of the original application on the file also confirms the sale (r) These decisions were doubted in a later case (s) which held that

(i) *Mahadeo v. Rao* (1890) 1 C 1 69 [F B] *Colam Ahad v. J. d. d. d.* (1903) 30 Cal 14 153 *Hira v. I. v. C. H. d. d.* (1898) 26 C 1 53 *Hira v. I. v. C. H. d. d.* (1899) 26 C 1 53 *Hira v. I. v. C. H. d. d.* (1899) 26 C 1 53 *Hira v. I. v. C. H. d. d.* (1899) 26 C 1 53

(j) *Imitation v. I. v. C. H. d. d.* (1899) 26 C 1 53 *Hira v. I. v. C. H. d. d.* (1899) 26 C 1 53 *Hira v. I. v. C. H. d. d.* (1899) 26 C 1 53 *Hira v. I. v. C. H. d. d.* (1899) 26 C 1 53

(k) *S. p. r. I. v. C. H. d. d.* (1899) 26 C 1 53 *Hira v. I. v. C. H. d. d.* (1899) 26 C 1 53 *Hira v. I. v. C. H. d. d.* (1899) 26 C 1 53 *Hira v. I. v. C. H. d. d.* (1899) 26 C 1 53

(l) *I. v. C. H. d. d.* (1899) 26 C 1 53 *Hira v. I. v. C. H. d. d.* (1899) 26 C 1 53 *Hira v. I. v. C. H. d. d.* (1899) 26 C 1 53 *Hira v. I. v. C. H. d. d.* (1899) 26 C 1 53

(m) *M. t. r. v. I. v. C. H. d. d.* (1899) 26 C 1 53 *Hira v. I. v. C. H. d. d.* (1899) 26 C 1 53 *Hira v. I. v. C. H. d. d.* (1899) 26 C 1 53 *Hira v. I. v. C. H. d. d.* (1899) 26 C 1 53

(n) *H. b. J. m. v. I. v. C. H. d. d.* (1899) 26 C 1 53 *Hira v. I. v. C. H. d. d.* (1899) 26 C 1 53 *Hira v. I. v. C. H. d. d.* (1899) 26 C 1 53 *Hira v. I. v. C. H. d. d.* (1899) 26 C 1 53

(o) *Mahadeo v. Dhoba* (19 3) 2 Pat 916 74 I C 843 (3) A 1 293 *Jagg v. Nath v. Da d.* (19 3) 4 Lah 43 5 I C 103 (3) A 1 59 *Jur. v. gh v. S. w. v. I. v. C. H. d. d.* (19 3) 4 Lah 41 5 I C 941 *S. t. v. Nath v. I. v. C. H. d. d.* (19 3) 45 Cal 1 5 104 I C 188 ( ) A C 6

(p) *M. t. r. v. I. v. C. H. d. d.* (1899) 26 C 1 53 *Hira v. I. v. C. H. d. d.* (1899) 26 C 1 53 *Hira v. I. v. C. H. d. d.* (1899) 26 C 1 53 *Hira v. I. v. C. H. d. d.* (1899) 26 C 1 53

(q) *K. I. A. v. S. v. m. Lal* (191) 25 Cal. L. J 163 381 504

(r) *V. e. v. I. v. C. H. d. d.* (19 3) 41 Cal. L. J 26 91 (3) A 1 510

(s) *Ba. v. I. v. C. H. d. d.* (19 3) 53 Cal. L. J 163 381 504 ( ) A C 23

the judgment debtor was not entitled to have the sale set aside as the petition amounted to an admission on his part that the notification was correct or that at any rate there was no such mistake or irregularity as would be likely to mislead. But it is different where an application for a postponement of sale does not contain any such admission and moreover it is refused. In such a case there is no estoppel (w). The objection as to irregularity in publishing or conducting the sale cannot be taken for the first time in the Court of appeal (x) but it may be so taken if no fresh evidence is necessary (y).

Where no application is made under this rule.—If no application is made to set aside a sale under the present rule an order will be made confirming the sale see r 92 below.

Questions outside the scope of this rule.—The question whether the decree in execution whereof the property was sold was obtained without service of summons on the judgment debtor ( ) or whether the decree was obtained by fraud (a) or whether the Court had jurisdiction to sell the property (b) or whether the sale was brought about by the fraud of the decree holder the auction purchaser and others (c) is outside the scope of this rule. See note below application to set aside sale on other grounds.

Objections not raised in the application.—The Court should not under this rule consider objections not expressly taken in the application (d).

Compromise of proceedings under this rule.—It has been held by the Patna High Court that a proceeding to set aside a sale under this rule is not a proceeding in execution within the meaning of O 23 r 4 but that it is a proceeding in the suit itself. A compromise therefore of proceedings under this rule may be recorded under O 23 r 3 (e). But this decision is of doubtful authority.

Whether O 9 applies to applications under this rule.—The provisions of O 9 do not apply to proceeding in execution and therefore do not apply to an application under this rule (f). See notes to O 9 r 9 and O 9 r 13. Whether this rule applies to proceedings in execution. See also notes below Appeal.

Suit to set aside sale on ground of material irregularity.—Where an application made by a judgment debtor under this rule to set aside a sale on the ground of material irregularity in publishing or conducting the sale is disallowed and the sale is confirmed under r 92 (1) he is precluded by virtue of the provisions of r 92 (3) from bringing a suit to set aside the sale on the same grounds (g). But this rule does not apply in the case of revenue sales in Madras (h).

Limitation.—An application under this rule must be made within 30 days from the date of sale [Limitation Act 1908 Sch I art 166]. But where the irregularity affecting the sale has by the fraud of the decree holder or other parties to the sale been kept concealed from the judgment debtor he is entitled to apply under this rule whether

- (w) *Thakor v Leelanand* (1881) C 1 613  
*Imray v Kulkarni* (1894) 17 M d 304  
 (x) *Olpherts v Mahabir Persad* (1883) 10 I A 309 (al 6 6 681 *Mahadeo v Dhia* (19 3) 1 at 916 918 4 I C 838 (3) A 1 83  
 (y) *S. Mahomed v Mera v Sarwan* (1900) 1 A 17 at p 5 *Tekal v Kripna* (1913) 40 I A 140 145 40 C 1 63 191 (1) 70  
 (z) *Velu v Shekh Karren* (1896) 3 Cal 686 689  
 ( ) *Khagendra v Pr Nath* (190) 29 (al 79 9 I A 99  
 (b) *Shir v Agha Ali* (1896) 18 All 141 145  
 (c) *Bhagwan D v Suraj I* at (19 4) 4 All 21 84 I C 1031 (15) 1 146

- (d) *H. Bane v Fudn* (1899) 21 All 140  
*Copickand v Be at Das* (1919) 1 Lah L J 19  
 (e) *Cfo Ikry v Cfo dila* (19 1) 6 Pat L J 53 6 I C 608 (21) A F 10  
 (f) *Bhar t Chnd v Isam Sakar* (191) 1 Cal W N 69 41 I C 586 *Bra tilla v Rea* 11 M (19 6) 53 (al 6 9 96 I C 0 (6) A C 7 d  
 (g) *Bahmajay v Appayya* (19 1) 44 Mad J 1 62 I C 03 (21) A M 11 *Ma Na* M u y Ky (19 4) 5 Jc 2 606 10 I C 705 (18) A R 18 *Nand A ho* v Ban (1926) 71 Lal 1 93 I C 1007 (18) A Y 16  
 (h) *J q tha v Kath per nal* (19 ) 1 Mad 6 10 I C 88 (1) 4 M 103

the sale has been confirmed or not and the time for making the application is to be computed from the date when the fraud first became known to him (i)

The point of distinction as regards limitation between the old law and the new law is this that while under the Code of 1852 the application to set aside a sale on the ground of fraud in publishing or conducting a sale had to be made under s 244 [now s 47] and the period of limitation for the application was 3 years from the date of sale (j) such application must now be made under the present rule and the period of limitation is 30 days from the date of sale See notes below Application to set aside sale on other grounds

**Application to set aside sale on other grounds**—When the auction purchaser is the decree holder himself and when an application is made to set aside the sale on a ground other than that covered by the present rule and no application has been made under r 89 the case falls within 47 and hence there is a second appeal (k) Similarly where a judgment debtor applies to have a sale set aside not only on the ground of material irregularity in publishing and conducting the sale but also on the ground that no notice of the application for attachment and sale was given as required by O 21 r 22 the case falls within s 47 and hence there is a second appeal (l) Neither this rule nor r 92 applies to such cases It must however be noted that where an application really comes under the present rule the mere mention of s 47 in the application will not make it an application under s 47 for the purposes either of an appeal or of limitation (m) See note above Question outside the scope of this rule

**Joinder of claim under this rule with claim under sec 47**—A claim to set aside a sale on the ground of material irregularity under this rule may be combined with a claim for a declaration that the sale is a nullity as the decree was passed after the death of the judgment debtor (n)

**Whether sale can be challenged by way of defence in a suit for possession**—See notes to r 92 below under the same head

**Appeal**—An appeal lies from an order under this rule and rule 92 setting aside or refusing to set aside a sale [O 43 r 1 cl (j)] But no second appeal lies from the order of the first appellate Court (o) See s 104 subsec (2) and notes above Fraud in publishing or conducting sale Nor does an appeal lie under the Letters Patent from the order of the first appellate Court (p) See notes above Application to set aside sale on other grounds

It has been held by the High Court of Calcutta that an appeal lies from an order dismissing an application under this rule for default the reason given being that the effect of such an order is to confirm the sale under r 92 (q) *fortiori* it is so if the order dismissing the application for restoring the original application on the file also confirms the sale (r) The decisions were doubted in a later case (s) which held that

- (i) *M F Iro v n v C p I* (1899) 17 Cal 69  
(F B) *Colam Aha I J d ster* (1903)  
30 Cal 14 13 *H r a I Ch indra*  
(1899) 6 C 1 539 54 545 *Bhu v*  
*Irof II* (19 1) 48 C 119 60 IC 801  
(1) A C 51
- (j) *Limitation A t 1905 h I rt 181 Nem*  
*Ch Is Den Nath* (1898) C W N 691  
*II t Lal ch v Ch t I a I a to C I a*  
(1899) 6 C 1 539
- (k) *Si pe tor L k Lid v B dh v gl* (19 4)  
All I J 413 83 I C 10 9 (4) A A  
694 v 3044 h v Cor d J I t  
(19 4) 4 Mal I J 49 84 I C 95  
(4) A M 8
- (l) *I jing p La v Jam j chara* (19 4) 4  
M d 88 80 I C 9 (4) A M 431 [F B]  
( ) *M t v Ibl I* (19 5) 30 C W N 66 89 I  
C 6 (6) A C 109
- ( ) *B h J m la v De v d* (19 4) 7 Pat 331  
107 I C 845 (-8) A 1 7
- ( ) *Mah deo Dhob* (19 3) 2 Pat 918 4  
I C 833 (3) A 1 33 *J gyan*  
*Nath v Da d* (19 3) 4 Lah 243 51 C  
103 (-3) A L 59 *J w S gh v*  
*Sac n Mel* (19 0) Lal J J 41 54 IC  
911 *S t dra v th v Cha Ch d m*  
(19 ) 4 Cal L J 5 104 I C 189  
(7) A C 6
- (p) *I t am I v I h will h* (189 ) 14 All 6  
[F B] *P t I v M ta L I* (191 ) 39  
All 191 39 I C 460 *I a ja v M kha d*  
(19 5) 6 Lah 50 94 I C 51 (5)  
A I 6 3
- (q) *K h k ta Shy m Lal* (191 ) 5 Cal  
L J 163 38 I C 59
- (r) *v e d a F A H* (19 5) 41 C 1  
L J 6 91 C 31 ( ) A C 510
- (s) *B r rat B v Pr add n* (19 6) 53 Cal  
6 9 96 I C 03 (6) A C 3 *L so ta*  
*A m v A A ode Chan t a* (19 9) 55  
Cal 616 104 IC 59 (8) A C 5



an order of dismissal by default is not a confirmation of the sale and does not preclude the party from making a fresh application while a dismissal on the merits or when the applicant does not appear and the opposite party does appear is appealable under O 43 r 1 (j). The case last cited was dissented from by the same High Court in *Anwarali v Bhim Sanhar* (t) where it was held that an appeal lies from an order dismissing an application under this rule for default where such dismissal is for the non appearance of the applicant or for non appearance of both the parties and even when no formal order is recorded under r 92 confirming the sale.

**Revision**—No revision lies from an order dismissing an application under this rule for default (u). See notes above. **Appeal**

**Appeal to Privy Council**—See notes to r 92 under the same head.

**91 [S 313]** The purchaser at any such sale in execution of a decree may apply to the Court to set aside the sale, on the ground that the judgment debtor had no saleable interest in the property sold.

Application by purchaser to set aside sale on ground of judgment debtor having no saleable interest

**Application to set aside sale**—This rule enables the auction purchaser to proceed by an application to set aside the sale where the judgment debtor had no saleable interest in the property. It does not apply where a sale is sought to be set aside by an auction purchaser on the ground that he had been induced by *misrepresentation or concealment* to buy the property for more than its real value (t). The remedy of the purchaser in such a case is by a regular suit. As to refund of purchase money when a sale is set aside on the ground that the judgment debtor had no saleable interest see r 83 below. In two recent Madras cases a decree holder brought to sale and purchased property which did not belong to the judgment debtor and notified satisfaction of his decree. On discovering his mistake he filed a fresh execution application but the Court held that he could not execute again without first setting aside the sale under this rule (w).

**No saleable interest**—This rule applies only where a judgment debtor has no saleable interest at all. Hence the rule does not apply if the judgment debtor has even a partial interest in the property sold (x) however small that interest may be. In other words a purchaser is not entitled to have a sale set aside under this rule on the ground that the judgment debtor had a saleable interest in a very small portion of the property and had no saleable interest in the major portion of the property (y). For the purposes of this rule a mortgagor has a saleable interest in the mortgaged property even though a decree has been obtained by the mortgagee for the enforcement of the mortgage (z) and although the amount due under the mortgage exceeds the value of the property (a).

The decision that a sale cannot be set aside under this rule if the judgment debtor has any interest in the property does not apply to a sale under a mortgage decree held under the rules of the Calcutta High Court and the conditions of sale framed thereunder. Therefore a purchaser under such a sale is entitled to have it set aside if the property

(t) (19 9) 33 C W N 332 (-9) A C 407

(u) (19 5) 41 Cal L J 86 91 C 351 (75) A C 510 s pra

(v) *Durga Sund v Gov da* (1894) 10 Cal 388  
B v Mohun v R Uma v ill (1893) 0  
Cal 8 19 I 4 154 bh oyobinda v Dhanul  
dha (1913) 19 C W N 1 91 -11 C  
774

(w) *Muthu Kum rasam v Muthusami* (1977)  
50 Mad 639 100 I C 5 (-7) A M 391

*Jaya nada v Bas v Jja* (19 7) 53 Mad  
L J 255 104 I C 614 ( ) 4 M 83

(x) *Ram Cooma v Shu hee* (1893) 9 Cal 6 6  
*Ram Varain v Dur ria oth* (1900) 7 Cal  
64

(y) *Sonaram v Moh ram* (1901) 78 Cal. 3

(z) *Prot p Chunder v Panotj* (1883) 9 Cal.  
508

(a) *Sa t Lal v Ramj* (188 ) 9 All 187

sold was under attachment at the date of sale and that the attaching creditor was not joined as a party to the suit (b)

Necessary parties—See the proviso to r 92 sub r (2)

Limitation—The application under this rule must be made within 30 days from the date of sale Limitation Act 1908 sch 1 art 166

Appeal—An appeal lies from an order setting aside or refusing to set aside a sale made under this rule and rule 92 [O 43 r 1 cl (j)]

Withdrawal of purchase money by auction purchaser from Court—See notes to s 151 case (bb)

Compensation for loss of part of property bought at a Court sale—A purchaser who is deprived of a part of the property bought at a Court sale is not entitled to compensation as against the judgment debtor for the loss of that part The principle is that apart from the case provided for by this rule and apart from fraud a purchaser at an auction sale must abide by his bargain What is sold and bought is the right title and interest of the judgment debtor in the property The Court which sells the property does not guarantee the title and the maxim *Caveat emptor* applies It does not make any difference that the property was sold in execution of a mortgage decree and the mortgagee himself is the purchaser (c) See notes to r 94 below What passes at a Court sale

92 [ss 312, 314] (1) Where no application is made under rule 89, rule 90 or rule 91, or where such application is made and disallowed, the Court shall make an order confirming the sale, and thereupon the sale shall become absolute

(2) Where such application is made and allowed, and where, in the case of an application under rule 89, the deposit required by that rule is made within thirty days from the date of sale, the Court shall make an order setting aside the sale

Provided that no order shall be made unless notice of the application has been given to all persons affected thereby

(3) No suit to set aside an order made under this rule shall be brought by any person against whom such order is made

Alterations in the rule —

- 1 The corresponding s 312 of the Code of 1882 applied only to application referred to in r 90 The present rule applies also to applications referred to in rr 89 and 91 [Code of 1882 ss 310A and 313] see sub r (1)
- 2 In sub r (1) the words as regards the parties to the suit which occurred in s 312 after the words confirming the sale have been omitted.
- 3 In sub rule (3) the words on the ground of such irregularity which occurred in the old section after the words no suit to set aside have been omitted

(b) *Moh n Lal v Na dala* (19 9) 33 C W N 177 118 I C 887 (9) A C 07  
(c) *Abi n A v Hahben* (19 1) 5 C W N 56

63 I C 16 (21) A C 115 *Kalepalli v Thadacavoy* (19 0) 43 Mad 3 54  
I C 515

2. No suit will lie to set aside an order made under this rule—  
No suit will lie to set aside an order made under this rule by any person against whom such order is made. The only remedy of the party against whom the order is made is to appeal from the order under O 43 r 1 cl (j). Now an order under this rule may be—

- (1) either an order confirming the sale or
- (2) an order setting aside the sale

*Order confirming the sale*—An order confirming the sale may be made—

- (a) either where no application is made at all to set aside the sale or
- (u) where an application is made and is allowed

No suit will lie in either case to set aside an order confirming the sale (d)

*Order setting aside the sale*—The language of sub rule (3) makes it clear that no suit will be to set aside an order *setting aside* a sale made on an application under rule 89 90 or 91 (e). The party against whom the order is made has a remedy by way of appeal under O 43 r 1 cl (j).

The suits barred under sub rule (3) are suits to set aside (1) an order confirming a sale under sub rule (1) and (2) an order setting aside a sale under sub rule (2). Sub rule (3) refers to applications under rr 89 90 and 91. A suit by an auction purchaser for a return of the purchase money on the ground that the judgment debtor has no saleable interest in the property sold is barred under sub rule (3) for the case is within r 91 above see notes to r 93. Suit for a return of purchase money where no saleable interest. But a sale by a judgment debtor to recover property sold in execution of a mortgage decree which was neither included in the mortgage nor in the decree but which found its way into the certificate of sale in some unexplained manner is not barred by sub rule (3) such a case is not one of material irregularity within r 90 nor does it fall under r 89 or r 91 above (f). A person claiming title to a property attached and sold by the Insolvency Court as belonging to the insolvent is entitled to bring a suit to establish his title to the property though his claim has been disallowed by the Insolvency Court. The present rule is no bar to such a suit (g).

Whether an execution sale can be challenged by way of defence in a suit for possession—Where a judgment debtor does not question the validity of a sale under r 90 above and a suit is brought by the auction purchaser against him for possession it is not competent to him to challenge the sale in that suit. The penalty imposed upon a negligent judgment debtor is set out in r 92 and it is that the Court shall make an order confirming the sale and thereupon the sale shall become absolute. This amounts to a judicial determination that none of the objections exists on which the validity of the sale could have been questioned (h). The dismissal however of an application made by a judgment debtor under r 90 does not preclude him in a suit for possession by the auction purchaser from pleading by way of defence that the property sold in execution of a mortgage decree passed against him and bought by the purchaser was not included in the mortgage suit or decree but was fraudulently inserted in the sale certificate (i).

- (d) *Bhim S. gh v Sarwan* (1889) 16 Cal 33 40  
*Damola v I. a. a. gh* (190 ) 76 Bom 40  
*Giraymat v Teor v Akbar Hussain* (190 )  
-9 All 196 31 44 3 *Brahma v. a. v*  
*App. v. a.* (19 1) 44 Mad 351 6 I. C. 03  
( 1 ) A M 11 [Mat rhl irregularity]  
*Agha Hu. in v Qasim Ali* (19 ) 73 All  
L J 946 (-8) A A 3 89 I C  
1018 [Ameniment of decr after  
sal] *Mia S. o v Maung F. w* (19 8)  
5 R ng 606 10 I C 706 ( 8 ) A R 18  
(e) See *SA b Si gh v. Mu. k. t S ng* (1806) 18 All

- 43 *Sham Beh. r. I. v. t. ip. Ashore*  
(1894) O A R 3 9 1 no lo g r law  
(f) *Bulaga Da v Keers* (19 8) 60 All 646  
(28) A A 363  
(g) *Harn m. v. Corp. t* (19 3) 5 Lah L J 9  
31 C 36 ( 3 ) A L 4  
(h) *Jag. en. ar. v. Ad. la. h* (19 3) 81 C W N 81  
78 I C 1 6 ( - ) A C 81 *Lat. Ad.*  
( 1 ) d a v *Ramd. s* (19 9) 33 C W N  
95 118 I C 8 7 ( 9 ) A C 374  
(i) *M. h. v. W. h.* (19 1) 41 M. I. J 61  
70 I C 303 ( 1 ) A M 70

**Sale by receiver in a partnership action**—A sale by a receiver under the directions of the Court given under a preliminary decree in a suit for dissolution of partnership is not a sale in execution of a decree. The provisions of the Code relating to execution sales do not apply to such a sale (j)

**Court**—The word Court means the Civil Court and not the Collector when the decree is transferred to the Collector for execution (k)

**Plea of bar of limitation after confirmation**—No application can be entertained after confirmation of a sale to set aside a sale on the ground that the application for attachment and sale was barred by limitation (l)

**Appeal**—An appeal lies from an order under this rule setting aside or refusing to set aside a sale [O 43 r 1 cl (j)] But no second appeal lies from the order passed on first appeal (m) [see s 104 (2)]

**Appeal to the Privy Council**—An appeal lies to His Majesty in Council from an order passed under this rule and r 90 (n)

**93 [S 315]** Where a sale of immovable property is set aside under rule 92, the purchaser shall be entitled to an order for repayment of his purchase money, with or without interest as the Court may direct, against any person to whom it has been paid

L turn of pur ha e  
mon v in certain es

**Section 315 of the Code of 1882**—The corresponding s 315 of the Code of 1882 ran as follows—

When a sale of immovable property is set aside under s 310A [O 21 r 89] 312 or 313 [O 21 r 91]

or when it is found that the judgment debtor had no saleable interest in the property which was purported to be sold and the purchaser is for that reason deprived of it

the purchaser shall be entitled to receive back his purchase money (with or without interest as the Court may direct) from any person to whom the purchase money has been paid

The repayment of the said purchase money and of the interest (if any) allowed by the Court may be enforced against such person under the rules provided for by this Code for the execution of a decree for money

The second and fourth paragraphs of s 315 have been omitted in the present section. Further the words shall be entitled to an order for repayment have been substituted for the words shall be entitled to receive back which occurred in the third paragraph

**No saleable interest**—An auction purchaser may under r 91 apply to set aside the sale on the ground that the judgment debtor had no saleable interest in the property sold. If the sale is set aside he may apply under this rule for an order for repayment of his purchase money. But no sale can be set aside under r 91 nor can any repayment be ordered under this rule if it is found that the judgment debtor had some saleable interest in the property. The reason is that in the case of a sale under a decree of the

(j) *Narayan Das v. H. M. Chander* (1906) 48 All

209 90 I C 116 (26) A A 14

(k) *Faaf v. W. N. N. (1918)* 40 All 4 45 I C

3

(l) *Inah v. Rai v. Ma v. J. K. h. Pros* 2 (191)

1 t I J 15 341 t 8 6

(m) *Jura S. gh v. Sa a. Mal* (1919) Punj Rec

no 168 p 446 541 C 941 *Jagan Nath v.*

*D. ud* (1933) 4 Lah 43 51 C 103 (3)

A L 59

(n) *Kr. h. a. P. shah v. Motchand* (1913) 40 Cal.

635 40 I A 140 19 I C 296

93 Court there is no warranty of title either by the decree holder or by the Court as there is in the case of private sales. The purchaser must be taken to accept the property with all risks and all defects in the judgment debtor's title. It follows that the purchaser is not entitled to any refund even if the judgment debtor has no saleable interest at all. Rules 91 and 93 however confer upon him a statutory right to a return of the purchase money in such cases (o).

**Suit for return of purchase money where no saleable interest**—The Code of 1859 did not contain any express provision for a return of the purchase money to the auction purchaser if it turned out that the judgment debtor had no saleable interest in the property at all. Hence it was held that the auction purchaser was not entitled to a return of the purchase money even if the judgment debtor had no saleable interest (p). The right to a return of the purchase money was first given by s 315 of the Code of 1877. That section was in terms similar to s 315 of the Code of 1882. Under the Code of 1882 it was held by all the High Courts (q) following a Full Bench ruling of the Allahabad High Court (r) that a purchaser at a sale in execution of a decree could maintain a suit against a decree holder for recovery of the purchase money if it turned out that the judgment debtor had no saleable interest in the property sold and that he was not limited to the special procedure in the execution department mentioned in that section. This view was based principally upon the words *may be enforced* which occurred in the last paragraph of s 315. It was also held under that section that whether the purchaser proceeded by an application for execution under that section or by a regular suit he was not entitled to receive back his purchase money unless the judgment debtor had *no saleable interest at all*; if the judgment debtor had *some* saleable interest in the property however small he could not by *suit* any more than by *application* obtain a refund of the purchase money in proportion to the extent to which the judgment debtor had no interest (s). It was further held having regard to the words and the purchaser is for that reason *deprived* of it which occurred in the second paragraph of s 315 that the cause of action did not arise and the period of limitation for a suit under that section did not commence until the purchaser was *deprived* of the property sold to him (t). It was also held that the purchaser was entitled to proceed by way of suit even after rateable distribution against those among whom the purchase money was distributed (u). It was further held that a suit would lie even *after confirmation* of the sale if the purchaser was after confirmation deprived of the property as the result of a suit by the lawful owner (v).

(o) *Kunh med v Chaitu* (1896) 9 M d 43  
*Sha to Chanler v Na n Sukh* (1901) 3  
 All 355 3 G 357 *Muhammad v Buchcho*  
 (190) 2 All 537 539

(p) *Soudamini v Frishta* (1869) 4 Ben L R  
 11 *Hira Lal v Ka m n n Yasa* (1880)  
 2 All 80 *Ram Varain v Malhab* (1880)  
 2 All 8 9

(q) *Kish in Lal v M hammad* (1891) 13 All 383  
*Sudhencari v Goshal* n (1913) 35 All 419  
 19 I C 956 *Muhammad v Ja n nari*  
 (1914) 36 All 5 9 26 I C 59 *Girdha*  
*Das v Sudehwari* (1918) 40 All 411 44 I C  
 637 *Gursh la ra v Lang va* (1899)  
 Bom 83 *Rustom v l naja* (1911)  
 3 Rom 99 7 I C 9 5 *H r v Sh ukh*  
 (1900) 5 C W N 40 *A tja ad v*  
*Juggal* (190) 7 C W N 105 *Ram*  
*Kumar v Ram Ce r* (1910) 37 Cal 67  
 7 I C 559 *Mak r 4l v S fuddin*  
 (1913) 50 Cal 115 1 G O I C 606 (3)  
 A C 8 *Ichojapp n v Va n n a* (1888)  
 11 Mad 269 *Udaka la v Imamsah b*  
 (1993) 16 Mad 361 *Mof deen v Maho*

m d (191) 3 Mad L J 487 17 I C 437  
*T rumala am v Subramanian* (1911)  
 40 Mad 1009 45 I C 109

(r) *Mu na Singh v Gajadhar Singh* (1883) 5  
 All 7

(s) *Shanto Chindar v Va n S kh* (1901) 3 All  
 3 *Muhammad v Buchcho* (1905) 7  
 All 537 *Sundara v Venkata* (1894) 1  
 Mad 8 *Bhagwan Das v Allah Bokhal*  
 (1913) 10 All Rec no 5 p 130 51 I C  
 59

(t) *Gurshidawa v Gangraja* (1899) 2 Bom 83  
*Secalso Nihal la v Imamsahib* (1893) 16  
 Mad 361 *Mohideen v Mahomed* (191) 3  
 Mad L J 487 17 I C 437 *Sudhencari v*  
*Chah in* (1913) 35 All 419 19 I C 956  
*Ramk mar v Ram Cour* (1910) 37 C I 6  
 1 I C 559 *C Jha Das v Sudhencari*  
 (1918) 40 All 411 44 I C 697

(u) *Ki A n L i v Mufamm i* (1891) 13 All  
 393 *Ch dhar Das v Sudhe art* (1913)  
 40 All 411 44 I C 69

(v) (1913) 3 Cal 11 O I C 606 (3) A C 85  
 n pr

The second and fourth paragraphs of s. 315 of the Code of 1882 have now been omitted. The words *may be enforced* which occurred in s. 315 are not reproduced in the present rule. The present rule says that if an application is made by the auction purchaser under r 91 to set aside the sale—and such application must be made within 30 days from the date of sale—and the sale is set aside under r 92 the purchaser is entitled to an order for a return of the purchase money. The result therefore under the present Code is that if the purchaser does not apply under r 91 to set aside the sale or if an application is made but it is disallowed the Court shall make an order confirming the sale under r 92 (1). If an order is made confirming the sale the purchaser is precluded by r 92 (3) from bringing a suit to set aside the order confirming the sale. And it has been held by all the High Courts (w) that under the present Code an auction purchaser is not entitled as he was under the Code of 1882 to bring a regular suit for a return of the purchase money in cases where the judgment debtor has no saleable interest in the property unless he can bring himself within the equitable principles which justify a suit for money had and received to his use (x). The result of these decisions is that if in ignorance of the true facts the purchaser fails to make the application to set aside the sale under r 91 within the period of limitation he can get no relief and the judgment debtor is entitled to take credit for the price of property not belonging to him. This may at first sight seem inequitable but the explanation is that while in a private sale there is in the absence of a contract to the contrary an implied covenant for title by the vendor there is no such covenant either by the decree holder or by the Court in the case of a sale in execution of a decree the doctrine of *causae emptor* applies to a Court sale. The right now given to the purchaser being a creation of the statute the remedy to enforce that right must be confined to that prescribed by the statute. That remedy is to apply under r 91 to set aside the sale and if the sale is set aside to apply for a return of the purchase money under r 93. If the Court passes an order refusing to set aside the sale he may appeal from the order under O 43 r 1 (j) the order being one made under r 92. The judgment of the appellate Court is final there being only one appeal from such order. He cannot as stated above bring a regular suit to set aside the sale and for a refund of the purchase money as he could under the Code of 1882 (y).

But it is otherwise where the auction purchaser has bought the property in execution of a mortgage decree and the decree as *v l* as the sale is set aside in a separate suit brought by part es interested in the mortgaged property. In such a case it has been held that the auction purchaser is entitled to a return of the purchase money his remedy being by an application under s. 47 above (z).

Where a sale took place and was confirmed by the Court before the present Code came into force it was held by the High Court of Calcutta that the rights of the purchaser must be determined with reference to the provisions of the Code of 1882 and that the purchaser was therefore entitled to maintain a regular suit for a return of the purchase money if the judgment debtor had no saleable interest in the property (a).

- (w) *Nannu Lal v Bhagwan Das* (1917) 39 All 114 118 119 37 I C 9. *R m Srup v Dalpat* (1921) 43 All 60 58 I C 105 (21). *A A 377 Mohideen v Mahomed* (191) 23 Mad L J 48 1 I C 437 per Napier J. *Trimalaisami v Subramanian* (1917) 40 Mad (1009) 1011 45 I C 109. *Sabbu v Io ambala* (1918) Mad W N 655 49 I C 39. *Bairat v Bala* (19) 46 Dom 833 67 I C 360 (1) A B 205. *Ratomji v Vinjak* (1911) 3 Bom 271 L 955 was a case under the Code of 1882. *Juranu v Jithi* (1917) 2 C W N 760 46 I C 793. *Bhaskar v Qu Das* (193) 5 C W N 80 50 I C 257 (4). *A C 172 dissenting from Prasanna v Ibrahim* (19) 38 (1) L J 05. *Habib uddin v Haim* (195) 6 Lah 83 86 I C

- 6 (25) A L 467 distinguishing *Asad Ullah v Karamchand* (193) 4 Lah 354 76 I C 60 (4) A L 115. *Mauq v Maung v Maung Ba G A* (195) 6 Rang 468 11 I C 436 (28) A R 7. *Shikesh v Mamik* (195) 63 Cal 58 96 I C 64 (4) A C 971.
- (x) *Rasik v M & Molla* (195) 53 Cal 758 96 I C 64 (6) A C 771 see also *Dorab Ali v Abdul Azeez* (187) 3 Cal 806 5 I A 116.
- (y) *Seo* (191) 43 All 60 8 I C 10 (1) A A 377 supra (195) 6 Lah 283 86 I C 6 (5) A L 467 supra.
- (z) *Ramesh v Badal S G A* (193) 45 All 369 74 I C 873 (3) A A 394 (F B).
- (a) *Mata Ali v Sarjuddin* (1923) 50 C 115 01 C 608 (3) A C 85.

**Suit for return of purchase money where sale set aside on ground of material irregularity**—Where a sale is set aside on the ground of material irregularity under rr 90 and 92 the auction purchaser may bring a suit for a refund of the purchase money. Such right exists independently of the Code. The mere use of the expression "order" in this rule has not the effect of taking away that right (b).

**Interest**—The Court has power by the express terms of this rule to award interest on the purchase money (c).

**Limitation**—The period of limitation for an application under this rule is 3 years from the accrual of the right under art 181 of the Limitation Act 1908 (d). The period of limitation for a regular suit in cases governed by the Code of 1887 to recover back the purchase money is 6 years from the accrual of the right under art 190 of that Act (e).

**Be entitled to an order**—Where an order is made under this rule it may be executed in the manner prescribed for the execution of decrees. See s 36 above.

**94 [S 316]** Where a sale of immovable property has become absolute, the Court shall grant a certificate specifying the property sold and the name of the person who at the time of sale is declared to be the purchaser. Such certificate shall bear date the day on which the sale became absolute.

Certificate to purchaser

**Old section**—This rule corresponds with the first part of s 316 of the Code of 1882. The second part of that section relating to the vesting of title has been reproduced in s 60 of this Code with an important alteration as regards the time when the property vests in the purchaser.

**Purchaser's title**—See s 60 and notes thereto.

**The Court shall grant a certificate**—The provisions of this rule are mandatory (f).

**Certificate of sale**—A sale certificate does not transfer the title. It is evidence of the transfer (g).

**Certificate to legal representative**—When the purchaser is dead the certificate may be granted to his legal representative (h). See s 146 above.

**What passes at a Court sale**—As regards private sales there is in the absence of a contract to the contrary an implied covenant for title by the vendor as provided by the Transfer of Property Act 1882 s 55 sub (2). But as regards sales under a decree of the Court there is no warranty of title either by the decree holder or by the Court. Rule 13 of this Ordinance shows that the decree holder when applying for execution has only to specify the judgment debtors share or interest in the property to the best of his belief and so far as he has been able to ascertain the same. Rule 60

(b) *Inter alia* Cor (1916) 93 L J 803  
10 L J 803 (1916) 93 L J 803  
H J (1907) 36 L J 311 (1)  
Lr pr nt (1) n t sal 13 (1) Office r  
m t t t property was t in sol l fr m  
m t g t t t t w t w t l g sol l  
l t t w t op r t sol l t t m t g t  
(1) *Inter alia* Cor (1916) 93 L J 803  
L J 570 63 L J 4 (1) A A 9  
(1) *Inter alia* Cor (1916) 93 L J 803  
n m t t t t t t t t t t t t t t t t  
(1) *Inter alia* Cor (1916) 93 L J 803  
L A 9 L J 803 (1) A A 9

(d) *Inter alia* Cor (1916) 93 L J 803  
(1) *Inter alia* Cor (1916) 93 L J 803  
L J 570 63 L J 4 (1) A A 9  
(f) *Inter alia* Cor (1916) 93 L J 803  
(g) *Inter alia* Cor (1916) 93 L J 803  
(1) *Inter alia* Cor (1916) 93 L J 803  
L J 570 63 L J 4 (1) A A 9  
(h) *Inter alia* Cor (1916) 93 L J 803  
L J 570 63 L J 4 (1) A A 9

shows that the prelati non only profess to specify the particulars prescribed by that rule including the property to be sold and the judgment debtor's interest therein as fairly and accurately as possible. Hence what passes to a purchaser at a Court sale is the right title and interest of the judgment debtor whatever that interest may be. In other words a purchaser at a Court sale buys the property with all risks and all defects in the judgment-debtor's title except where it is found that the judgment debtor had no saleable interest at all (1). In the latter case the purchaser may apply to have the sale set aside under r 91 of this Order and he may then apply under r 93 for a return of the purchase money. If the purchase money has been distributed amongst the creditors of the judgment debtor under s 73 he may follow the money in their hands (2). But—and this is an important consequence of the purchaser buying only the right title and interest of the judgment debtor—the sale will not be set aside if the judgment debtor has even a partial interest in the property nor will the purchaser be entitled to a refund of the purchase money to the extent to which the judgment debtor had no interest until the case be one of fraud (3). On the same principle a purchaser in execution of a money decree is bound by the estoppel which binds the judgment debtor whose interest he has purchased (4). The Madras High Court has held that he is not bound in all cases (5).

It has been stated above that what passes to a purchaser at a Court sale in execution of a money decree is the right title and interest of the judgment debtor in the property sold. To determine the nature and extent of the judgment debtor's right title and interest in the property sold the test is as stated by Lord Watson in the course of the argument in *Pillai & Co. v. Chinnathurai* (n) what did the Court intend to sell and what did the purchaser understand that he bought? These are questions of fact or rather of mixed law and fact and must be determined according to the evidence in the particular case (o). This test was applied in *Bilant v. Hurachint* (p) cited in the next following paragraph and in *Abdul K. v. Appayyasaami* (q) cited in the notes below.

Where a purchaser at a Court sale in execution of a decree against a member of a joint Hindu family buys 4 specific properties A B C and D alleged to belong to him and subsequently there is a partition decree by which properties 1 B 1 and 1 are allotted to that member the purchaser is entitled only to such of the properties as are common to the sale certificate and the share of that member under the decree namely properties A and B He is not entitled to have the equivalent of properties C and D out of properties 1 and 1 (r)

*D* is entitled to 10 annas share in a village. Out of this share he mortgages 6 annas to *B*. In execution of a simple money decree obtained by *C* against *D*, a 4 annas share is attached and sold. The presumption is, in the absence of specific indications to the contrary, that the share sold was the share which was not mortgaged (*s*).

- (j) D All Fz l s f k l a j l M a l e e o  
d e (18 s) 3 C l 1 M 6 5 I A 11 f  
s i a t o l i e s i s a d h (1901) 3  
All 3 s h e a s i l a t (1894) 1  
M a l s s i j g h l f f d  
(18 s) 6 B o m l j s M t e a 4 p a  
(1913) 6 M i l 194 197 1 I C 444  
l i m p r o m n t s j u r d a t l  
(j) f l l a i s M i t i m l (1891) 13 A H  
283  
(k) s i a t o c l a l s s i f (1901) 3 A H  
3 M l a l s H t h o (190 ) 3  
All 53 f a n s D a k l  
(1900) (a l 64 B j l v 4 r t a  
(190 ) 9 C l 3 0 4 i s t l o  
f l g l o r e (190 ) 9 C l 4 0  
B i o d i v P j (1 6 ) 4 B H C A C  
114  
(l) P j l l s s i h l e r t (190 s) 3 C l  
8 M l o e l M u f f H o o  
A h o r M o h l j (189 ) C l 30 919  
1 4 1 3 1 3 s l o P o s A h t h



94 *Sale in execution of a mortgage decree*—Where mortgaged property is sold in execution of a mortgage decree obtained by the mortgagee against the mortgagor the interest both of the mortgagor and mortgagee passes to the purchaser (t)

*Variance between proclamation of sale and sale certificate*—O 21 r 66 requires that where property is ordered to be sold in execution of a decree the proclamation of sale should specify as fairly and accurately as possible the property to be sold. By the present rule it is provided that where property is sold, and the sale becomes absolute the Court shall grant a certificate specifying the property sold. It sometimes happens that the property as described in the certificate of sale is different from that described in the proclamation of sale. In such a case the description of the property in the proclamation of sale is *conclusive* as to what was the subject matter of the sale. As stated by their Lordships of the Privy Council in *Thalur Barmha v Jiban Ram* (u) that which is sold in a judicial sale of this kind can be nothing but the property attached and that property is *conclusively* described in and by the schedule to which the attachment refers—that is the schedule of the attached property in the proclamation of sale. Thus where a judgment debtor owned a mahal of which a 10 annas share was mortgaged and the proclamation of sale stated that what was to be sold was a 6 annas share in the mahal included in the mortgage but the purchaser obtained a certificate of sale in which the property described was a 6 annas share in the mahal not included in the mortgage it was held that the sale certificate should be set aside. The Court has no power to grant a certificate in which the property described is different from that specified in the proclamation of sale (v). Similarly where the proclamation of sale stated that the whole interest of five brothers in a mortgaged property was to be sold and by a mistake on the part of the officer in charge of the sale the certificate of sale omitted to mention the names of four of them it was held that what was sold to the purchaser was the property as described in the proclamation of sale and not the property as erroneously described in the sale certificate (w). The real question in such cases under the present Code of Civil Procedure seems therefore to be what was the sale: i.e. what was bargained and paid for and that must depend not on *erroneous statements* of what was offered for sale but on what was *actually* offered for sale and bid for. What [is actually] offered for sale [is] determined by the order of the Court and the proclamation (x).

*Effect of new interpretation of law on sale*—A purchased at a Court sale the right title and interest of B in an impartible zamindari. By the law as then interpreted the holder of such a zamindari was only entitled to a life interest in the zamindari. [A must therefore be deemed to have purchased only the *life interest* of B]. Subsequently this interpretation of the law was reversed by the Judicial Committee which decided that the holder of an impartible zamindari is entitled to an absolute interest in it and that such interest is alienable. The new interpretation does not entitle A to claim that what he purchased at the sale was the *absolute* interest of B (y).

*Amendment of certificate of sale*—A purchaser at a Court sale may apply to the Court for amendment of the sale certificate where the description of the property in the certificate differs from that in the proclamation. The Court may allow or refuse the amendment but no appeal lies from the order in either case. Such an order is not appealable under s 104. Nor is it appealable as a decree under s 47 for the question cannot be regarded as one relating to the execution discharge or satisfaction of the decree the decree being fully executed. The only question in such a case is whether the

(t) *Maganlal v Shakra* (1898) 22 Bom 245

(u) (1914) 41 Cal 590 41 I.A. 38 21 I.C. 936

(v) *Thakur Ba mla v Jib n Ram* (1914) 41 Cal 590 41 I.A. 38 21 I.C. 936 *Uma Churn v Gobind Chander* (1887) I.C.L.I. 460 *Ramacha d v Haji Kasim* (1893) 16 Mad 207

(w) *B Isant v Hirschland* (1903) 7 Bom 334 *Chridan v Prasad* (1915) 4 P.L. 60 90 I.C. 501 (-5) A.P. 615

(x) (1903) 7 Bom 334 341 *supra*

(y) *Abdul Aziz v Appayya mi* (1904) 27 Mad 131 31 I.A. 1

certificate given to the auction purchaser gives a right description of the property sold ( )

**Limitation**—The provisions of the Limitation Act do not apply to an application for a sale certificate. The reason is that it is the duty of the Court on the sale becoming absolute to issue a sale certificate and there is no duty imposed on the purchaser to apply for such a certificate. The action of the Court in granting the certificate is ministerial and not judicial. The Limitation Act does not apply to applications to the Court to do what it has no discretion to refuse nor to applications for exercise of functions of a ministerial character. Hence if the Court fails to issue a sale certificate and the purchaser has thereupon to apply to the Court for a grant of the certificate the application may be made at any time (a)

**Effect of certificate of sale on irregularities**—All irregularities though material are cured by the certificate of sale (b)

**Certificate of sale and res judicata**—A sale certificate is just like a deed of sale and it does not operate as a plea of res judicata. Where a defendant contends that the act of the Court did not pass title to the property in dispute to the plaintiff and the plaintiff produces a sale certificate the defendant is barred not by sec 11 relating to res judicata but by sec 47 of the Code (c)

**95 [S 318]** Where the immovable property sold is in the occupancy of the judgment debtor or of some person on his behalf or of some person claiming under a title created by the judgment debtor subsequently to the

Delivery of property  
in occupancy of judgment  
debtor

attachment of such property and a certificate in respect thereof has been granted under rule 94, the Court shall, on the application of the purchaser, order delivery to be made by putting such purchaser or any person whom he may appoint to receive delivery on his behalf in possession of the property, and, if need be, by removing any person who refuses to vacate the same

**Delivery of possession to purchaser**—The possession contemplated by this rule is khas or actual possession. See notes to r 35 of this Order. For the form of the order for delivery see App E form No 39

**Separate suit for delivery of possession**—See notes to s 47. Questions between the auction purchaser on the one hand and a party to the suit or his representative on the other hand on p 160 above

**Appeal**—See notes to s 47. Questions between the auction purchaser on the one hand and a party to the suit or his representative on the other hand on p 160 above

**Limitation**—The period of limitation for an application for delivery of possession is three years from the date when the sale becomes absolute [Limitation Act 1908 sch. I art 181]. The period of limitation for a suit for delivery of possession is two years from the date when the sale becomes absolute [ib art 138]

- (a) *Eh ja Roy v R m Kumar* (1899) 8 Cal 59  
*Saddo v Banas* (1901) 23 All 476 Af m  
*mod v Locke* (189 ) 0 Mad 487 see also  
*And Lal v Joye d a* (1903) 25 C W N  
 403 8 I C 294 ( 4) A C 831  
 (a) *Kylasa v Ramasami* (1882) 4 M d 172

- Futal v Fithof ray* (1892) 6 Bom 24  
 (b) *Balkrushna v M sumu* (1887) 6 A m 5  
 9 I A 18 *Agar v Bhasker* 1000  
 Bom 444  
 (c) *Lakshmi Chand v Landas* 1902 25 C W N 79 118 I C 87 (27) A C 35

**Procedure under this rule**—If the Court finds on inquiry that the property is in the occupancy (1) of the judgment debtor (2) or of some person on his behalf (3) or of some person claiming title under him the Court shall order delivery to be made by putting the purchaser in possession of the property. If however the Court finds that the person in possession of the property is holding the property *on his own account* the Court has no option but to dismiss the application under this rule (d)

It may be observed that a purchaser at a Court sale is not bound to *apply* for possession under this rule. He may at his option bring a regular suit for possession the period of limitation for the suit being 12 years as stated above. The remedy by way of application and that by way of suit are concurrent (e). Further the fact that an application has been made under this rule and it is rejected as being time barred (f) or on any other ground (g) is no bar to a regular suit for possession.

**96 [S 319]** Where the property sold is in the occupancy of a tenant or other person entitled to occupy the same and a certificate in respect thereof has been granted under rule 94 the Court shall, on the application of the purchaser, order delivery to be made by affixing a copy of the certificate of sale in some conspicuous place on the property, and proclaiming to the occupant by beat of drum or other customary mode, at some convenient place, that the interest of the judgment debtor has been transferred to the purchaser.

**Delivery of possession to purchaser**—The possession contemplated by this rule is *symbolical possession*. See notes to r 30 above.

**Limitation**—See notes to r 90 above.

### *Resistance to delivery of possession to decree holder or purchaser*

**97 [Ss 328 334]** (1) Where the holder of a decree for the possession of immovable property or the purchaser of any such property sold in execution of a decree is resisted or obstructed by any person in obtaining possession of the property, he may make an application to the Court complaining of such resistance or obstruction.

(2) The Court shall fix a day for investigating the matter and shall summon the party against whom the application is made to appear and answer the same.

**Rules 97 98 and 99**—These rules are to be read together.

(d) See *Govind v. T. (1944) 46 All 693 696 831 C* | (f) *Sh. V. d. v. V. r. Muhammed (1901) 1*  
 (e) *93 (4) A.A. 49* | *All 463*  
 (g) *A. v. v. C. (1883) 14 C 1 644* | (g) *Seru v. B. Gobna (1893) 9 (a) 60*

When rule applies—The rule does not apply unless the auction purchaser has made an attempt to obtain possession of the property either through Court or out of Court and he is resisted or obstructed in obtaining possession (*h*)

Regular suit—The decree holder may either resort to the summary remedy provided by this rule or he may bring a regular suit. Failure on the part of the decree holder to avail himself of the remedy under this rule does not deprive him of his right to bring a regular suit against the party obstructing execution of the decree (*i*). But if he applies under this rule and fails the order against him is conclusive unless he brings a suit to establish his right to possession as provided by r 103 below. Such a suit must be brought within one year from the date of the order (*j*). See Limitation Act 1908 ch I art 11 A.

Limitation—The period of limitation for an application complaining of resistance or obstruction to delivery of possession of immovable property decreed or sold in execution of a decree is 30 days from the date of the resistance or obstruction (Limitation Act 1908 sch I art 17).

Fresh application for delivery of possession—Under the present Code a holder of a decree for possession of immovable property applies for possession under O 21 r 30 while an auction purchaser applies for possession under O 21 r 90. The present rule deals with *obstruction or resistance* in obtaining possession. An important question that arises in this connection is whether if a decree holder or auction purchaser who is obstructed or resisted in obtaining possession omits to apply under this rule within 30 days from the date of obstruction or resistance the only other remedy open to him is to proceed by a regular suit or whether he is entitled to a fresh writ of possession. It has been held by the High Courts of Madras (*l*) and Patna (*l*) that he is entitled to make a fresh application for delivery of possession and to a fresh warrant for possession. On the other hand it has been held by the High Courts of Bombay (*m*) and Allahabad (*n*) that he is not so entitled and that his only remedy is by a regular suit.

Whether O 9 applies to proceedings under this rule—The provisions of O 9 do not apply to proceedings under this rule. See notes to O 9 r 9. Whether this rule does apply to execution proceedings.

## 98 [Ss 129, 330] Where the Court is satisfied that the

resistance or obstruction was occasioned

without any just cause by the judgment-debtor or by some other person at his

instigation it shall direct that the applicant be put into possession of the property, and where the applicant is still resisted or obstructed in obtaining possession, the Court may also, at the instance of the applicant, order the judgment debtor, or any person acting at his instigation, to be detained in the civil prison for a term which may extend to thirty days.

When this rule applies—This rule deals with two cases namely where the obstruction is occasioned without just cause (*1*) by the judgment debtor or (*2*) by some other person at his instigation. No order can be made under this rule if the obstruction

(1) *Solhan v T* (1944) 46 All 633 636 831 C 93 (4) A A 41

(2) *Birnet v Babaj* (1944) 8 B m 60

(3) *Sobhan v T* (1944) 46 All 633 636 831 C 93 (4) A A 40

(4) *M v Appia* (1890) 13 Mad 04

(5) *Fayh v L J* 94 49 I C 150 (1919) 4 P 1

(6) *Vijaykrishna v Durr* (1944) 11 Bom 43 115 C 83 (1944) 8 Bom 60

(7) *Kesari v Abul Hasan* (1904) 6 All 36

1,  
97

Procedure under this rule—If the Court finds on inquiry that the property is in the occupancy (1) of the judgment debtor (2) or of some person on his behalf (3) or of some person claiming title under him the Court shall order delivery to be made by putting the purchaser in possession of the property. If however the Court finds that the person in possession of the property is holding the property *on his own account* the Court has no option but to dismiss the application under this rule (d)

It may be observed that a purchaser at a Court sale is not bound to *apply* for possession under this rule. He may at his option bring a regular suit for possession the period of limitation for the suit being 12 years as stated above. The remedy by way of application and that by way of suit are concurrent (e). Further the fact that an application has been made under this rule and it is rejected as being time barred (f) or on any other ground (g) is no bar to a regular suit for possession.

**96 [S 319]** Where the property sold is in the occupancy of a tenant or other person entitled to occupy the same and a certificate in respect thereof has been granted under rule 94 the Court shall, on the application of the purchaser, order delivery to be made by affixing a copy of the certificate of sale in some conspicuous place on the property, and proclaiming to the occupant by beat of drum or other customary mode, at some convenient place, that the interest of the judgment debtor has been transferred to the purchaser.

*Delivery of property to occupant of tenant*  
Delivery of possession to purchaser—The possession contemplated by this rule is *symbolical* possession. See notes to r 35 above.

Limitation—See notes to r 93 above.

### *Resistance to delivery of possession to decree holder or purchaser*

**97 [Ss 328, 334]** (1) Where the holder of a decree for the possession of immovable property or the purchaser of any such property sold in execution of a decree is resisted or obstructed by any person in obtaining possession of the property, he may make an application to the Court complaining of such resistance or obstruction.

(2) The Court shall fix a day for investigating the matter and shall summon the party against whom the application is made to appear and answer the same.

Rules 97, 98 and 99—These rules are to be read together.

|  |  |
|--|--|
| (d) S. 174 v. T. (1948) 46 All 693 696 831 C | (f) S. 174 v. T. (1948) 46 All 693 696 831 C |
| (e) S. 174 v. T. (1948) 46 All 693 696 831 C | (g) S. 174 v. T. (1948) 46 All 693 696 831 C |

**When rule applies**—This rule does not apply unless the auction purchaser has made an attempt to obtain possession of the property either through Court or out of Court and he is resisted or obstructed in obtaining possession (b)

**Regular suit.** The decree holder may either resort to the summary remedy provided by this rule or he may bring a regular suit. Failure on the part of the decree holder to avail himself of the remedy under this rule does not deprive him of his right to bring a regular suit against the party obstructing execution of the decree (c). But if he applies under this rule and fails the order against him is conclusive unless he brings a suit to establish his right to possession as provided by r 103 below. Such a suit must be brought within a year from the date of the order (j). See Limitation Act 1908 ch. I art 114.

**Limitation**—The period of limitation for an application complaining of resistance or obstruction to delivery of possession of immovable property decreed or sold in execution of a decree is 30 days from the date of the resistance or obstruction (Limitation Act 1908 ch. I art 114).

**Fresh application for delivery of possession**—Under the present Code a holder of a decree for possession of immovable property applies for possession under O 21 r 3 while an auction purchaser applies for possession under O 21 r 30. The present rule deals with *resistance or obstruction* in obtaining possession. An important question that arises in the connection is whether if a decree holder or auction purchaser who is resisted or obstructed in obtaining possession omits to apply under this rule within 30 days from the date of obstruction or resistance the only other remedy open to him is to proceed by a regular suit whether he is entitled to a fresh writ of possession. It has been held by the High Courts of Madras (k) and Patna (l) that he is entitled to make a fresh application for delivery of possession and to a fresh warrant for possession. On the other hand it has been held by the High Courts of Bombay (m) and Allahabad (n) that he is not entitled and that his only remedy is by a regular suit.

**Whether O 9 applies to proceedings under this rule**—The provisions of O 9 not apply to proceedings under this rule. See notes to O 9 r 9. Whether this rule does apply to execution proceedings.

**98 [Ss 329, 330]** Where the Court is satisfied that the resistance or obstruction was occasioned without any just cause by the judgment-debtor or by some other person at his instigation it shall direct that the applicant be put into possession of the property, and where the applicant is still resisted or obstructed in obtaining possession, the Court may also, at the instance of the applicant, order the judgment debtor, or any person acting at his instigation, to be detained in the civil prison for a term which may extend to thirty days.

**When this rule applies**—This rule deals with two cases namely when the obstruction is occasioned without just cause (1) by the judgment debtor or (2) by any other person at his instigation. No order can be made under this rule if the obstruction

(1) *Solanki v. Turner* (1943) 46 All 693; 696 83 IC 93 (4) A A 43

(2) *Brant v. Bhai* (1944) 8 Bom 60

(3) *Solanki v. Turner* (1943) 46 All 693; 694 83 IC 93 (4) A A 43

(4) *M. A. v. M. A.* (1890) 13 Mad 64

(5) *Raghav v. Iyer* (1914) 6 Pat 139

(6) *But see Bales v. Bhai* (1914) 11 Pat 60

(7) *K. v. A. I. I. I. I.* (1904) 5 All 2

tion is caused by a person other than the judgment debtor unless the Court is satisfied that the person was acting at the instigation of the judgment debtor (o)

**Purchaser from a judgment debtor pending attachment**—The High Court of Madras has held that proceedings can be instituted under this rule against a purchaser from a judgment debtor pending attachment though such a purchaser is not expressly mentioned in the rule. The reasons given are (1) that this rule is to be read with r 95 which expressly provides for the institution of proceedings against such a purchaser under that rule and (2) that such a purchaser is a representative of the judgment debtor within the meaning of s 146 so that proceedings which can be instituted against a judgment debtor can also be instituted against him (p)

**Presidency Small Cause Court**—This rule applies to proceedings under Chapter 7 of the Presidency Small Cause Courts Act 1882 relating to recovery of possession of immovable property by virtue of s 48 of that Act (q)

**Appeal**—See notes to s 47. Questions between the auction purchaser on the one hand etc. See also notes to r 101 below under the head Appeal. It is submitted that r 103 excludes an appeal from an order under this rule

**99 [Cf Ss 331, 335]** Where the Court is satisfied that the resistance or obstruction was occasioned by any person (other than the judgment-debtor) claiming in good faith to be in possession of the property on his own account or on account of some person other than the judgment-debtor, the Court shall make an order dismissing the application

Resistance or obstruction  
by bona fide claimant

When this rule applies—The present rule deals with two cases of claimants in good faith namely (1) persons claiming on their own account and (2) persons claiming on account of some person other than the judgment debtor

**Person other than judgment debtor claiming to be in possession on his own account**—The word possession as used in this rule is not limited to actual physical possession. It includes also constructive possession such as possession through tenants or servants. Hence a landlord who is in possession of a property through his tenant is a person in possession of the property on his own account within the meaning of this rule (r)

Where in a suit brought by a plaintiff against two defendants a decree is passed by consent against one of them only the other defendant is not a judgment debtor. He is a person other than the judgment debtor within the meaning of this rule (s)

**Sub tenants**—A lets his house to B. B sublets the house to C. A files a suit against B for possession and obtains a decree against B. C is not joined as a party to the suit. C obstructs A in obtaining possession of the property. Can C be said to be in possession on his own account within the meaning of this rule? The High Court of Calcutta (t) has held that the words any person claiming to be in possession on his own account mean any person claiming to be in possession as a matter of fact on his own account and that a sub tenant is such a person. On the other hand

- (o) *E v Gubbay* (19 0) 47 Cal 90, 911 91  
60 IC 969 *M ncha m v Fakir Cha d*  
(1901) 25 Bom 478 496  
(p) *Kupp nar v Kuma s* (1911) 34 Mad 450 71  
C 418  
(q) *Daroga v M Hildee* (1973) 45 Mad I J 66

- 73 IC 935 (1914) A M 4  
(r) *See Mancha am v F Surah d* (1901) 25 Bom  
478  
(s) *Jathavedun K m Au* (190 ) 30 Mad --  
(t) *Era v C Dday* (19 0) 4 Cal 90 60 IC 969

the High Court of Bombay (u) has held that the words any person claiming to be in possession on his own account means any person claiming to be in possession on his own title, and that a sub tenant is not such a person. According to the former view A is not entitled to an order for possession against G. According to the latter view he is.

The Bombay High Court has also held that G is not entitled to claim the benefit of the Bombay Rent Act against A there being no privity of contract between him and A (v).

Transferee pendente lite—See r 102 below

Appeal—See notes to rr 93 and 101 under the head, Appeal

**100 [S 332]** (1) Where any person other than the judgment debtor is dispossessed of immovable property by the holder of a decree for the possession of such property or, where such property has been sold in execution of a decree, by the purchaser thereof, he may make an application to the Court complaining of such dispossession

Dispossession by decree holder or purchaser

(2) The Court shall fix a day for investigating the matter and shall summon the party against whom the application is made to appear and answer the same

Rules 100 and 101—These rules are to be read together

When this rule applies—This rule refers to a person who has been dispossessed by an auction purchaser who has taken possession of the property through the Court. He complains to the Court of such dispossession and the Court makes a summary investigation and if it holds that the applicant was in possession of the property on his own account and not on account of the judgment debtor it directs under r 101 that possession be given back to the applicant. The party against whom the order is made may then institute a suit under r 103 to establish the right which he claims to the present possession of the property (w).

Any person other than the judgment debtor—See notes to s 47

Representatives on p 156. A purchaser of a portion of a holding from a judgment debtor is his representative and is not entitled to apply under this rule (x). The Patna High Court has held that a purchaser from a judgment debtor of a non transferable holding is also a representative and not entitled to apply (y). But the Calcutta High Court has come to the opposite conclusion and says that so far as the decree holder is concerned he is a trespasser and is entitled to apply under this rule (z).

Is dispossessed—Where mere symbolical possession is delivered to the decree holder or purchaser under r 96 the person in possession cannot be said to be dispossessed within the meaning of this rule so as to entitle him to apply under this rule (a). It is only the delivery of actual possession (r 95) that can constitute dispossession within the meaning of this rule. A person who is in possession through his tenant

(u) *Ja ram v. Yaw* of (1921) 23 Bom L R 1316  
6 IC 1 (2) A B 449

(v) *Jaffery v. Miyadin* (19 —) 48 Bom 5 8 64  
1 C 60 (2) A B 23

(w) *Ambica v. Pam Firoz* (19 5) 30 C W N  
163 168 90 IC 575 (26) A C 37

(x) *Bhikha v. Birji Bihari* (1917) 2 Pat L J  
478 4 IC 5 6

(y) *Panchratna v. Jam Sahay* (1918) 3 Pat  
L J 579 43 IC 969

(z) *Purna Chandra v. Manohar Das* (19 7)  
53 Cal 913 99 IC 718 (7) A C 1 6

(a) *Ibrahim v. Ramjodu* 1903) 30 Cal 710





**102 [S 333]** Nothing in rules 99 and 101 shall apply to resistance or obstruction in execution of a decree for the possession of immovable property by a person to whom the judgment debtor has transferred the property after the institution of the suit in which the decree was passed or to the dispossession of any such person

If an order is made under r 99 or r 101, it is conclusive against the party against whom it is made unless he brings a suit to establish his right as provided by r 103 below. This rule provides that nothing in rr 99 and 101 applies to resistance by a transferee pendente lite from the judgment debtor. If an order is made in execution proceedings in such a case r 103 does not apply. The Oudh Court has held that where a transferee pendente lite pays off a prior usufructuary mortgage and enters into possession of the property and resists the decree holder in obtaining possession he must be treated in relation to his position as a purchaser from the possessory mortgagee and that the case falls within r 99 above and is not affected by the rule of pendente lite (j).

**103 [S 332 fourth para S 333, second para]** Any party not being a judgment debtor against whom an order is made under rule 98, rule 99 or rule 101 may institute a suit to establish the right which he claims to the present possession of the property but subject, to the result of such suit (if any), the order shall be conclusive

*Orders conclusive subject to the suit*  
**Suit to establish right to present possession**—The suit must be brought within one year from the date of the order Limitation Act 1908 sch I art 114. If no suit is brought within the aforesaid period the order will be conclusive (k).

This rule does not apply unless an order has been made under r 98, r 99 or r 101. Therefore where an application is made under r 97 or r 100 but the Court declines to pass any order upon the application thinking it best that the applicant should be referred to a separate suit the present rule does not apply and any suit which the applicant may subsequently institute for possession is not a suit under this rule and it is not therefore governed by art 114A of the Limitation Act (l). Not only is it necessary that an actual order should have been made but the order must have been one made after investigation as contemplated by r 97 sub r (2) and r 100 sub r (2). An order dismissing an application for default of prosecution is not an order made after investigation. The present rule therefore does not apply to such an order (m).

**Scope of suit under this rule**—It must not be supposed that a suit under this rule is concerned only with actual possession at the date of the order. The suit is to establish the right which the plaintiff claims to the present possession of the property and this right may be established without showing that the plaintiff was in actual possession at the date of the order against him (n).

**Suit by auction purchaser for possession under a different right**—An auction purchaser against whom an order is made under r 99 or r 101 may bring

(j) *M. Mamat Fatma v. Raza Ali* (1977) Luck. 69 93 L C 19 (6) A O 610

(k) *Ch. I. I. I. v. Aida* (1919) 1 Lal 5 511 C 87

(l) *Meerud n v. Isha* (1904) M d 5

( ) *Sa at Cha d a v. T. Prasad* (1907) 24 Cal 491.

(n) *Uani v. Fowler* (1911) 44 Mal L 60 I C 109 (1) A M 317

a suit under this rule to establish the right which he claims to the present possession of the property. Where a suit is brought by him under this rule the suit is one for possession under his auction purchase and the cause of action in the suit is the adverse decision under r 99 or r 100. A suit under the present rule is quite irrespective of any other cause of action which such person apart from his character as auction purchaser may have against the opposite party. It is therefore competent to the auction purchaser to abandon all his right in the auction sale including the right to bring a suit under this rule as auction-purchaser and to bring a suit against the opposite party for possession upon a different title altogether. To such a suit the provisions of the present rule do not apply and the suit need not be brought within one year from the date of the order as required by art 11 A of the Limitation Act (o).

Order dismissing application under rule 101—A makes an application under r 100. The application is dismissed under r 101. A is a party against whom an order is made under r 101 within the meaning of the present rule though there is no express provision for dismissal of an application under r 101 (p).

Order dismissing an application under r 95—An order dismissing an application under r 95 cannot be treated as an order under r 99 so as to attract the application of the present rule (q).

## ORDER XXII

### *Death, Marriage and Insolvency of Parties*

- 1 [S 361] The death of a plaintiff or defendant shall not cause the suit to abate if the right to sue survives

No abatement by party's death if right to sue survives

Application of order to appeals—The provisions of this order apply to appeals. See s 107 sub s (2) and r 11 below.

Application of Order to execution proceedings—The provisions of this order apply to execution proceedings except rr 3 4 and 8. See r 12 below.

Right to sue—The right to sue means the right to bring a suit asserting a right to the same relief which the deceased plaintiff asserted at the time of his death (r).

In what cases the right to sue survives and in what cases it does not.—To answer this question we may turn to the provisions of—

I the Indian Contract Act 9 of 1872 sec 37 and

II the Indian Succession Act 39 of 1925 sec 306

I *Contract Act s 37*—Section 37 of the Contract Act runs as follows. Promises bind the representatives of the promisors in case of the death of such promisors before performance unless a contrary intention appears from the contract. The words in italics refer to contracts involving the exercise of special skill or involving special personal confidence for these are not binding on the representatives of the promisors. A promises to paint a picture for B by a certain day at a certain price. A dies before the day. The contract cannot be enforced either by A's representatives against B or by B against A's representatives. The reason is that the right to sue does not survive to or against the representatives of A.

(o) *Amal Chandra v. J. M. Das* (1920) 40 C. W. N. 163 90 LC 575 (25) A C 877

(p) *Zipru v. Hari* (1918) 40 Bom 10 4-1 C. 73

(q) *Sobha v. Turen* (1911) 46 All 603 83 LC 923 (24) A.A. 49

(r) *Sarot Chandra v. S. S. Chandra* (1909) 36 Cal. 799 601 31 C. 925

**II Indian Succession Act 39 of 1925 sec 306**—Section 306 of the Succession Act is as follows All demands whatsoever and all rights to prosecute or demand any action or special proceedings existing in favour of or against a person at the time of his decease survive to and against his executors or administrators except causes of action for defamation assault as defined in the Indian Penal Code or other personal injuries not causing the death of the party and except also cases where after the death of the party the relief sought could not be enjoyed or granting it would be nugatory

The effect of this section is that the right to sue does not survive in the following cases —

(i) Suits for defamation assault or other personal injuries not causing the death of the party [Where death is caused by a personal injury the legal representative of the deceased may sue the wrong doer for damages see Act 13 of 1855]

(ii) Cases where after the death of the party the relief sought could not be enjoyed or granting it would be nugatory

### Illustrations

1 A sues B to recover possession of his minor daughter illegally detained by B B dies before decree The cause of action does not survive against B's representative and the suit abates *Sharifa v Munelhan* (1901) 20 Bom. 574

2 A claiming to be the nearest reversionary heir of a deceased Hindu brings a suit to set aside alienations made by the widow of the deceased. A dies before decree It has been held by the High Court of Madras that the suit abates and that it cannot be continued by the next reversioner *Salyahani v Elatani* (1904) 27 Mad 588 *Chinnai v Lalshminarasamma* (1912) 37 Mad 406 15 I C 213 But this it would seem is no longer law *Venkatanarayana v Subbammal* (1915) 33 Mad 406 411 414 42 I A 125 129 132 29 I C 298

3 A applies to be appointed guardian of the person of X The application is opposed by B who claims that he has been appointed guardian by the will of X's father B dies B's representative is not entitled to continue the proceedings A claim based on a personal trust does not survive to the claimant's representative *Gangabai v Khashabai* (1899) 23 Bom 719 It is different however where the claim is not based on a personal trust In such a case the legal representative of the deceased is entitled to continue the proceeding and to contend that the applicant is not a proper person to be appointed guardian *Palamandi v Adailalam* (1924) 47 Mad 459 84 I C 613 (24) A.M. 484

4 A sues B to establish his right to the office of Mahant A dies before decree The suit abates for the right claimed is a personal right to an office *Sham Chand v Bhayaram* (1895) 22 Cal 92

5 The right of an unmarried Hindu daughter to claim the property left by her father to the exclusion of her married sister is not a personal right If a suit is brought to establish such a right and the plaintiff dies pending the suit the suit does not abate *Jadubansi v Mahpal Singh* (1915) 38 All 111 32 I C 104 dissenting from *Balak Puri v Durga* (1908) 30 All 49

6 A as the sole executor and residuary legatee under the will of X applies for probate of the will B files a caveat and the proceedings are thereupon converted into a suit Pending the hearing A dies Thereupon C A's widow applies to have her name substituted for that of A and to have the petition amended by asking for letters of administration with the will annexed instead of probate The application was rejected for A's right to apply for probate became extinguished on his death *Parat Chandra v Hans Mohan* (1909) 36 Cal 799 3 I C 995 *Haribasan v Manmohan Joshi* (1918) 45 Cal 862 51 I C 76

7 A sues B for an injunction to restrain him from preventing A from enjoying the honour of standing at a particular place in temple B dies pending the suit The suit abates *Josiari v Swami* (1910) 34 Mad 76 5 IC 937

8 A a Sunni Mahomedan sues B for pre-emption A dies pending the suit It is not settled whether the right to sue is extinguished or whether it survives to his heirs or legal representatives *Muhammad v Viamat un Vissa* (1897) 20 All 88 *Sayyad Jiaul v Sitaram* (1912) 36 Bom 144 12 IC 720

9 An action to recover damages for breach of contract of marriage abates on the death of the plaintiff *Balubhai v Vanalal* (1920) 44 Bom 446 5 IC 624

10 A sues B for damages for malicious prosecution A dies pending the suit Does the right to sue survive? The Calcutta High Court has held that it does and that A's legal representative is entitled to continue the suit (v) On the other hand it has been held by the High Courts of Bombay (f) Patna (u) Madras (v) and Allahabad (u) that the right to sue does not survive and that the suit abates on A's death

11 The right to sue for damages for breach of contract the right to sue on a promissory note the right to sue for a debt the right to sue on a mortgage the right to sue for wrong done to property are all instances of rights that are not extinguished on the death of the plaintiff or defendant In all these cases the suit does not abate on the death of the plaintiff or defendant An agreement referring matters in dispute to arbitration is not in this country revoked by the death of any of the parties thereto before the award is made Hence the question whether the legal representative of a deceased party is or is not entitled to enforce the contract to refer is a question which would depend upon whether the right dealt with in the reference is of a purely personal nature or is one which survives to the legal representative (x)

**Partial abatement**—A suit may abate as to one of the reliefs claimed and not as to another Plaintiff sued under sec 92 for the removal of a trustee and for the settlement of a scheme On the death of the trustee the suit as for his removal abates but not so far as it prayed for the settlement of a scheme (y) See notes to sec 9

**Death of defendant trustee pending suit** on page 282 above

**Death of either party pending appeal**—Where a decree has been passed for the plaintiff in a suit in which the right to sue would not have survived had the plaintiff died before decree and either party dies pending an appeal preferred by the defendant from the decree the appeal does not abate (z) But if the plaintiff's suit is dismissed and the plaintiff has appealed from the decree and either party dies pending the appeal the appeal will abate (a)

### Illustrations

1 A sues B for damages for defamation and obtains a decree for Rs 5,000 B appeals from the decree A dies pending the appeal The appeal does not abate and A may continue the appeal against A's representatives If B dies pending the appeal B's representative may continue the appeal against A

- (a) *Ar v v Co pation of Calcutta* (1904) 31 Cal 903 34 Mad 499  
(1903) 31 Mad 499  
(f) *H v v Iamul* (1849) 13 Bom 677  
(g) *J v j v nph v la sa tar* (1919) 41 Cal 663 5 IC 348  
(h) *F v v v v v* (1911) 44 Mad 3 6 IC 60 (1) A M 144 B) *M v v ppa v* (1911) 44 Mad 8-3 6 IC 757 (2) A M 405 J *la ap* (1911) 44 Mad 49 Mad 49 J *v v v v v* (1911) 44 Mad 43  
(u) *M v v v v v* (1911) 44 Mad 43  
(v) *M v v v v v* (1911) 44 Mad 43

- (x) *I v v v v v* (1911) 44 Mad 43  
(y) *Arum v v v v v* (1911) 44 Mad 43  
(z) *M v v v v v* (1911) 44 Mad 43  
(a) *G v v v v v* (1911) 44 Mad 43

If a suit for damages for defamation but the suit is dismissed, the appellant appeals from the decree. Pending the appeal, the appellant's representative is not entitled to prosecute the appeal. The reason is that the decree in the original suit being against the appellant, the right to sue survives in appeal. *Right to sue*. But the right to sue in a suit for defamation does not survive to the legal representative, hence the appeal abates. Similarly if *B* is pending, the appellant is not entitled to continue the appeal against *A* or present it, not even if the suit was dismissed *with costs* (b).

**2 [S 362]** Where there are more plaintiffs or defendants than one and any of them dies, and where the right to sue survives to the surviving plaintiff or plaintiffs alone, or against the surviving defendant or defendants alone, the Court shall cause an entry to that effect to be made on the record and the suit shall proceed at the instance of the surviving plaintiff or plaintiffs or against the surviving defendant or defendants.

**Executors and trustees**—Where a suit is brought by executors or trustees, the right to sue in the death of any one of them survives to the surviving plaintiffs alone. Where a suit is brought against executors or trustees, the right to sue survives against the surviving defendant alone.

**Joint Hindu family**—See note to r 3 below. Joint Hindu Family and legal representative.

**3 [Ss 363, 365, 366]** (1) Where one of two or more plaintiffs dies and the right to sue does not survive to the surviving plaintiff or plaintiffs alone, or a sole plaintiff or sole surviving plaintiff dies and the right to sue survives, the Court, on an application made in that behalf, shall cause the legal representatives of the deceased plaintiff to be made a party and shall proceed with the suit.

(2) Where within the time limited by law no application is made under sub-rule (1) the suit shall abate so far as the deceased plaintiff is concerned and, on the application of the defendant, the Court may award to him the costs which he may have incurred in defending the suit, to be recovered from the estate of the deceased plaintiff.

**Alterations in the rule**—

1. The words "so far as the deceased plaintiff is concerned" in sub-rule (2) are new. See notes below. The suit shall abate so far as the deceased plaintiff is concerned.

- 2 The words the suit shall abate in sub rule (2) have been substituted for the words the Court may pass an order that the suit shall abate which occurred in sec 366 of the Code of 1882. The latter words gave rise to a conflict of opinion as to whether an order that a suit shall abate was appealable. The High Courts of Bombay (c) and Madras (d) held that such an order was a decree and was therefore appealable. The Allahabad High Court (e) held that the order was not appealable. No such question can arise under the present rule for it is no longer necessary to make an order that the suit shall abate. The suit abates *ipso facto* if no application is made under sub rule (1) within the time limited by law. It has been so held by the High Court of Lahore (f) and a Full Bench of the High Court of Allahabad (g).

**Limitation**—The application under this rule must be made within 90 days from the date of the death of the deceased plaintiff or appellant. Limitation Act 1908 Sch I art 176.

**The suit shall abate**—See notes above. Alterations in the rule No 2.

**The suit shall abate so far as the deceased plaintiff is concerned**—Where one of two or more plaintiffs dies and the right to sue survives to the surviving plaintiffs or plaintiff alone the surviving plaintiff or plaintiffs may proceed with the suit. This is the case dealt with in r 2 above. The present rule provides inter alia that where one of two or more plaintiffs dies and the right to sue does not survive to the surviving plaintiffs alone the legal representative of the deceased plaintiff ought to be made a party to the suit. For this purpose an application should be made to the Court and it must be made within 90 days from the date of the death of the deceased plaintiff. Sub rule (2) provides that where no such application is made the suit shall abate so far as the deceased plaintiff is concerned. The words italicized above mean that the suit shall primarily abate so far as the deceased plaintiff is concerned but they do not mean that the suit shall in no case abate as a whole. If the suit is of such a nature that it can proceed in the absence of the legal representative of the deceased plaintiff it will abate so far only as the deceased plaintiff is concerned. A suit by the partners of a firm to recover a partnership debt is a suit of this nature so that if one of the partners dies pending the suit and his legal representative is not brought on the record the suit will abate only so far as the deceased partner is concerned (h). But if it is of such a character that it cannot proceed in the absence of the legal representative it will abate as a whole. A suit by some of the partners of a firm against the other partners for dissolution and for accounts is a suit of this character so that if one of the plaintiffs (or defendants) dies and his legal representative is not brought on the record the suit will abate as a whole (i). See notes above. Alterations in the rule No 1.

**This rule applies to appeals**—The provisions of this rule apply not only to the case of a deceased plaintiff but to the case of a deceased appellant [see sec 107 and r 11 below]. Therefore where one of two or more appellants dies and the right to appeal does not survive to the surviving appellant alone the legal representative of the deceased appellant ought to be brought on the record. If this is not done the appeal will abate so far as the deceased appellant is concerned. But the appeal will abate as a whole if the case is of such a nature that the appeal cannot proceed in the absence of the legal representative of the deceased appellant.

(c) *Bhikaj v Purshotam* (1886) 10 Bom 20

(d) *Subbaya v Saminadayyar* (1892) 18 Mad 496

(e) *Hamida Bib v Ali Hussain* (189) 17 All 172

(f) See *Ram Gopal v Hari Krishan* (1925) 7 Lah L J 517 519 83 IC 478 (1) A L 598

*Qam v Nura* (1906) 7 Lah 73 91 IC 4 (28) A L 334

(g) *Charya v Beshwar* (1906) 48 All 331 overruling *Guyati v Sital Mehar* (1900) 41 All 439 66 IC 554 (2) A A 208

*Lachmi v Muhammad* (1900) 4 All 540 59 IC 903

(h) *Srinivas v Ram Sarap* (1911) 19 All L J 260 60 IC 7 (1) A A 34

(i) *Rajivdev v Pungat* (1904) 32 Cal 437 31 L A 71

There is one class of cases in which the appeal cannot abate as a whole but abates only so far as the deceased appellant is concerned and these are cases which come within O 41 r 4 corresponding with sec 514 of the Code of 1882 O 41 r 4 provides that where there are two or more plaintiffs or defendants in a suit and the decree appealed from proceeds on any ground common to all the plaintiffs or to all the defendants any one of the plaintiffs or of the defendants may appeal from the whole decree and thereupon the appellate Court may reverse or vary the decree in favour of all the plaintiffs or all the defendants as the case may be. Where several plaintiffs or defendants jointly appeal from a decree in a case to which O 41 r 4 applies and one of the appellants dies pending the appeal but his legal representative is not brought on the record within the period of limitation the appeal abates so far only as the deceased appellant is concerned and not as a whole. *A* and *B* sue *C*, *D* and *E* for possession of certain property alleging that it had been unlawfully dispossessed by the defendants. The defence is that the land belongs to *C*, *D* and *E*. The Court finds that the property belongs to the plaintiffs and a decree is passed in favour of the plaintiffs. *C*, *D* and *E* appeal from the decree. *E* dies pending the appeal but his legal representative is not brought on the record within the period of limitation. *A* and *B* (respondents) contend that the appeal has abated as a whole and it could not therefore be proceeded with. Does the appeal abate as a whole? No it abates only so far as the deceased appellant is concerned and the appeal should therefore be proceeded with. The reason is that the ground of appeal being common to all the appellants viz that they were the lawful owners of the land any one of them might have appealed from the whole decree under O 41 r 4 and so the death of one of the appellants cannot affect the right of the other appellants to proceed with the appeal. The same principle applies to suits for partition redemption and for a declaration of title to the property in suit (j). The High Court of Calcutta holds that O 41 r 4 does not apply on the grounds that a decree cannot be varied or reversed in favour of a person who is dead, and that the appeal having abated the rights between the deceased appellant and the respondents must be deemed to have been determined by the decree of the lower Court (k). In one Calcutta case *A*, *B* and *C* sued *D*, *E* and *F* for ejectment but the suit was dismissed. *A*, *B* and *C* appealed from the decree. *A* died pending the appeal but no steps were taken to bring his legal representative on the record within the period of limitation. It was held that the appeal abated as a whole. It was also held that if at the hearing of the appeal *B* and *C* instead of asking for ejectment asked only for joint possession with *D*, *E* and *F* the Appellate Court could grant leave to them to amend the plaint by asking for joint possession though on terms that they should pay all costs incurred up to that date (l). See notes to r 4 below.

Suit or appeal shall abate as against the deceased defendant or respondent

**Suit for pre-emption**—A decree in a suit for pre-emption passed against the defendants respondents in ignorance of the death of one of them and without bringing his legal representative on the record is a nullity as the right to sue in such a case does not survive against the surviving defendants alone (m). On the other hand when three plaintiffs appeal from a decree dismissing their suit for pre-emption and one of them dies pending the appeal and his legal representatives are not impleaded the appeal abates as regards the deceased alone for each pre-emptor has an independent right to

(j) *Chandra ng v Khima har* (1898) Bom 718 (suit for possession) *K m Serat v Lambat* (1903) 5 All (suit for partition) *Pinda n v Gangabai* (1903) 7 Bom 284 (suit for partition) *S mas ndara v I d h g* (1917) 40 Mad 846 868 41 I C 45 (s for possession) *M d Singh v K L run ura* (1914) Punj Rec no 89 3 3 20 I C 4 6 (suit for declaration of title) *J yare L v C I ramani* (1918) Punj Rec no 84 p 279 46 I C 50

(k) *ult for possession* *Mav g Bya g v Manng S/ue* (19 4) Rang 486 84 I C 1 0 (-i) *A B 376* (suit for redemption) (l) *Vasumadd n v Maniraddin* (1927) 3° C W 299 (m) *Hari Charan v Kalipada* (19 9) 56 Cal 6... (29) A C 579 ( ) *Imam ul Din v Sadarath* (1910) 3° All 301 5 I C 897





are unknown a bona fide application by those who are willing to join in making the application is a sufficient compliance with this rule. The same principles apply to appeal. See notes to r 4 below under the same head (r).

**Wrong person as legal representative**—See notes to r 4 below under the same head.

**Joint Hindu family and legal representative**—The High Court of Patna has held that this rule is to be applied even if the plaintiffs are members of a joint Hindu family and that r 4 is to be applied even if the defendants are members of a joint family. According to that Court the legal representatives of a deceased coparcener within the meaning of sec 2 (11) are the surviving coparceners and the latter must be brought on the record in their representative character though they may be already on the record in their own capacity (w). On the other hand it has been held by the Calcutta High Court that the case of members of a joint Hindu family is governed by r 2 above; that the right to sue survives to or against the surviving coparceners alone and if they are already on the record it is not necessary to bring them on the record in their representative capacity also (x).

**Legal representative already on record in another character**—The Lahore High Court in one case (y) held that the fact that the legal representative of the deceased party is already on the record in his individual capacity does not dispense with the application of this or the next rule. This decision was dissented from in a latter case (z) on the ground that rule 2 is independent of and in no way subject to the provisions of rule 4 (or of rule 3). The High Court of Patna has held that the fact that one of the legal representatives of a deceased party is already on the record but not as such does not prevent the abatement of the suit or appeal and the other party to the suit is not thereby relieved from the duty of applying within time for the substitution of the legal representative of the deceased (a). As to joint Hindu family see notes above.

**A, B and C sue D and E for possession of certain land: A dies pending the suit leaving B and C as his heirs. No application is made by B and C to bring them on record as the legal representatives of A. Held by the Pangoon High Court that the suit abates only as to A and not as a whole the reason given being that the surviving plaintiffs themselves are the sole legal representatives of the deceased plaintiffs (b).**

**Determination of question as to legal representative**—The present rule presupposes that the party claiming to represent the deceased plaintiff is his legal representative. If there is a dispute as to whether any person is or is not the legal representative of the deceased plaintiff it should be determined by the Court under r 5 below (c).

**What pleas may be taken by a legal representative**—The legal representative of a deceased plaintiff can only prosecute the cause of action as originally framed (d). Likewise the defendant can raise no defence against the legal representative other than what he could have raised against the deceased plaintiff himself (e). But this is not the case if the real defendant is an institution such as a temple which may be represented at different stages by different trustees. For if the original suit is against the trustee

- (v) *Bhatia v Pwshotam* (1886) 10 Bom 20  
*Musala v Ilmoyya* (1900) 23 Mad 125  
*Abd I I I v S I Pabud D* (1900)  
 1 Lah 421 5 11 853  
 (w) *Lilo v Jaghru* (1904) 31 Lat 839 IC 9  
 ( ) A 1 123 I set v *Mofath* (1908)  
 71 t 8 108 IC 5 ( ) A 1 0  
 (x) *Chand v Sharma nd v I jiar n* (1906)  
 111 W N 186  
 (y) *rd it M I Muhammad* (19 ) 7 Lah  
 L J 44 00 IC 41 ( ) A L 3  
 (z) *G J I D v Mukl d* (1906) 7 Lah 309  
 98 IC 900 (26) A L 807 *S dar Shah*

- v Mit Sardar Bey n* (1909) 10 Lah  
 531 113 I C 44 (25) A L 893  
 (a) *Lilo v Jaghru* (1904) 3 Pat 853 8 I C  
 ( ) A P 123 *Basist v Modnath*  
 (1908) 7 Pat 8 108 I C 55 (8)  
 A P 0  
 (b) *M g P v Ma Shree Ma* (1904) - Rang  
 44 84 IC 09 ( ) A L 9  
 (c) *O la v Repathoe* (1894) 1 Mad 09  
 (d) *Shamcha d v Bh ja am* (189 ) Cal 9  
 (e) *S bb ra ja M nli* (1896) 19 Mal 34  
*G u J S wa* (1903) 4 Lah 41 C  
 146 ( ) A L 45

3 who created a debt agreeing to pay it out of the temple funds and that trustee is removed it is open to his successor to raise the plea not taken by the first trustee namely that the temple funds were not liable for the debt. The devolution of interest in such a case is the one contemplated by r 10 below and not r 4 (f)

A Hindu son sues his father and the purchaser from the father to set aside a sale of ancestral property made by the father alleging that the sale was without legal necessity. The son dies pending the suit. As the father's sale is impeached the father is not the proper legal representative but some other member of the family interested in setting aside the sale must be appointed (g)

Minor applicant—A minor is as much entitled to be made a party as the legal representative of a deceased plaintiff as an adult. But he must apply through a next friend (h)

Death of plaintiff after preliminary and before final decree—In some cases (i) the rule has been applied where plaintiff dies after the preliminary decree but before the final decree. These cases are however rendered obsolete by the dictum of Privy Council in *Lachmi Narain v Balmukund* (j) that a decree once passed confers rights and imposes liabilities which are fixed until the decree is reversed or varied in appeal. The later decisions are that the suit cannot abate between preliminary and final decree (k)

Death after final decree—The provisions of this Order do not apply where a party dies after the final decree is passed. Thus if A sues B but the suit is dismissed and A dies after the dismissal his legal representative may appeal from the decree without making any application under this rule to be brought on the record in place of the deceased (l). After a preliminary decree was passed on a mortgage a compromise decree was passed which operated as a final decree. The plaintiff died after the final decree. It was held that the legal representative could apply for execution under O 21 r 16 and there was no occasion for substitution (m). See also r 12 below

Death of pauper applicant—Where there is only an application for leave to sue in forma pauperis and the applicant dies before the leave is granted the right to sue as a pauper being a personal right cannot survive to his legal representative. But the legal representative may present a fresh application for leave to sue in forma pauperis or he may institute a suit for the same relief which the deceased claimed if the right to sue survives (n)

Effect of abatement on rights of parties—Where a suit has abated and the abatement has not been set aside under r 9 below the defendant is entitled as long as he continues in possession of the suit property to plead against the plaintiff and those claiming under him that the order of abatement is conclusive of the rights to the property. In such a case the order of abatement operates as a judgment in favour of the defendant to the same extent as a judgment on the merits (o)

Suit under section 92 and abatement—See notes to sec 92. Death of either plaintiff pending suit on p 282 above

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>(f) <i>Sridharan v Venuada</i> (1922) 45 Mad 03 72 I C 103 (2) A M 40</p> <p>(g) <i>Gulli v Suman</i> (19 3) 4 Lab 72 74 I C 146 (24) A L 45</p> <p>(h) <i>Puckman v Ieerasan</i> (19 4) 4 Mad L J 370 80 I C 94 (24) A M 813</p> <p>(i) <i>Laksh v Subba ayadu v R madasu</i> (19 4) 4 Mad 872 68 I C 94 (23) A M 37</p> <p>(j) <i>Madala v Kannammal</i> (19 4) 46 Mad L J 181 8 I C 64 (4) A M 86</p> <p>(k) (19 4) 51 I A 31 4 Pat 61 81 I C 747 (24) A PC 198</p> | <p>(l) <i>L. Kpat v Da lat Singh</i> (19 7) 2 Luck 464 101 I C 174 (27) A O 156</p> <p><i>Perumal v Perumal</i> (19 8) 51 Mad 01 11 I C 116 (8) A M 914 F B overruling <i>Subba ayadu v Ramadasu supra</i></p> <p>(m) <i>Famanada v JI natchi</i> (1881) 5 M d 36</p> <p>(n) <i>Hem nd a v Fakir</i> (19 3) 50 Cal 60 74 I C 99 (23) A C 66</p> <p>(o) <i>Lalit v Swish</i> (1906) 33 Cal 1163</p> <p>(p) <i>Rahim v Sasa</i> (19 0) 38 Mad L J 268 54 I C 56</p> <p><i>Naimudda v Man raddan</i> (1927) 32 C W N 239 107 I C 76 (23) A C 184</p> |
|---|---|

**Suit under O 1 r 8 and abatement.**—See notes to O 1 r 8, Abatement of suit and Abatement of appeal

**Execution proceedings.**—This rule does not apply to proceedings in execution See r 12 below

**Revision.**—When the legal representative of a deceased plaintiff applies within the prescribed period to have his name entered on the record the Court is bound under this rule to enter his name. If the Court fails to do so it amounts to a failure to exercise jurisdiction vested in it by law under this rule and the High Court may interfere in revision under sec 115 (p)

**Appeal.**—The decisions on the question of appeal are not uniform. In some cases to be presently considered the alteration introduced in the present rule namely the substitution of the words the suit *shall abate* for the words the Court may *pass an order* that the suit shall abate which occurred in the corresponding sec 366 of the Code of 1882 has not been noticed see notes above. Alterations in the rule No 2. We proceed to consider the decisions of each High Court separately

**Madras.**—The Madras High Court has held that where on the death of a plaintiff two rival claimants apply to the Court to be brought upon the record as the legal representative of the deceased plaintiff and the Court decides in favour of one of them and against the other the party against whom the decision is given is not entitled to appeal the reason given being that there is no abatement of the suit in such a case as the suit can be proceeded with by the other claimant (g). A Full Bench of the Madras High Court has also held that even if a sole plaintiff dies and only one person claims to be his legal representative an order refusing his application to be brought on the record is not one from which an appeal lies (r). But the Court declined to express an opinion as to what the consequence would be if the petitioner appeals against the actual order of abatement or dismissal. Presumably section 146 would enable him to do so as a person claiming under the deceased plaintiff

**Allahabad.**—It has been held by the High Court of Allahabad that no appeal lies from an adjudication that a suit (s) or an appeal (t) has abated whether the abatement is due to the fact that no application was made to bring the legal representative of the deceased plaintiff on the record (u) or the abatement follows on the dismissal of the application made by a person to be brought upon the record as the legal representative of the deceased plaintiff (v) the reason given being that such an adjudication does not amount to a decree. In a recent case where A had obtained an ex parte decree against B and B had applied to set aside the decree and thereafter B died and on B's death his son applied to continue the application and the application was granted notwithstanding opposition on A's part it was held that the case did not fall either under r 3 or r 4 of this order and that no appeal lay from the order (w). See, sec 146 above

**Lahore.**—In a case where a person applied to be brought on the record as the legal representative of a deceased plaintiff and the Court refused the application on the ground that he was not the legal representative and also made a separate order recording that the suit had abated inasmuch as no application by any legal representative had been made held by the High Court of Lahore that the order dismissing the application

- (p) *J na dhan v R mchandra* (190) 26 Bom 317  
 (q) *Lakshmi v S dbar ma* (1916) 39 Mad 488 9 IC 149 *Ve kasa v Guna swa a* (1924) 45 M d L J 19 9 IC 880 (4) A M 6—*Ruckmani v I rasanani* (1914) 47 Mad L J 20 80 IC 91 (1) A M 813  
 (r) *Venl lakshna v Krish na* (1926) 49 Mad 450 95 IC 489 (26) A M 586 overruling *Ayya Mudali v I eerayee* (190) 43

- Mad 812 58 IC 493  
 (s) *Hamida Bibi v Ali Hussain* (1895) 17 All 172 *Walaayat v Rami i* (1914) 1 All L J 1113 25 IC 613  
 (t) *Muhammad v Manohar* (19—) 0 A D. L J 214 64 IC 838  
 (u) See (1914) 1 All L J 1113 25 IC 643 *supra*  
 (v) See (1895) 17 All 17 *supra*  
 (w) *Mad Lal v Luthamhar* (19 ) 47 All 741 88 IC 9 (5) A A 431

was not appealable under the Code as it was really a matter collateral to the suit. As to the order recording the abatement the Court said it would amount to a decree and be appealable as such if the applicant was already a party to the suit in another character (x). In another case (y) where an appeal was declared to have abated as a whole it was held following a Full Bench ruling of the same High Court (z) that whether the final decision was called an abatement or a dismissal it came within the definition of decree and was appealable as such the applicants having been parties to the suit.

*Oudh*—The Oudh Court has held that a decision that a suit has abated coupled with a refusal to bring the legal representative on the record on the ground that the cause of action did not survive operates as a decree and is appealable (a).

4 [S 368] (1) Where one of two or more defendants dies and the right to sue does not survive against the surviving defendant or defendants alone, or a sole defendant or sole surviving defendant dies and the right to sue survives, the Court, on an application made in that behalf, shall cause the legal representative of the deceased defendant to be made a party and shall proceed with the suit.

Proceed in case of death of one of several defendants or of sole defendant

(2) Any person so made a party may make any defence appropriate to his character as legal representative of the deceased defendant.

(3) Where within the time limited by law no application is made under sub rule (1), the suit shall abate as against the deceased defendant.

#### Alterations in the rule —

- 1 The words used in sec 368 of the Code of 1882 were any person whom he alleges to be the legal representative of the deceased defendant. The words used in the present rule are the legal representative of the deceased defendant. See notes below. Effect of decree against legal representative of deceased defendant.
- 2 Sub rule (2) is new.
- 3 The words as against the deceased defendant in sub rule (3) are new. See notes below. The suit shall abate as against the deceased defendant.

*Suit*—The word suit in this rule includes an appeal and the word defendant a respondent see r 11 b low.

*Limitation*—The application under this rule must be made within 90 days from the date of the death of the deceased defendant or respondent. Limitation Act 1908 sch I art 177. The alteration in the language of art 177 as it stood in the Limitation Act 1877 art 145 C clearly shows that the word respondent in the present article is not confined to a respondent only in first appeal as was held by the High

(x) *Ram Srup v Mot Ram* (19 0) 1 Lah 493 7 IC 137  
(y) *Udmi v Hra* (19 0) 1 Lah 58 60 IC 111

(z) *Vajra v Afz* (1916) Panj Rec No 13 p 399 38 IC 7  
(a) *Rampal Singh v Abdul Hamid* (19 8) 3 Luck 68 110 IC 826 (8) A O 36 F B

Court of Madras under the old article (b) but that it includes a respondent also in second appeal as was held by the High Court of Calcutta and Allahabad (c). See also r 11 below.

Where no application made within the period of limitation The application to bring the legal representative of the deceased defendant on the record should as stated above be made within 90 days from the date of the death of the deceased defendant. If no such application is made within the foregoing period the suit abates against the deceased defendant (sub rule (3)) though the plaintiff was ignorant of the death of the deceased (d). After abatement the only course open to the plaintiff is to make an application under r 9 sub r (2) to have the abatement set aside. Such an application should be made within 60 days from the date of the abatement [Limitation Act 1908 s 11 art 171] but the Court may entertain the application even after 90 days if sufficient cause is shown (e) [sec 9 sub r 3 and Limitation Act 1908 s 5]. As to the inherent power of the Court to bring the legal representative of a deceased defendant on the record after abatement see notes below. It may be stated that where a defendant dies pending a suit it is open to its legal representative to apply to be brought on the record notwithstanding the plaintiff's omission to implead him (f).

defendant or respondent only (g) A suit on a joint and several promissory note against the promisers is a suit of this nature. But if the suit or appeal cannot proceed in the absence of the legal representative the suit or appeal will abate as a whole (A) A suit by a partner against his co-partners for dissolution of partnership and for accounts is a suit of this nature [see ill. (2)] under the head II Cases in which suit or appeal held to abate as a whole

The test often adopted in such cases is whether in the event of the appeal being allowed as against the remaining respondents there would or would not be two contradictory decrees in the same litigation with respect to the same subject matter. It is clear that a Court should not be called upon to make two inconsistent decrees about the same property and in order to avoid conflicting decrees the Court has no alternative but to dismiss the appeal as a whole. If on the other hand the success of the appeal would not lead to such a result there is no valid reason why the Court should not hear the appeal and adjudicate upon the dispute between the parties who are before it (i)

The High Court of Calcutta has held that where the plaintiffs are joint owners and a decree is passed for them for possession and the defendant appeals from the decree making the plaintiffs respondents and one of the plaintiffs-respondents dies pending the appeal the appeal abates as a whole the reason given being that the Court should not be called upon to make two contradictory decrees in the same litigation, which would be the result if the appeals were allowed as against the surviving joint owners, and the decree of the lower Court left undisturbed as against the deceased joint owner (j).

- (g) *Cha dare g v Ka madhai* (1898) 2 Bom 18 [suit for possession against trespassers—appeal] *Bai Full v Adesa g* (1907) 26 Bom—03 [suit for possession against trespassers—appeal] *Jay Gobind v Mon-motha* (1906) 33 Cal. 550 [suit for rent] *Lpendra K mar v Sham Lal* (1907) 34 Cal. 108 [suit for rent—appeal] *31 Ad Dues in v Supra Begam* (1907) 5 All 206 [suit as a mortgagor and surety] *Reng v Gnanap a Laas* (1906) 30 Mad. 6 [suit on a mortgage appeal] *Abd l Azis v Laidoo Si gh* (1911) 34 All 604 17 I C 89 [suit for rent] *Zannah Bibi v Rohila* (1911) Punj Rec. no. 3 p 80 39 I C [appeal] *Shan Ertha v Motulal* (19—) 49 Bom 118 8 I C 197 (2) A B 2 [appeal—suit by joint owners for possession] following—*20 Bom 18 supra* *Rai Kashi Nath v Kailas gh* (19—) 4 Pat 53 89 I C —6 (—5) A P 480 [suit for rent] *Kaptha v S Nath* (19—) 6 Lab 33 86 I C 1 (—) A L 351 [suit against transferees from a Hindu widow] *Devi Das v Muhammad* (1919) 1 Lab. L J 26 [appeal—suit by tenants-in-common for declaration of their interest in certain lands] *Laya Ram v Shambu Nath* (19—) 5 Lab. L J 14 91 C 46 (—3) A L [appeal—suit by tenants-in-common for a declaration that defendant entitled to life interest only] *Nadoo Singh v Balraj Singh* (1923) 5 Lab. L J 903 89 I C 49 (—4) A L 93 [appeal—suit for a declaration that plaintiffs entitled to succeed in preference to defendants] *Mahant Darshan v Bivr manj* (1915) 49 All. 81 80 I C 903 (—6) A A 1.3 [appeal—suit by Mahant against alienees from his predecessor as an alienee having a defined share in the property] *Faqir v Hardeva* (19—) 50 All. 5 9 (—3) A A 1 P B [appeal—suit for declaration of right to a share as a suitor of two sets of defendants] *Sarat Singh v Gulab Si gh* (1917) 10 Lab. (—28) A L 5 [appeal—suit against vendor tenants-in-common]
- (h) *Raj Chau der v Ga ga Das* (1904) 31 Cal. 437

- 31 LA 1 [appeal—partnership suit] *H m K nwar v Amba Prasad* (1900) 22 All 430 [appeal—suit for joint possession] *Imam ud Din v Sadarath Rai* (1910) 3 All 81 5 I C 897 [appeal—suit for pre-emption] *Dhara jul v Chandeshka* (1907) 11 C W N 504 [appeal—suit to set aside sale of land] *Khuda Baksh v Alahra Das* (1913) Punj Rec. no 62, p. 34 18 L C 15 [appeal—suit for joint possession] *Sardar Lal v Ram Lal* (19—) 1 Lab 230 5 I C 199 [appeal—suit by heirs of mortgagor] *Mu Zai v M ng Kyaw* (1923) 1 Bang 199 74 L C 1077 (23) A R. 2 8 [appeal—suit for partition] *Wajid Ali v Fur m S gh* (1914) 47 All. 100 8 I C 66 (2) A A 108 [appeal—suit for pre-emption] *Kul Dajal v Vajendra Nath* (1919) 4 C W N 44 54 L C 822 [appeal—suit for declaration of ownership] *Girdas Mal v Kashi P m* (1911) 3 Lab. L J 64 (21) A L 160 [appeal—suit against co-heirs] *Bhagwan Singh v Jamal* (1911) 3 Lab. L J 20— [appeal—suit for redemption against several joint mortgagors] *Nak Chand v Ram Chand* (192—) 4 Lab. L J 139 77 I C 195 (—2) A L 201 [appeal—suit for redemption by second mortgagee against prior mortgagee and mortgagor] *Sabbar Abbas* (19—) 23 All. L J 930 90 I C 34 (—6) A A 152 [appeal—suit for pre-emption]
- (i) *Sant Singh v Gulab Si gh* (1919) 10 Lab 7, 13 (28) A L 572 S also *Wajid Ali Khan v Purn S gh* (1919) 58 L A 80 81 51 All 257 11 I C 601 (1919) A P C. 58
- (j) *Dha j v Cha desha r* (1907) 11 C W N 501 *Kul D jul v Vajendra Nath* (1914) 4 C W N 44 54 I C 822 *Mahindra Chand v Bhagabot* (1925) 30 C W N 45 *M Inapur Zamadary Co., Ltd. v Amudya* (1916) 53 Cal. 70 *Vajmudin v Man rudd m* (1917) 3 C W N 199 *See also Hara Charan v Kai pada* (1919) 56 Cal. 622 (29) A C 519

*A* and *B* sue *C* *D* and *E* for declaration of title and for possession and a decree is passed for them. *C* *D* and *E* appeal from the decree. Pending the appeal *C* dies. No steps are taken to bring his legal representative on the record within the period of limitation. According to the Calcutta decision the appeal abates as a whole. The reason given is that if the defendants succeed in the appeal then there would be two decrees one against the surviving plaintiffs respondents and another decree of the lower Court in favour of the deceased plaintiff to the effect that the property in suit belongs to the plaintiffs of which he was a proprietor. Further as to O 41 r 4 the Calcutta High Court has said that the rule is limited to the case of appellants and does not apply to the case of respondents (l). On the other hand the High Court of Bombay has held that the appeal abates only as against deceased and it should be heard on the merits against the other joint owners. After the appeal is heard on the merits the Court may pass such decree as the case may require (l). It has been held by the High Court of Allahabad that where a joint decree is passed in a suit for redemption of a mortgage brought by two or more plaintiffs and the defendants appeal from the decree and one of the plaintiffs respondents dies pending the appeal but his legal representatives are not impleaded within the period of limitation the appeal abates only so far as the deceased respondent is concerned but not as a whole (m). See notes to r 3 above.

This rule applies to appeals.

Where there is no possibility of contradictory decrees the appeal abates only so far as concerns the deceased defendant or respondent but not as a whole. A Hindu widow sells immovable property belonging to her husband to *A* *B* and *C*. It is stated in the sale deed that the property is sold to *A* *B* and *C* in equal shares. After the sale the next reversioner sues the widow and *A* *B* and *C* for a declaration that the sale is not valid beyond the life time of the widow but the suit is dismissed. The reversioner appeals from the decree. During the pendency of the appeal *A* dies but his legal representative is not brought on the record within the period of limitation. The appeal abates as against *A* alone but not as a whole. The reason is that the interest of *A* in the property is separate from those of the surviving respondents *B* and *C* the shares having been defined in the sale deed and that it could not therefore be said that the decree of the appellate Court if passed in favour of the appellant would prove ineffective or inconsistent with that part of the decree of the lower Court which had become final upon the abatement of the appeal *qua* *A* (n).

1 Cases in which suit or appeal held to abate as against deceased defendant or respondent only—(1) *A* mortgages certain property to *B* *C* stands surety for repayment of the mortgage debt. *B* sues *A* and *C* praying as against *A* for a sale of the mortgaged property and as against *C* for a decree for the payment of the mortgage debt. *C* dies pending the suit. No application is made by *B* to make the legal representative of *C* a party to the suit within 6 months [now 90 days] from the date of *C*'s death. The suit abates as against *C* only and not as a whole. *Mehdi Husain v Sugra Begam* (1902) 20 All 206. [In this case it is clear that *B* could have abandoned his claim against *C* and sued *A* alone on the mortgage.]

(2) *A* lets certain lands to *B* and *C*. *A* then sues *B* and *C* for arrears of rent but the suit is dismissed. *A* files an appeal the respondents being *B* and *C*. *C* dies pending the appeal. No application is made by *A* to substitute *C*'s legal representative in *C*'s place within 6 months [now 90 days] from the date of *C*'s death. The appeal does not

(k) (1925) 30 C.W.N. 45 48 *supra*  
(l) *Sh. K. Bha. Mittal* (19) 43 Bom 118  
8 1 C 197 ( ) 4 B 1 *Ch. I* 9  
v *Sh. Moh. S. (1834)* L. m 718 *I*  
Full v *Adesa* 9 (190 ) 6 Lom 03 See  
also *C. Namam v Ga. Gabai* (1903) 7  
Lom 34 *I am Se. k. La. bar* (1903)  
23 All 7 *Somasundra m v Va. thini ga*

(1917) 40 Mad 846 868 41 L.C. 546  
*M. g. Eyzing v Maung Shwe* (1914)  
— *Ban* 488 81 IC 10 (21) A.R. 376  
(m) *Na. am. Das v Sheo Din* (19 8) 48 All 1  
91 IC 8 9 ( ) 5 A.A. 734  
( ) *Sant S. ngh v Gulab Singh* (19 9) 10 Lah  
7 (28) A.L. 57.



abate as a whole but against *C* only *Joy Gobind v Monmota* (1906) 33 Cal 680 *Abdul A 12 v Basdeo Singh* (1912) 34 All 604 17 I C 89, *Rai Kashi Nath v Kailas Singh* (1920) 4 I at 53 89 I C 236 (20) A P 480 [In this case it is clear that *A* could have sued *B* alone without joining *C* as a party defendant see Contract Act 1872 s 43]

(3) *A* and *B* obtain a joint decree for redemption against *C* who appeals. *A* dies pending the appeal and his legal representatives are not brought on the record. The appeal abates against *A* alone *Varun Das v Sheo Din* (1926) 49 All 251 91 I C 809 (21) A 234 (In this case either *A* or *B* could have sued to redeem)

II Cases in which suit or appeal held to abate as a whole—(1) *A*, *B* and *C* are joint owners of certain property. The property is sold for arrears of Government revenue and purchased by *D*. *A*, *B* and *C* sued *D* to set aside the sale on the ground of fraud and irregularities and a decree is passed in their favour. *D* files an appeal from the decree against *A*, *B* and *C*. *C* dies pending the appeal but *D* makes no application to bring *C*'s legal representative on the record within the period of limitation. The appeal abates not only as against *C* but as a whole. In this case it is clear that *A*, *B* and *C* being joint owners the suit would have been bad if *C* were not joined as a party to the suit. Again if the appellate Court heard the appeal in the absence of *C*'s legal representative and came to the conclusion that the decree of the lower Court should be reversed the decree could then be reversed only as to *A* and *B* but it could not be reversed as to *C* for *C*'s representative is not on the record. But this would be a *reductio ad absurdum* for the whole appeal could not be reversed as to the *undetermined* shares of some joint holders [that is *A* and *B*] and confirmed as to the *undetermined* share of other joint holders [that is in this case *C*]. The case therefore is one in which the appeal could not proceed in the absence of *C*'s legal representative. The appeal therefore must abate as a whole *Dharanjit v Chandeshwar* (1907) 11 Cal W N 504 *Kali Dayal v Jagendra Nath* (1919) 24 C W N 44 54 I C 822 *Bejoy Gopal v Lmesh Chandra* (1901) 6 C W N 196 *Manindra v Bhagubhai* (1906) 30 Cal W N 40 90 I C 946 (26) A C 330 *Madhapore Zamindari Co v Amulya Nath* (1906) 53 Cal 752 90 I C 649 (21) A C 893 *Hadu v Lala* (1910) Punj Rec no 41 p 107 91 I C 901 *Jamna v Sarjit* (1919) Punj Rec no 67 p 166 52 I C 510 *Haji Moham mad v Mahlu* (1924) 5 Lah 429 86 I C 592 (20) A L 124 *Muhammad v Abdulla* (28) A L 969 According to the Bombay ruling the appeal abates as against *C* only and it should be heard on the merits against *A* and *B*. The Court may after hearing the appeal on the merits pass such a decree as the case may require *Shankerbhai v Motilal* (1925) 49 Bom 118 85 I C 197 (20) A B 122 *Chandarsang v Aminabhai* (1897) 2 Bom 718

(2) *A* sues his partners *B*, *C*, *D* and *F* for dissolution and for accounts of the partnership. A decree is passed in the suit by which it is ordered that a sum of Rs 9000 should be contributed by *A*, *B* and *C* and that out of that sum Rs 1740 should be paid to *D* and the rest to *F*. *A* appeals from the decree making *B*, *C*, *D* and *F* party respondents. *B* and *C* also appeal from the decree making *A*, *D* and *F* party respondents. Pending the appeal *D* dies. No application is made by the appellants in either appeal to bring on the record the legal representative of *D* within the period of limitation. The appeal abates as a whole for as the suit is for partnership accounts it is not one in which the appeals could proceed in the absence of the legal representative of *D*. *Poy Chunder v Gunga Das* (1904) 31 Cal 457 31 I A 71 *Moti Lal v Ram Varan* (1917) 39 All 301 40 I C 1006 *Jamnadas v Sorabji* (1891) 16 Bom 27

Suit for pre-emption—See notes to r 3 above under the same head

Appellate Court and abatement—Where a defendant appeals from a decree and the plaintiff respondent dies pending the appeal without the legal representatives

being joined within the period of limitation it is the appeal which abates and not the suit ( )

**Inherent power to add legal representative as a party after abatement**—Notwithstanding the abatement of a suit the Court has the power in a proper case to bring on the record the representative of a deceased defendant under s 151 and O 1 r 10. Thus *B* and *C* for partition of joint family property. A preliminary decree was passed and a commissioner is appointed to make a partition according to the rights declared in the decree. *B* then dies but no application is made to bring his legal representative on the record within the period of limitation. Though the suit abates as regards *B* the Court may add *B*'s representative as a defendant (*p*). But no such order can be made if a preliminary decree has been passed (*q*).

**Effect of decree against legal representative of deceased defendant**—The words used in sec 395 were "any person whom he alleges to be the legal representative of the deceased defendant." The words used in the present rule are "the legal representative of the deceased defendant." It was accordingly held under the Code of 1859 that where a person alleged by the plaintiff to be the legal representative of the deceased defendant was brought on the record without any objection by him and a decree was passed in the suit the estate of the deceased was bound by the decree in the absence of fraud or collusion (*r*). But in view of the altered wording of the present rule it is not sufficient for the plaintiff to allege that a particular person is the legal representative of a deceased defendant and for such person to be brought on the record as representing the estate of the deceased. Thus if the sole defendant dies pending a suit against him for the recovery of money leaving sons and daughters but in ignorance of the existence of these heirs his brother is brought on the record as his representative and a decree is passed against the estate of the deceased the decree is not binding on the estate and on the persons rightly entitled to that estate (*s*).

**Two or more legal representatives**—If there are several legal representatives it seems to suffice if at least one of them is impleaded whether in the suit (*t*), or in the appeal (*u*). The Lahore High Court in one case (*t*) held that rule 4 is sufficiently complied with if all the legal representatives known after diligent inquiry are joined. But in another case (*v*) where only two out of three heirs of a deceased respondent were brought on the record the same Court held that the appeal abated as the whole estate was not represented. See notes to r 3 above under the same head.

**Indian Succession Act and legal representative**—In the case of a person subject to the Indian Succession Act his legal representatives within the meaning of s 2 (11) of the Code are his executors or administrators and not his heirs (*x*).

**Joint Hindu family and legal representative**—See notes to r 3 above under the same head.

**Legal representative already on record in another character**—See notes under the same head to r 3 above.

- (o) *Dund v M. M. M. M. M. M.* (1919) 41 All 23 201 C 93  
(p) *L. K. v. A. I. v. A. I. v. A. I.* (1911) 3 Bom 333 111 C 9 (Landa g v f)  
311 (1898) 2 B 11 718 1 2  
(q) *M. A. Z. v. M. g. g. g. g.* (19 3) 1 Kang 189 131 19 41 C 10 (3) A R 8  
(r) *K. d. r. M. H. u. l. f. a.* (199) 6 Mad 30  
(s) *P. I. h. f. v. J. a. m. e. j.* (19 6) 0 B 11 80 100 I C 18 (2) A B 63 See also  
J. f. r. v. A. v. f. (8) A 1 19  
(t) *J. e. l. r. v. B. v. H. a. b.* (1 3) 26 Bor 1 R 8 80 I C 9 (24) A B 40 D p  
v. r. d. v. L. c. h. (19) 47 All 466

- 87 I C 39 ( ) A 4 49 J f f v  
M. H. u. l. d. a. p. M. H. u. l. d. a. p.  
v. f. v. A. d. l. (19 9) 59 All 857 111 I C  
238 ( ) A A 51  
(u) *L. o. v. J. a. g. f. r. r.* (19 4) 3 Pat 8 2 8 I C  
( ) A 1 1 3 Shub D ita v Sh 1A  
K. a. (19) 4 I v 30 89 I C 80  
( ) A 1 1  
(v) *B. e. g. J. a. n. v. J. a. m. t. B. b.* (19 ) 7 Lah 438  
98 I C 61 ( ) A L 6  
(w) *M. h. v. d. H. a. s. a. n. v. I. g. t.* (19 ) 100  
1 C 418 ( ) A I 94  
(x) *B. r. n. t. B. r. o. t. r. v. F. o. l.* (19 ) 3 Ran 4  
8 I C 3 C ( ) A 1 146 F. a. j. v  
444 J. (1894) 18 Bom 33

4 Death of insolvent respondent—An appeal preferred by the creditors of an insolvent against an order of adjudication abates on his death as the right to sue does not survive within the meaning of this rule (y)

Wrong person as legal representative—An application to bring on the record as legal representative of a deceased defendant a person who is not in fact such representative will be of no avail to save the running of limitation in the case of a subsequent application to implead the person who really is the legal representative (z) As already stated if the wrong person is impleaded as legal representative the decree will not bind the true heir (a)

What pleas may be taken by a legal representative—See sub r (2) and notes under the same head to r 3 above

Rehearing of suit or appeal—A plaintiff whose suit is heard and dismissed is not entitled to a rehearing of the suit on the ground that one of the defendants had died previous to the hearing of the suit and that the suit was heard without bringing the legal representative of the deceased defendant on the record The right to have the suit reheard is the right of the legal representative [which he would not care to exercise as the suit was dismissed] and not the right of the unsuccessful plaintiff The same rule applies to appeals (b)

Pro forma defendant—Omission to bring on record the legal representative of the defendant against whom no relief is claimed does not cause the suit to abate (c)

Death of defendant after preliminary and before final decree—It has been held in several cases that this rule applies where a defendant dies after the preliminary and before the final decree and that his legal representatives must be brought on the record otherwise the suit abates so far as concerns the deceased defendant (d) But it is difficult to reconcile these cases with the decision of Privy Council in *Lachmi Narain v Bal Mukund* (e) In a recent case the Oudh Court held relying upon *Lachmi Narain* a case that this rule does not apply where a defendant dies after the passing of a preliminary decree (f) See notes to r 3 above Death of plaintiff after preliminary and before final decree

Decree for or against a dead person—A decree against a person who was dead at the date of the institution of the suit is a nullity (g) Similarly a decree passed against a defendant who died pending the suit without bringing his legal representative on the record is a nullity and it cannot be executed against the legal representative (h) A decree passed against a respondent in ignorance of the fact of his death is also a nullity (i) If one of several defendants is discovered to have been dead at the institution of the suit there is no question of abatement nor should the suit be dismissed as against him The

(y) *Ahain v Gurbaksh* (19 8) 9 Lah 306 107 I C 81 (23) A L 110

(z) *M Hamm d v Aulia* (19 0) 4 All 497 61 I C 947 But see *Mallapragatuv L gh m* (1910) 40 Mad L J 328 51 C 514 commented upon in *Paichur v I ems* (19 3) 44 Mad L J 60 69 I C 5 9 ( 3) 4 M 36

(a) *P Ahraj v Jameeti* (19 6) 50 Bom 80 100 I C 185 (27) A B 63

(b) *I Itayam v J Ith* (1915) 24 M d L J 138 81 C 83

(c) *Brij I dar St gh v Kanahs Ram* (191 ) 44 I A 718 8 45 Cal 94 110 4 I C 43 (191 ) 1 Junj Rec no 104 p 393 at p 40 *Alia B kih v Madho Ram* (1901) 23 All 24 *Abd Ila v M Hammanad* (19 0) 2 Lah L J 601 *Ra s Lakh ya v Kori r St gh* (19 ) 7 Lah L J 466 9 I C 61 ( ) 4 L 6 1

(d) *Vot Lal v Ram Varan* (191 ) 33 All 551 40 I C 1006 [partnership suit] *Jag r*

*Yath v Kam Raran* (192 ) 0 All L J 575 69 I C 51 ( ) A A 396 [mortgage suit] *Bhat ath v Tarachand* (19 0) 25 C W N 595 59 I C 177 [mortgage s it] *Ju gl Lall v Laddu Ram* (1919) 4 Pat L J 240 50 I C 5 9 [mortgage -suit] *Manaye dra v Jaan* (19 6) 87 I C 818 ( 6) A C 303 [suit for accounts]

(e) (19 4) 1 I A 3 1 4 Pat 61 81 I C 747 ( 1) A PC 198

(f) *Musammam Lakhpati v Daulat Singh* (19 7) 2 Luck 401 101 I C 174 (27) A C 156

(g) *Mohun v Azeem* (18 0) 12 W R 45 1 *erappa v Tind I* (1903) 31 Mad 86 *Rampratap v G vrush nk r* (19 3) Bom L R 11 8 I C 461 ( 4) A B 109

(h) *Radha Prasad v Lal S Aeb* (1891) 13 All 53 17 I A 150 *Ju gl Lall v Laddu Ram* (1919) 4 Pat L J 240 50 I C 5 9 *Seshamma v Ve Iata* (19 4) 47 Mad L J 35 80 I C 39 ( 4) A M 713

(i) *Va au v K tu R m* (19 0) Lah L J 144

Court should remove the name of the deceased from the record and proceed under O 1 r 10 (j). A decree in a suit for rent against several joint tenants of whom some are dead at the institution of the suit is a nullity as against those who are dead but is valid as a money decree as against those who are living for under sec 43 of the Contract Act because the liability of a joint promisor is joint and several (1). But it has been held that a decree passed by the Privy Council against the respondents in ignorance of the death of one of them is not a nullity though the legal representative of the deceased was not brought on the record the decree being an order of the Sovereign (1).

O 41 r 20 and abatement.—O 41 r 20 does not override the provisions of O 2 of the Code (m).

Sub rule (2) Defence appropriate to his character as legal representative.—See notes to r 3 above. What pleas may be taken by a legal representative.

O 1 r 8, and abatement.—See notes to O 1 r 8 under the same head.

Execution proceedings.—This rule does not apply to proceedings in execution of a decree see r 1 below.

Appeal.—It has been held by the High Court of Lahore that an adjudication that an appeal has stated as a whole amounts to a decree and is appealable as such (n). See notes to r 3 above. Appeal.

**5 [S 367]** Where a question arises as to whether any person is or is not the legal representative of a deceased plaintiff or a deceased defendant, such question shall be determined by the Court.

Determined by the Court as to legal representative of

#### Alterations in the rule —

- 1 The words where a question arises as to whether any person is or is not the legal representative have been substituted for the words if any dispute arises as to who is the legal representative. The object is to make it clear that this rule applies not only where two or more persons claim to be the legal representative of a deceased party but where there is only one claimant and his representative character is denied. This is in accordance with the interpretation put upon the words of the old section in the undermentioned cases (o).
- 2 Under the old section where a question arose as to whether any person was or was not the legal representative of a deceased party the Court had the power either to stay the suit until the question was determined in another suit or to determine the question itself. Under the present rule the Court is bound to determine the question itself (p).
- 3 It is provided by rules 3 and 4 of this Order that once the Court determines who the legal representative is and the legal representative is brought on the record under those rules the Court shall proceed with the suit. No objection therefore as to the representative character of such person can be entertained after he is brought on the record though the hearing of the suit

(j) *Palamal v Fauja S. gh* (19 6) 89 I C 661  
(6) A L 153 *Roop Chand v Saadar Khan* (1928) 9 Lah 56 110 I C 81  
(8) A L 353

(k) *Kesho Prasad v Shamnandan* (1926) 6 Pat 233 94 I C 23 (26) A P 504

(l) *Dondan v Jakh Singh* (19 0) 5 Pat L J 314 319 56 I C 32

(m) *Mada v Bhagwati* (19 5) 20 C W N 45 43 49 99 I C 946 (6) A C 335

(n) *Udasi v Hir* (19 0) 1 Lah 58 69 I C 111

(o) *Ola v Deepathie* (1894) 17 Mad 209 210  
*Subbayya v S. minadaggar* (1835) 16 Mad 496 *Ra. ram. S. rai v Ram Gop I* (1903) 30 All 348

(p) *Raj v Anant* (1918) 4 Bom 535 54 46 I C 70

*has not commenced* Under the old section the objection could be taken at or before the first hearing of the suit. But the words at or before the first hearing have been omitted in the present rule the object being that the objections as to whether any person is or is not the legal representative of a deceased party should be taken before such person is made a party under rules 3 and 4 above (g). But if a person alleging himself to be a legal representative is brought on the record as such *without notice to the other side* the other side is entitled to raise the objection at the hearing (r).

**Legal representative**—See s 2 cl (11) and notes to r 3 above. **Legal representative of deceased plaintiff**

**Shall be determined**—If the Court of first instance fails to determine the question as to who is the legal representative it is necessary for the appellate Court to determine it (s).

**Objection as to representative character when to be taken**—See notes above. **Alteration in the rule** No 3.

**Effect of order under this rule**—The Allahabad High Court at one time seemed to decide that this rule provides a summary procedure for appointing a person to be the legal representative of the deceased plaintiff *for the purpose of prosecuting the suit* and that an order appointing a legal representative does not operate as a final determination of the representative character of the person appointed in other words it does not operate as res judicata (t). But in a later case the same High Court disapproved of this decision and held that an order under this rule does operate as res judicata (u).

**Power of Court to correct its order**—The Court has power to correct an *ex parte* order made under this rule (v).

**Appeal**—No appeal lies from an order under this rule (w). But a party aggrieved by the order may object to the order in an appeal from the decree (s 100) provided he was a party to the decree (x). But the order will not be set aside unless it is shown that it has affected the decision of the case (y). See notes to r 3 above. **Appeal**

**6 [Ver]** Notwithstanding anything contained in the foregoing rules, whether the cause of action survives or not there shall be no abatement by reason of the death of either party between the conclusion of the hearing and the pronouncing of the judgment, but judgment may in such case be pronounced notwithstanding the death and shall have the same force and effect as if it had been pronounced before the death took place.

- (g) See *M. C. v. Ina thar* (1903) 4 M. L. J. 18. In both these cases the plaintiff was taken at a late stage of the trial.  
(r) *P. C. v. J. C.* (1933) 4 M. L. J. 60. 63.  
(s) *T. J. v. D.* (1933) 4 M. L. J. 314.  
(t) *J. v. J.* (1906) 5 M. L. J. 103.  
(u) *J. v. J.* (1906) 5 M. L. J. 49.  
All 4 94 C. L. 7 (6) A. 43.

- (v) *I. v. Santhaj* (1912) 43 D. 103.  
(w) *D. v. Chait* (191) 3 All. 103. 104. 105. 106. 107. 108. 109. 110. 111. 112. 113. 114. 115. 116. 117. 118. 119. 120. 121. 122. 123. 124. 125. 126. 127. 128. 129. 130. 131. 132. 133. 134. 135. 136. 137. 138. 139. 140. 141. 142. 143. 144. 145. 146. 147. 148. 149. 150. 151. 152. 153. 154. 155. 156. 157. 158. 159. 160. 161. 162. 163. 164. 165. 166. 167. 168. 169. 170. 171. 172. 173. 174. 175. 176. 177. 178. 179. 180. 181. 182. 183. 184. 185. 186. 187. 188. 189. 190. 191. 192. 193. 194. 195. 196. 197. 198. 199. 200. 201. 202. 203. 204. 205. 206. 207. 208. 209. 210. 211. 212. 213. 214. 215. 216. 217. 218. 219. 220. 221. 222. 223. 224. 225. 226. 227. 228. 229. 230. 231. 232. 233. 234. 235. 236. 237. 238. 239. 240. 241. 242. 243. 244. 245. 246. 247. 248. 249. 250. 251. 252. 253. 254. 255. 256. 257. 258. 259. 260. 261. 262. 263. 264. 265. 266. 267. 268. 269. 270. 271. 272. 273. 274. 275. 276. 277. 278. 279. 280. 281. 282. 283. 284. 285. 286. 287. 288. 289. 290. 291. 292. 293. 294. 295. 296. 297. 298. 299. 300. 301. 302. 303. 304. 305. 306. 307. 308. 309. 310. 311. 312. 313. 314. 315. 316. 317. 318. 319. 320. 321. 322. 323. 324. 325. 326. 327. 328. 329. 330. 331. 332. 333. 334. 335. 336. 337. 338. 339. 340. 341. 342. 343. 344. 345. 346. 347. 348. 349. 350. 351. 352. 353. 354. 355. 356. 357. 358. 359. 360. 361. 362. 363. 364. 365. 366. 367. 368. 369. 370. 371. 372. 373. 374. 375. 376. 377. 378. 379. 380. 381. 382. 383. 384. 385. 386. 387. 388. 389. 390. 391. 392. 393. 394. 395. 396. 397. 398. 399. 400. 401. 402. 403. 404. 405. 406. 407. 408. 409. 410. 411. 412. 413. 414. 415. 416. 417. 418. 419. 420. 421. 422. 423. 424. 425. 426. 427. 428. 429. 430. 431. 432. 433. 434. 435. 436. 437. 438. 439. 440. 441. 442. 443. 444. 445. 446. 447. 448. 449. 450. 451. 452. 453. 454. 455. 456. 457. 458. 459. 460. 461. 462. 463. 464. 465. 466. 467. 468. 469. 470. 471. 472. 473. 474. 475. 476. 477. 478. 479. 480. 481. 482. 483. 484. 485. 486. 487. 488. 489. 490. 491. 492. 493. 494. 495. 496. 497. 498. 499. 500. 501. 502. 503. 504. 505. 506. 507. 508. 509. 510. 511. 512. 513. 514. 515. 516. 517. 518. 519. 520. 521. 522. 523. 524. 525. 526. 527. 528. 529. 530. 531. 532. 533. 534. 535. 536. 537. 538. 539. 540. 541. 542. 543. 544. 545. 546. 547. 548. 549. 550. 551. 552. 553. 554. 555. 556. 557. 558. 559. 560. 561. 562. 563. 564. 565. 566. 567. 568. 569. 570. 571. 572. 573. 574. 575. 576. 577. 578. 579. 580. 581. 582. 583. 584. 585. 586. 587. 588. 589. 590. 591. 592. 593. 594. 595. 596. 597. 598. 599. 600. 601. 602. 603. 604. 605. 606. 607. 608. 609. 610. 611. 612. 613. 614. 615. 616. 617. 618. 619. 620. 621. 622. 623. 624. 625. 626. 627. 628. 629. 630. 631. 632. 633. 634. 635. 636. 637. 638. 639. 640. 641. 642. 643. 644. 645. 646. 647. 648. 649. 650. 651. 652. 653. 654. 655. 656. 657. 658. 659. 660. 661. 662. 663. 664. 665. 666. 667. 668. 669. 670. 671. 672. 673. 674. 675. 676. 677. 678. 679. 680. 681. 682. 683. 684. 685. 686. 687. 688. 689. 690. 691. 692. 693. 694. 695. 696. 697. 698. 699. 700. 701. 702. 703. 704. 705. 706. 707. 708. 709. 710. 711. 712. 713. 714. 715. 716. 717. 718. 719. 720. 721. 722. 723. 724. 725. 726. 727. 728. 729. 730. 731. 732. 733. 734. 735. 736. 737. 738. 739. 740. 741. 742. 743. 744. 745. 746. 747. 748. 749. 750. 751. 752. 753. 754. 755. 756. 757. 758. 759. 760. 761. 762. 763. 764. 765. 766. 767. 768. 769. 770. 771. 772. 773. 774. 775. 776. 777. 778. 779. 780. 781. 782. 783. 784. 785. 786. 787. 788. 789. 790. 791. 792. 793. 794. 795. 796. 797. 798. 799. 800. 801. 802. 803. 804. 805. 806. 807. 808. 809. 810. 811. 812. 813. 814. 815. 816. 817. 818. 819. 820. 821. 822. 823. 824. 825. 826. 827. 828. 829. 830. 831. 832. 833. 834. 835. 836. 837. 838. 839. 840. 841. 842. 843. 844. 845. 846. 847. 848. 849. 850. 851. 852. 853. 854. 855. 856. 857. 858. 859. 860. 861. 862. 863. 864. 865. 866. 867. 868. 869. 870. 871. 872. 873. 874. 875. 876. 877. 878. 879. 880. 881. 882. 883. 884. 885. 886. 887. 888. 889. 890. 891. 892. 893. 894. 895. 896. 897. 898. 899. 900. 901. 902. 903. 904. 905. 906. 907. 908. 909. 910. 911. 912. 913. 914. 915. 916. 917. 918. 919. 920. 921. 922. 923. 924. 925. 926. 927. 928. 929. 930. 931. 932. 933. 934. 935. 936. 937. 938. 939. 940. 941. 942. 943. 944. 945. 946. 947. 948. 949. 950. 951. 952. 953. 954. 955. 956. 957. 958. 959. 960. 961. 962. 963. 964. 965. 966. 967. 968. 969. 970. 971. 972. 973. 974. 975. 976. 977. 978. 979. 980. 981. 982. 983. 984. 985. 986. 987. 988. 989. 990. 991. 992. 993. 994. 995. 996. 997. 998. 999. 1000.

No abatement by reason of death after hearing—This rule is new. It gives effect to the decision in the undermentioned cases ( )

In a marriage suit the judgment referred to in this rule is the judgment supporting the final decree and not the judgment supporting the preliminary decree and the hearing referred to in the rule is the hearing if any upon which judgment is to be delivered determining the plaintiff's right to a final decree. Therefore this rule does not apply where a party to a marriage suit dies before the application for a final decree is made and heard (a). See notes to r 3 above. Death of plaintiff after preliminary and before final decree and notes to r 4 above. Death of defendant after preliminary and before final decree.

7 [S 369] (1) The marriage of a female plaintiff or defendant shall not cause the suit to abate, but the suit may notwithstanding be proceeded with to judgment, and where the decree is against a female defendant, it may be executed against her alone.

(2) Where the husband is by law liable for the debts of his wife the decree may, with the permission of the Court, be executed against the husband also, and in case of judgment for the wife execution of the decree may, with such permission, be issued upon the application of the husband, where the husband is by law entitled to the subject matter of the decree.

Liability for wife's debts—See Pollock and Mulla's Indian Contract Act 18 and notes thereto.

8 [S 370] (1) The insolvency of a plaintiff in any suit which the assignee or receiver might maintain for the benefit of his creditors, shall not cause the suit to abate, unless such assignee or receiver declines to continue the suit or (unless for any special reason the Court otherwise directs) to give security for the costs thereof within such time as the Court may direct.

(2) Where the assignee or receiver neglects or refuses to continue the suit and to give such security within the time so ordered, the defendant may apply for the dismissal of the suit on the ground of the plaintiff's insolvency, and the Court may make an order dismissing the suit and awarding

(a) *Sudhansu Dutt v. Irfan* (1893) 19 C 133, 39 L J 410, 411, 1 B N 314, C 17, 1 B N 314 (1894) 14 L J 314, 1 B N 314 (1901) 6 Cal 101

(a) *Jwala Lal v. Lalla* (1914) 41 L J 405, 50 L C 59

has not commenced Under the old section the objection could be taken at or before the first hearing of the suit But the words at or before the first hearing have been omitted in the present rule the object being that the objections as to whether any person is or is not the legal representative of a deceased party should be taken before such person is made a party under rules 3 and 4 above (q) But if a person alleging himself to be a legal representative is brought on the record as such without notice to the other side the other side is entitled to raise the objection at the hearing (r)

Legal representative —See s 2 cl (11) and notes to r 3 above Legal representative of deceased plaintiff

Shall be determined —If the Court of first instance fails to determine the question as to who is the legal representative it is necessary for the appellate Court to determine it (s)

Objection as to representative character when to be taken—See notes above Alteration in the rule No 3

Effect of order under this rule—The Allahabad High Court at one time seemed to decide that this rule provides a summary procedure for appointing a person to be the legal representative of the deceased plaintiff for the purpose of prosecuting the suit and that an order appointing a legal representative does not operate as a final determination of the representative character of the person appointed in other words it does not operate as res judicata (t) But in a later case the same High Court disapproved of this decision and held that an order under this rule does operate as res judicata (u)

Power of Court to correct its order—The Court has power to correct an ex parte order made under this rule (v)

Appeal—No appeal lies from an order under this rule (w) But a party aggrieved by the order may object to the order in an appeal from the decree [s 10b] provided he was a party to the decree (x) But the order will not be set aside unless it is shown that it has affected the decision of the case (y) See notes to r 3 above Appeal

6 [New] Notwithstanding anything contained in the foregoing rules whether the cause of action survives or not there shall be no abatement by reason of the death of either party between the conclusion of the hearing and the pronouncing of the judgment but judgment may in such case be pronounced notwithstanding the death and shall have the same force and effect as if it had been pronounced before the death took place

|   |  |
|---|--|
| (g) See <i>Munth v Anantharajana</i> (1903) 3 M L J 4 L I v G J (1903) B 18 18 In both the cases the objection was taken at a late stage of the trial | (h) <i>I v I v Sahty</i> (1910) 41 P n 163 4 L C   |
| (i) <i>Patel v D</i> (1935) 44 M L J 60 67 I C 3 (23) 3 M 36  | (j) <i>D v Chandra Prasad</i> (1911) 3 All 1 C 93 <i>I v I v Sahty</i> (1910) 41 P n 163 4 L C 3 I v I v Sahty (1910) 41 P n 163 4 L C 3 I v I v Sahty (1910) 41 P n 163 4 L C 3 |
| (k) <i>Tij v D</i> (1935) 44 M L J 314  | (l) <i>S v H v I v I v Sahty</i> (1910) 41 P n 163 4 L C 3 I v I v Sahty (1910) 41 P n 163 4 L C 3   |
| (m) <i>I v I v Sahty</i> (1910) 41 P n 163 4 L C 3  | (n) <i>I v I v Sahty</i> (1910) 41 P n 163 4 L C 3   |
| (o) <i>I v I v Sahty</i> (1910) 41 P n 163 4 L C 3  | (p) <i>I v I v Sahty</i> (1910) 41 P n 163 4 L C 3   |
| (q) <i>I v I v Sahty</i> (1910) 41 P n 163 4 L C 3  | (r) <i>I v I v Sahty</i> (1910) 41 P n 163 4 L C 3   |
| (s) <i>I v I v Sahty</i> (1910) 41 P n 163 4 L C 3  | (t) <i>I v I v Sahty</i> (1910) 41 P n 163 4 L C 3   |
| (u) <i>I v I v Sahty</i> (1910) 41 P n 163 4 L C 3  | (v) <i>I v I v Sahty</i> (1910) 41 P n 163 4 L C 3   |
| (w) <i>I v I v Sahty</i> (1910) 41 P n 163 4 L C 3  | (x) <i>I v I v Sahty</i> (1910) 41 P n 163 4 L C 3   |
| (y) <i>I v I v Sahty</i> (1910) 41 P n 163 4 L C 3  | (z) <i>I v I v Sahty</i> (1910) 41 P n 163 4 L C 3   |

No abatement by reason of death after hearing.—This rule is new. It gives effect to the decision in the underlined case (1).

In a mortgage suit the judgment referred to in the rule is the judgment upholding the final decree and not the judgment upholding the preliminary decree and the hearing referred to in the rule is the hearing final up on which judgment is to be delivered leaving the plaintiff a right to a final decree. Therefore this rule does not apply where a party takes mortgage suit before the application for a final decree is made and heard (a). See note 1 r 3 above. Death of plaintiff after preliminary and before final decree and note 1 r 4 above. Death of defendant after preliminary and before final decree.

7 [S 369] (1) The marriage of a female plaintiff or defendant shall not cause the suit to abate, but the suit may notwithstanding be proceeded with to judgment, and where the decree is against a female defendant it may be executed against her alone.

(2) Where the husband is by law liable for the debts of his wife the decree may, with the permission of the Court, be executed against the husband also and in case of judgment for the wife execution of the decree may, with such permission, be issued upon the application of the husband, where the husband is by law entitled to the subject matter of the decree.

Liability for wife's debts—see *Idol* and *Mulla's Indian Contract Act*

8 [S 370] (1) The insolvency of a plaintiff in any suit which the assignee or receiver might maintain for the benefit of his creditors, shall not cause the suit to abate, unless such assignee or receiver declines to continue the suit or (unless for any special reason the Court otherwise directs) to give security for the costs thereof within such time as the Court may direct.

(2) Where the assignee or receiver neglects or refuses to continue the suit and to give such security within the time so ordered, the defendant may apply for the dismissal of the suit on the ground of the plaintiff's insolvency, and the Court may make an order dismissing the suit and awarding

[illegible]



8 to the defendant the costs which he has incurred in defending the same to be proved as a debt against the plaintiff's estate

**Insolvency of plaintiff**—This rule lays down the procedure to be followed when a plaintiff becomes insolvent. The suit should not be dismissed for default of appearance for O 9 r 8 cannot apply where there is known to be no person in the position of the plaintiff who has any right or duty to appear (b)

The procedure laid down in this rule applies to appeals see r 11 below. Thus if a decree is passed in a suit by A against B and B appeals from the decree and pending the appeal B becomes insolvent and the Official Assignee does not give security for costs the Court must under this rule dismiss the suit. If the plaintiff respondent has filed cross objections they could not be heard the dismissal of the suit being in effect an abatement of the appeal (c)

**Insolvency of defendant**—As to the case of the insolvency of a defendant in a presidency town it is now provided by sec 13 of the Presidency towns Insolvency Act 1909 that where a defendant to a suit has been adjudged an insolvent the Court may at any time after the making of the order of adjudication stay any suit or other proceeding pending against the insolvent before any Judge or Judges of the Court or in any other Court subject to the superintendence of the Court. The same section also enacts that any Court in which proceedings are pending against a debtor may on proof that an order of adjudication has been made against him under the Act either stay the proceedings or allow them to continue on such terms as it may think just. As to cases governed by the Provincial Insolvency Act 1900 see sec 29. See also notes to r 10 below.

**Insolvency of the defendant** joinder of Official Assignee

**Insolvency**—This rule does not apply to a case where the adjudication has been annulled. In such a case the dismissal for the non appearance of the plaintiff or the Official Assignee on the date fixed for the hearing is under O 9 r 9 (d)

**Limitation**—There is no limitation provided for the Official Assignee to appear and apply for substitution. Again where the plaintiff's name is struck off and the Official Assignee is substituted for the insolvent plaintiff and the adjudication is thereafter annulled there is no limitation for the plaintiff to appear and apply for the restoration of his name on the record (e)

**Insolvency of pauper applicant**—In the case of a pauper who has applied for leave to sue as a pauper the present rule can be applied only after leave to sue is granted but not before (f)

**Costs payable by plaintiff prior to his insolvency**—The general principle is that a person who comes in by representation whether it be an assignee in bankruptcy or as an executor or administrator of an original plaintiff where costs are due by the person whom he represents the suit cannot be carried on except upon the costs of the original suit being paid. It has accordingly been held that where a plaintiff who has been ordered to pay the costs of a proceeding in the suit becomes bankrupt and the suit is revived by his assignee the Court will stay proceedings until payment of the costs which the plaintiff has been ordered to pay (g). The security required of the Official Assignee is for costs incurred prior to the insolvency (h)

- (b) *Ku v Gopal v S Lal* (1905) 53 Cal 844  
99 I C 81 (1) A C 6  
(c) *Mul Chand v Doss & Co Ltd* (1902)  
10 Lah 205 110 I C 910 (28) A L 500  
(d) *Amrit Lal v Jankhai* (1900) Cal 217  
(e) *Khu v Lal v Rame Das* (1901) 43 All 61  
64 I C 5 (2) A. A. 361

- (f) *Cf Isabram v Kothar* (1905) 48 Mad L J  
491 87 I C 20 (25) A M 791  
(g) *Cook v H Thwa* (1899) L P 8 L 1 Cas 61  
(h) *Gul m H v Farally Abdulla* (1901)  
3 Bom L R 104 97 I C 2 (5)  
A B 533

**Costs of successful defendant**—Where a suit is continued by the assignee in bankruptcy and the defendant obtains judgment with costs the defendant is entitled to be paid all his costs in full and not merely the costs as from the date of insolvency with liberty to prove for the costs previously incurred (i)

**Practice**—As to the form of the order under this rule see the undermentioned case (j)

**Execution proceedings**—This rule does not apply to proceedings in execution See r 12 below

**Cause of action arising after insolvency**—A an undischarged insolvent sues B for brokerage earned by him subsequent to his adjudication B applies for security for costs If the Official Assignee has not intervened no order should be made for security for costs (l) It may be observed that under the Presidency towns Insolvency Act 1909 property acquired by an insolvent after adjudication does not vest in the Official Assignee until he intervenes and claims it on behalf of the creditors In cases governed by the Provincial Insolvency Act 1920 such property vests immediately on the making of order of adjudication

**9. [Ss 371, 372A] (1)** Where a suit abates or is dismissed under this Order, no fresh suit shall be brought on the same cause of action

(2) The plaintiff or the person claiming to be the legal representative of a deceased plaintiff or the assignee or the receiver in the case of an insolvent plaintiff may apply for an order to set aside the abatement or dismissal, and if it is proved that he was prevented by any sufficient cause from continuing the suit, the Court shall set aside the abatement or dismissal upon such terms as to costs or otherwise as it thinks fit

(3) The provisions of section 5 of the Indian Limitation Act 1877, shall apply to applications under sub rule (2)

**Sub rule (1) No fresh suit on the same cause of action**—This rule prohibits a fresh suit on the same cause of action As to the meaning of Cause of action see notes to s 20 above Cause of action

A a member of a joint Hindu family sues B for redemption of a mortgage of ancestral property executed by A to B A then dies A's heirs are not brought on the record and the suit abates Subsequently A's son and grandsons institute another suit against B for redemption of the same mortgage There is no indication that A's suit was brought by him in a representative capacity that is as representing the joint family The second suit is not barred (l)

**Sub rule (2) Who may apply under this rule**—The following persons may apply under sub r (2) namely (1) the plaintiff where a suit has abated under

(i) *L. d. n. Dr. pery Stores* [1898] Ch 684  
 (j) *Flowing Boats v. Boynton* (1884) 4  
 App Cas 33 (a.c. of executors) See  
 also *Datoobhoy v. Velu* (1899) 1 Bom  
 L R 83

(j) *Leff v. Shaml* (189) 16 Bom 404  
 (k) *Murray v. East Bengal Milk and Flotilla Co*  
*Ld* (1919) 46 Cal 156 43 I C 6  
 (l) *P. mchandra v. Shripatrao* (1916) 40 Bom  
 49 33 I C 71

**r 9 r 4 (3) (m)** (2) *the legal representative of a deceased plaintiff* where a suit has abated under r 3 (2) (3) *the assignee of an insolvent plaintiff* where a suit is dismissed under r 8 (2)

**Limitation**—An application under this rule for an order to set aside an abatement must be made within 60 days from the date of the abatement [Limitation Act 1908 sch I art 77] Similarly an application for an order to set aside the dismissal of a suit must be made within 60 days from the date of the order of dismissal [Ib Art 172] If no application is made within 60 days the Court has the power under s 5 of the Limitation Act to admit the application after the expiry of that period if the applicant satisfies the Court that he had sufficient cause for not making the application within 60 days See sub r (3) In an Oudh case a decree was passed against a defendant in ignorance of his death but on application of his legal representatives the decree was treated as a nullity delay was excused the representatives impleaded and the appeal heard *de novo* (n)

**Sub rule (2) Sufficient cause**—An application to bring upon the record the legal representative of a deceased plaintiff must be made within 90 days from the date of the death of the deceased [Limitation Act 1908 sch I art 176] An application to bring upon the record the legal representative of a deceased defendant must also be made within 90 days from the date of the death of the deceased [Ib Art 177] If no application is made within the prescribed period the suit abates in the case of a deceased plaintiff under r 3 (2) and in the case of a deceased defendant under r 4 (3) But the plaintiff or the person claiming to be the legal representative of a deceased plaintiff as the case may be may apply under r (9) (2) for an order to set aside the abatement The application to set aside the abatement must be made within 60 days from the date of the abatement If no application is made within 60 days the Court may under s 5 of the Limitation Act admit the application if the applicant satisfies the Court that he had sufficient cause for not making the application within 60 days see sub r (3)

An abatement ought not to be set aside as a matter of course or lightly The reason is that when a suit abates the setting aside of the abatement deprives the party in whose favour the abatement operates of a valuable right Under sub r (9) the applicant has to satisfy the Court that he was prevented by some sufficient cause from making the application to bring the legal representative of the deceased upon the record within 90 days from the date of the death of the deceased Under sub r (3) the applicant has to satisfy the Court that he had sufficient cause for not making the application to set aside the abatement within 60 days from the date of abatement (o) The two sub rules are distinct In dealing with an application under sub r (2) the Court has to decide whether there was sufficient cause for not bringing the legal representative of the deceased upon the record within 90 days from the date of the death of the deceased independently of sub rule (3) (p)

Ignorance of the death of the deceased (q) or of the whereabouts of the legal representatives of the deceased (r) may be a sufficient cause for excusing the delay unless the ignorance was due to negligence Where the defendants appealed from a

(m) *Secretary of State v Jow for Lal* (1914) 36 All 43 5 I C 43 *Brj I dar S gh v* *sh R m* (1917) 44 I A 418 2 43 Cal 94 104 109 (1917) 1 unj Rec no 101 p 393 4 I C 43  
( ) *K'hd v Ahar* (19 7) 2 Luck 59 101 I C 841 (2) A O 21  
(o) *S i C h d a v Ma h r No e & L me Co* (19 1) 40 Cal 6 67 I C 917 ( ) A C 33  
(p) *La Amiv Muhammad* (1900) 4 All 540 59 I C 903

(q) *D ya S gh v B la S gh* (1916) 14 Rec no 118 p 360 34 I C 7 *Za nab Ebi v R hla* (1917) 1 unj Rec no 3 p 90 32 I C 7 *Jam v Sarj* (1919) 1 unj 1 c no 67 p 165 5 I C 510 CA *Jal v A la* (19 1) 4 Lah L J 1 1 67 I C 596 (27) A L 61 *Jor la R m v Hari* (19 1) 5 Lah 0 80 I C 690 (24) A L 4 2 *Faya v I ja Jyor* (1922) C W 10 75 I C 5 1 4) A L 90  
(r) *Munshi Poo v Ba lha* (19 4) 6 Lah L J 19 80 I C 694 (4) A L 461

decree passed against them and one of the defendants died pending the appeal and the legal representative of the deceased was under the impression that the co defendants were prosecuting the appeal and challenging the validity of the entire decree it was held that it was a sufficient cause for excusing the delay in making the application to bring him on the record in place of the deceased (j)

Sub rule (3)—See notes above Sub rule (2) Sufficient Cause

Substitution without setting aside abatement—The Patna High Court has held that where a sole defendant dies and the suit has abated no order can be made for substituting his legal representative in his place until the abatement has been set aside under this rule (t) The Bombay High Court would treat the omission to set aside the abatement as merely a formal defect (u)

Minor and abatement—Where an application on behalf of a minor to be brought on the record in place of his deceased father who was the plaintiff in the suit was dismissed under r 3 above as being time barred and the minor then made a second application to be brought on the record and that application was also dismissed it was held that the lower Court should have in the circumstances of the case treated the second application as one under r 9 to set aside the abatement and that it should have in the circumstances of the case set aside the abatement (v)

Remand—When the High Court in second appeal declares the first appeal to have abated it has no power to set aside the abatement but should remand the case to the lower Appellate Court for disposal under this rule (x)

Cause of action in revived suit.—Where an abatement is set aside under this rule the suit is revived No fresh cause of action can be imported into the revived suit for the proceedings in the revived suit are a continuation of the proceedings in the original suit (z)

Appeal—An appeal lies under the Code from an order refusing to set aside the abatement or dismissal of a suit O 43 r 1 (k) But no appeal lies under the Code from an order *setting aside* an abatement But it has been held that if the order setting aside the abatement is passed without jurisdiction and is really not one under r 9 it is appealable or at least open to revision (y)

Letters Patent appeal—The High Court of Allahabad has held that an appeal lies under cl 10 of the Letters Patent of that Court (corresponding with cl 15 of the Letters Patent of the High Court of Calcutta from an order of a single judge of the High Court refusing to set aside the abatement of an appeal The decision proceeds upon two grounds namely (1) that an order rejecting the application to set aside an abatement would if unappealable be a final order determining once and for all the rights of parties and (2) that an appeal was allowed by the Code to the High Court from an order of a District Judge refusing to set aside an abatement of a suit and it would be strange if there was permission to appeal as undoubtedly there was from the lower appellate Court to the High Court that there should not also be the right of appeal not merely in a suit but when the question arose in a Court of appeal (z)

The High Court of Calcutta has held that an order *setting aside* the abatement of a suit is a judgment within the meaning of cl 15 of the Letters Patent and is

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| (r) <i>Chand a Kun v S adhyaman</i> (1909) 35       | (w) <i>Ama sang v D</i> (19 5) 27 Bom L R 91    |
| (l) 418 21 C 412                                    | 86 I C 31 (25) A B 290                          |
| (t) <i>Bib Khoza m v Official Liquidator</i> (19 3) | (x) <i>Sham Chand v Bhajaram</i> (189 ) - Cal 9 |
| PA 168 84 1 C 1063 (23) A B 515                     | (y) <i>Seth nma v Je lata</i> (10 4) 4 Mad LJ   |
| (u) <i>L kahmidas v Iethu ni</i> (13 3) 47 Bom 9    | 235 80 I C 397 (24) A M 713                     |
| 75 I C *83 (2) A B 449                              | (z) <i>Sadq Ali v A w Ah</i> (19 3) 45 All 66   |
| (v) <i>Ijayar ng v Shroffs</i> (13 4) 6 Bom         | 01 C 80 (23) A A 44                             |
| L R 3 8 80 I C 16 (14) A B 416                      |   |

appealable as such the reason given being that when a suit has abated the setting aside of the abatement deprives the party in whose favour the abatement operates of a valuable right (a)

**10 [S 372]** (1) In other cases of an assignment, creation or devolution of any interest during the pendency of a suit, the suit may, by leave of the Court, be continued by or against the person to or upon whom such interest has come or devolved

(2) The attachment of a decree pending an appeal therefrom shall be deemed to be an interest entitling the person who procured such attachment to the benefit of sub rule (1)

**Alterations in the rule—**(1) The words either in addition to or in substitution for the person from whom it has passed which occurred in sec 372 of the Code of 1859 after the words interest has come or devolved have been omitted. It would seem to follow from some of the observations of their Lordships of the Privy Council in the undermentioned case (b) that the effect of the omission of those words is that a transferee *pendente lite* cannot under this Code be added as a party but that he may be substituted for his transferor. It is not clear whether their Lordships intended to go that length. If they did a difficulty would arise in every case where a mortgagee *pendente lite* applied to be joined as a party.

(2) Sub rule (2) is new. See notes below under the heading Sub rule (2)

**Other cases of assignment creation or devolution of interest—**It will be observed that the preceding rules deal with certain specified cases of assignment creation and devolution of interest. Rule 8 deals with the case of assignment on the insolvency of a plaintiff rule 7 with the case of creation of an interest in a husband on marriage and rules 2 3 and 4 with the case of devolution of interest on the death of a party to a suit. The present rule provides for cases of assignment creation and devolution of interest *other than* those mentioned above (c). See notes below Devolution of interest

**Assignment of interest—**This includes a sale or a mortgage or a lease (d) of the property in suit also an assignment of a mortgage (e)

**Devolution of interest representative suits—**Rules 2 3 and 4 relate to cases of devolution of interest on the death of a plaintiff or a defendant. These rules however do not apply where a suit is brought by or against a person in his representative character e.g. by or against the head of a mutt or the manager of a temple as such. In such a case the present rule applies so that if the head of the mutt or manager of the temple dies his successor may be substituted in his place. But the rule is not confined to devolution of interest by death. It also applies if the head of the mutt or manager of the temple resigns his office or is removed from office (f). In such a case also the

- (a) *Sarat Chandra v. Math* 51 A L J 100 (1904) 1 C 917 (1904) 1 C 33  
(b) *Madhav v. P. Mal* (1904) 49 I A 202 6 11 at 81 588 63 I C 93 (1904) 1 C 304  
(c) *Rajgopal Das v. N. K. (1904) 9 C W N 171 173 41 Bahad v. Rajgopal (1907) 49 All 310 100 I C 248 (1907) 1 A A 2 S. L. J. 41 v. P. m. dasu (1907) 43 Mad*

- 80 63 I C 94 (1903) A M 37 overruled on both points by *Perumal v. Perumal* (1908) 51 Mad 61 11 I C 116 (1908) A M 914  
(d) *Ra. Kuma Lal v. Raja M. K. d. S. M. (1916) 11 I L J 696 34 I C 37*  
(e) *Ma. lead v. Kuman* (1906) 30 Bom 350 37 8  
(f) *Sourindra v. S. Romini* (1901) 2 Cal 171

successor to the head of the mutt (g) or to the manager of the temple (h) may be substituted as a party under this rule. But if the successor does not apply to be substituted as a party the original plaintiff may continue the suit and his successor will be bound by the result of the litigation (i). Where during the pendency of a suit brought by the manager of an encumbered estate the estate was released from management and restored to the owners it was held that the owners could apply under this rule to be made plaintiff in place of the manager (j).

**Interest**—The word interest in this rule means interest in the property the subject matter of the suit (l).

### Illustrations

1. A sues B for recovery of possession of certain property. Pending the suit A sells his interest in the property to C. C may apply under this rule to have his name substituted as plaintiff in A's place.

2. A sues the firm of B & C to recover Rs. 5,000. Pending the suit the firm of B & C transfers all its assets and liabilities to the firm of X & Y. Thereupon A applies to the Court under this rule to have the firm of X & Y joined as a party defendant. The firm of X & Y should not be joined as a party for the assignment cannot be said in any sense to be an assignment of the defendant's interest in the subject matter of the suit. *Harish Chandra v Chandpore Co Ltd* (1903) 30 Cal 961. [Here the subject matter of the suit is the amount claimed by A, namely Rs. 5,000.]

**Insolvency of defendant. Joinder of Official Assignee**—This section applies to the devolution of interest by reason of an order of adjudication (k). See *Mulla's Law of Insolvency in British India* p. 486 *et seq*.

(a) A sues B for recovery of possession of certain immovable property. The defence is that B is the full owner of the property. Pending the suit B is adjudged insolvent and his estate vests in the Official Assignee. The Official Assignee is entitled to be substituted as a party defendant under this rule. The reason is that the order of adjudication operates as a statutory transfer of the interest of the insolvent in the subject matter of the suit to the Official Assignee. see *Punithavelu v Bhashyam* (1902) 20 Mad 406. *Subbaya Bros v J. K. Munuswami Aiyar and Sons* (1906) 51 Mad L J 613.

(b) If the Official Assignee refuses to defend a suit relating to the insolvent's property the insolvent is not entitled to defend the suit independently of the Official Assignee. *Tribhovanadas v Abdulally* (1914) 39 Bom 568. 28 I C 506. see also *Surendra Nath v Thripura* (1921) 3 C W N 304. 109 I C 282 (28) A C 215. As to the old law on the subject see the undermentioned case (m).

(c) A mortgages his property to B. B sues A for a sale of the mortgaged property. Pending the suit A is adjudged insolvent. The Official Assignee or Receiver is a necessary party to the suit. *Kala Chand v Jagannath* (1927) 54 I A 190. 54 Cal 590 (27) A PC 108.

(d) A sues B to recover a debt or damages for breach of contract. Pending the suit B is adjudged insolvent and his property vests in the Official Assignee. Here there is a mere money claim against the insolvent and no vesting in the Official Assignee of any interest in the subject matter of the suit within the meaning of this rule. The Official Assignee therefore should not be added or substituted as a party defendant to the suit. *Miller v Budh Singh* (1891) 18 Cal 43. *Chanmull v Ranee Soondery* (1895) 23 Cal

(g) *Ratna v A. Am Lal* (1914) 46 M d L J 341. 84 I C 200 (24) A M 615.

(h) *S. deenan v Vaidya Aha* (1914) 4 Mad 103. 1 C 103 (1) A M 40.

(i) *R. Ch. ran v Bura Nath* (1914) 20 Cal L J 107. 111 26 I C 410.

(j) *S. S. Rao v S. Ramon* (1901) 29 Cal 111. *M. A. I. ad v. A. S.* (1906) 30 Bom 0.

(k) *Harish Chandra v Chandpore Co Ltd* (1903) 30 Cal 961.

(l) *Punithavelu v Bhashyam* (1902) 20 Mad 406. 613.

(m) *Hunt v. re* (1864) 1 Bom H C A C 21.

10 259 *Punithatelu v Bhashyam* (1902) 25 Mad 406 421 *Subbayar Bros v J K Munnuswami Aiyar and Sons* (1926) 51 Mad L J 613 See notes above Interest

**Annulment of order of adjudication**—Where a suit is brought by the Official Assignee and the order of adjudication is annulled pending the suit the insolvent is entitled to be substituted as plaintiff under this rule (n)

**During the pendency of a suit**—These words mean before a final decree or order has been passed or made in the suit [see the marginal note to the rule] Hence the provisions of this rule apply if the assignment creation or devolution of interest takes place before a final decree or order is passed or made in the suit. In the case of an appeal the provisions of this rule apply if the assignment etc takes place before a final decree or order is passed or made in the appeal [see r 11 below] Though a suit may be compromised and the terms of the compromise filed in Court the suit will be deemed to be pending until a decree is passed in terms of the compromise. Until the decree is passed a transferee *pendente lite* is entitled to apply under this rule to be joined as a party (o). If he is joined as a party he is entitled to object to a decree being passed in terms of the compromise arrived at between his transferor and the opposite party (p). But if he is not joined as a party he is bound by the decree passed on the compromise (q).

#### Illustrations

1 A decree is passed in a suit respecting a will that a scheme should be settled. Before the scheme is settled and a final order is made the interest of one of the parties to the suit passes by devolution to A B. A B may be brought on the record under this rule. *Gocool Chunder v Administrator General* (1880) 5 Cal 726

2 The devolution of the interest of a party to a suit after an order has been made directing the Commissioner to take accounts but before the passing of the final decree is within this rule. *Keshub Roy v Arishto Mitter* (1903) 30 Cal 609

3 The assignment of the interest of a mortgagee in a suit for sale of the mortgaged property after a preliminary decree for sale but before the passing of the final decree is within this rule. *Chunni Lal v Abdul Ali Khan* (1901) 23 All 331

4 In a suit by A against B to recover certain immovable property a decree is passed for A. B appeals from the decree. Pending the appeal A sells the property to C. C may be made a party to the appeal under this rule. *Rajaram Bhagrat v Jibai* (1885) 9 Bom 151. *Pandit Gocul Chand v Awar Sarat* (1896) 18 All 285

5 A sues B to recover Rs 5000 and a decree is passed for him. B appeals from the decree. Pending the appeal A assigns the decree to C. C may be made a party to the appeal under this rule. *Durga Prasad in the matter of* (1900) 22 All 231

6 A sues B for redemption of a mortgage. A preliminary decree for redemption is passed and a time is fixed within which the mortgage money is to be paid by A into Court. The money is not paid by A within the time fixed by the Court nor is any application made by A under O 34 r 8 (4) for a decree for sale. A then sells the mortgaged property to C. This amounts to an assignment pending the suit so as to entitle C to be brought on the record as a party under this rule. *Muhammad v Jaran* (1910) 37 All 226 27 I C 771

7 A sues B for possession of certain land and mesne profits. Pending the suit B lets the lands to C and delivers possession to him. A decree is then passed for A for possession and mesne profits. After the decree C at B's request delivers possession of the

( ) *Hasan v C Maitland* (1908) 3 Bom 313  
( ) *Lakshmi v K. J. J. J.* (1923) C.W.N. 755 80 J.C. 533 (4) A.C. 188

(p) *Verar gh v C. J. J.* (1920) 43 Mad 3  
(q) *B. J. J. v B. J. J.* (1923) Bom 105 I.C. 17 (28) A.B. 65.

land to A. A then applies in execution proceedings to join C as a party to the suit so as to compel C to account for profits which he had received from the land. C should not be joined as a party for it cannot be said that B's liability for mesne profits has devolved upon C within the meaning of this rule. *Manindra v. Ram Lal* (1922) 49 I. A. 220. 1 Pat. 581. 68 I. C. 973. (22) A. P. C. 304.

**Application under this rule when to be made**—This rule only governs an application to *continue* a suit. An application by a transferee of the interest of a party made *after the termination* of a suit is not within this rule (r). But where an appeal is preferred from the decree an application under this rule can be made to the appellate Court even though the devolution of interest occurred when the case was pending in the trial Court (s).

### Illustration

4 sues B to establish his right to certain property. Pending the suit B mortgages the property to C. A decree is then passed in favour of A. B does not appeal from the decree. C being desirous of appealing from the decree applies to be made a party to the suit. The suit having terminated C should not be joined as a party to the suit. He may however appeal from the decree under sec. 146 as a person claiming under B within the meaning of that section. *Sivaramaswami v. Lakshmi* (1918) 41 Mad 510 48 I C 840.

**Laches**—An applicant under this rule is not entitled to leave to be joined as a party as a matter of right. The Court has a discretion in the matter and it may refuse leave on the ground of laches or delay. (1)

Sub rule 2—*A* obtains a decree against *B* *B* appeals from the decree Pending the appeal *C* who holds a decree against *A* attaches the decrees obtained by *A* against *B* *C* may be made a party under this rule. See O 21 r 53.

**No new suit**—It is clear from the terms of this rule that when a party is brought on the record under this rule there is as regards him no new suit at all. He is brought on the record as a party to a suit that has already been instituted and that suit is continued by or against him. His substitution as a party does not initiate as regards him a new proceeding. (u) See notes below Limitation.

**Trial Court can bring assignee on record pending appeal**—The Court of first instance has jurisdiction to bring on record the assignee of a party to the suit though there may be an appeal pending in the appellate Court from an interlocutory order made by the Court of first instance (1)

Transfer of decree—This rule does not apply to transfers of decrees O 21  
 c 16 applies to such transfers (u)

Doctrine of lis pendens.—In this connection may be noted the provisions of sec. 52 of the Transfer of Property Act 1889 which runs as follows: During the active prosecution of a contentious suit or proceeding in which any right to any

prosecution of a contentious suit or proceeding in which any right to any immovable property is directly and specifically in question the property cannot be transferred or otherwise dealt with by any party to the suit or proceeding so as to affect the rights of any other party thereto under any decree or order which may be made therein except under the authority of the Court and on such terms as it may impose.

(c) *Sid amar mitu* *Z. Ish* (1918) 41 Mad  
510 451 C 840 *U. Kector* *J. M. Zaff* *all*  
*It's a* *By* *M. (1826)* *all* *56*  
*U. Kector* *J. M. Zaff* (1921) 49 *M. d*  
*J. J. 04* *81* *C. 0* *69* *M. 45*  
[applicatn n after sex c by monita c  
in for jo d a a party to sec re accou t  
in Court in part pay nt]

(d) *R. Jan* *J. J. 19* (19) 27 *CW* *10*  
*J. J. C. 2* (24) *AC* 90

(t) *L 1 Ha 1 Ad jamoni* (19 3) 27 C W N  
7 80 I C 35 (-4) A C 188

(u) *Cf in Lal v Abdul Ali* (1901) 23 All  
3 3

(v) *Bhog Lal v Darasha* (19 3) 5 Bom L R  
304 75 I C 743 (-3) A V 303

(w) *Musammam t Gulab Auer v Syed Mohamed*  
(19 1) 6 Pat L J 335 6 I C 30 ( 1)  
A 1 189



**Limitation**—The right to apply under this rule accrues from day to day and is not therefore barred by lapse of time. An application therefore to be added or substituted as a party under this rule may be made at any time (x).

**Appeal**—Under the Code of 1832 an appeal was allowed from an order giving leave to be joined as a party but none from an order refusing such leave (y). Under the present Code [O 43 r 1 (1)] an appeal lies from an order giving or refusing to give leave ( ). The High Court of Madras has held that an order purporting to be passed under this rule is appealable though on the facts the order should not have been passed under this rule (a).

**Letters Patent Appeal**—An order refusing leave to be joined as a party is a judgment within the meaning of cl 15 of the Letters Patent and is appealable as such (b).

**11 [S 582, 1st para]** In the application of this Order to appeals so far as may be, the word “plaintiff” shall be held to include an appellant, the word “defendant” a respondent, and the word “suit” an appeal.

Application of Order to appeals

**12 [New]** Nothing in rules 3, 4 and 8 shall apply to proceedings in execution of a decree or order.

Application of Order to proceedings

**Execution proceedings**—Rules 3 and 4 relate to the death of a party pending a suit or appeal. Rule 8 relates to the insolvency of a plaintiff pending a suit and the insolvency of an appellant pending an appeal. The present rule provides that nothing in rules 3, 4 and 8 shall apply to proceedings in execution of a decree. It sets at rest the conflict on the question whether the provisions relating to the abatement of suits and appeals apply to proceedings in execution.

#### Illustrations

(1) *A* sues *B*. The suit is dismissed. After the dismissal *A* dies leaving a will of which *C* is the executor. *C* may appeal from the decree without applying under r 3 to be substituted for *A*. The reason is that *A* having died after the termination of the suit r 3 does not apply. see *Ramanada v Vinatchi* (1881) 3 Mad 236.

(2) *A* sues *B* and obtains a decree against him. *A* then applies for execution of the decree against *B*. *B* dies during the pendency of the execution proceedings. Rule 4 does not apply. *A* should proceed under sec 50 and O 21 r 2.

(3) *A* sues *B* and obtains a decree against him. *A* applies for execution of the decree and dies during the pendency of execution proceedings. *A*'s legal representative cannot be substituted on the record to continue the proceeding. Rule 3 does not apply but the legal representative may under O 21 r 16 make a fresh application for execution. *Palaniappa v Valliammai* (1901) 50 Mad 1 99 I C 627 (2) A M 184. *Akhoy v Surendra* (1926) 30 Cal W N 73 96 I C 378 (26) A C 907. *Dayanath v Ram Bharos* (1927) 49 All 109 104 I C 116 (2) A A 160 F B. *Murad Mahomed v Sujai Mirza* (1928) 3 Luck 121 105 I C 611 (28) A O 30.

(x) *Kedath v Harra Choudhary* (1908) 38 Cal 40. *Krishna Rao v Krishna Misra* (1903) 30 Cal 605. *Lajpati v Jai Prakash* (1922) 2 C W N 10 5 I C 55 (4) A C 90.  
(y) *Jama v Bhai v Chakrabarti* (1901) 24 All 53.

(2) *Madras Zoroastrian Co. Ltd v Narsh* (1917) 54 Cal 116 101 I C 81 (25) A C 1.  
(a) *Murshid v C. of Allah* (1921) 44 Mad 919 69 I C 337 (1) A M 599 (F B).  
(b) *Commisariat of Int. v Subji* (1901) 4 Mad 75.

(4) A sues B and obtains a decree against him. A then applies for execution of the decree against B and an order is made in execution proceedings. B appeals from the order. Pending the appeal B dies. The appeal being one from an order in execution proceedings r 4 does not apply and there can be no abatement of the appeal. *Mir Khan v Sharfu* (1923) 5 Lah L J 163. 4 I C 577 (23) A L 560.

(5) A obtains a decree against B. After the decree B is adjudicated an insolvent. A then applies for execution of the decree against the Official Assignee. A should proceed under O 21.

With reference to illustrations (3) and (4) it should be noted that in an appeal from an order in execution proceedings the legal representatives of a deceased party may be substituted (c).

**Mesne profits.** A obtains a decree against B for possession and mesne profits. B dies pending the inquiry into mesne profits. Under the Code of 1882 an inquiry as to mesne profits was a proceeding in execution and hence there could be no abatement of the proceeding under that Code. *Kedarnath v Anant Prasad* (1925) 2 I A 188 4 Pat 307 33 I C 482 (25) A PC 117. Under the present Code an inquiry as to mesne profits is an inquiry pending the suit, hence r 4 applies and B's legal representative should be brought on the record. See notes to O 20 r 12. Inquiry as to mesne profits no longer a proceeding in execution.

**Death of party after preliminary and before final decree.**—See notes to r 3 above and notes to r 4.

## ORDER XXIII

### *Withdrawal and Adjustment of Suits*

**1 [S 73]** (1) At any time after the institution of a suit the plaintiff may, as against all or any of the defendants, withdraw his suit or abandon part of his claim.

Withdrawal of suit or abandonment of part of claim

(2) Where the Court is satisfied—

(a) that a suit must fail by reason of some formal defect, or

(b) that there are other sufficient grounds for allowing the plaintiff to institute a fresh suit for the subject matter of a suit or part of a claim,

it may, on such terms as it thinks fit, grant the plaintiff permission to withdraw from such suit or abandon such part of a claim with liberty to institute a fresh suit in respect of the subject matter of such suit or such part of a claim.

(3) Where the plaintiff withdraws from a suit, or abandons part of a claim, without the permission referred to in

1 a case however the Court should not act under this rule but return the plaint under O 7 r 10 to the plaintiff to be presented to the proper Court (u) But O 7 r 10 does not apply to Chartered High Courts In the case therefore of a Chartered High Court the Court may it seems act under this rule

Other sufficient grounds —Sec 97 of the Code of 1859 ran as follows —

If the plaintiff at any time before final judgment satisfies the Court that there are sufficient grounds for permitting him to withdraw from the suit with liberty to bring a fresh suit for the same matter it shall be competent to the Court to grant such permission on such terms as to costs or otherwise as it may deem proper

It is to be noted that sec 97 of the Code of 1859 did not contain the words some formal defect which occur in the present Code In *Walson v Collector of Rayshaye* (v) the plaintiff sued the defendant to set aside an auction sale of a putnee Taluk for arrears of rent A preliminary issue was framed whether the plaintiff was in a position to sue A commission was issued for the examination of witnesses but it was returned unexecuted as the witnesses had not been presented for examination Upon this the Court finding no excuse for the plaintiff's neglect dismissed the suit for want of evidence but with a reservation that the order made was not to be a bar to the plaintiff from proceeding as if the action has not been brought The plaintiff then brought a fresh suit in respect of the same cause of action The High Court of Bengal held that the second suit was barred as *res judicata* under s 2 of the Code of 1859 This decision was affirmed on appeal by the Privy Council In the course of the judgment their Lordships of the Privy Council referring apparently to sec 97 of the Code of 1859 said as follows —

There is a proceeding in those Courts (Courts of India) called a non suit which operates as a dismissal of the suit without barring the right of the party to litigate the matter in a fresh suit But that seems to be limited to cases of misjoinder either of parties or matters in contest in the suit to cases in which a material document has been rejected because it has not borne proper stamp and to cases in which there has been an erroneous valuation of the subject of the suit In all those cases the suit fails by reason of some point of form but their Lordships are aware of no case in which upon an issue joined and the party having failed to produce the evidence which he was bound to produce in support of that issue liberty has been given to him to bring a second suit except in the particular instance that is now before them

The passage cited above indicates their Lordships' view of the meaning of the words sufficient grounds in sec 9 of the Code of 1859 This decision was followed by the High Court of Bengal in *Madan Ram v I rail* (x) where it was held that a plaintiff cannot be permitted to withdraw with liberty to bring a fresh suit after issues have been joined and he has failed to produce the evidence to support his claim *Madan Ram* a case was also a case under the Code of 1859 The words by reason of some formal defect appeared for the first time in sec 313 of the Code of 1877 The decision in *Walson* a case was also followed by the High Court of Calcutta in *Kharda Co Ltd v Doorga Charan* (y) a case under the present Code The question in that case was whether a plaintiff can be permitted to withdraw from the suit with liberty to bring a fresh suit after he has adduced all his evidence and finds that the evidence is insufficient to establish his case It was contended for the plaintiff that the words other sufficient grounds were wide enough to entitle the Court to allow the plaintiff to withdraw from the suit under any circumstances that might be deemed sufficient by the Court but this contention was overruled

( ) (1878) 4 J M S 1 03 02 461 ( ) 65 *supra* (w) (184) 1 W R 31 (Cl. Ind)  
( ) (1869) 13 M 1 A 100 3 Ind. L. R. 1 C 44 ( ) (1909) 11 Cal L J 45 5 I C 1

and it was held that the Court had no power to allow a plaintiff to withdraw from the suit after evidence had been adduced and the evidence was found to be insufficient to support his case. In the course of his judgment Mookerji J. after referring to clauses (a) and (b) of sub rule (2) said: "The intention plainly is that a ground indicated in clause (b) must be of the same nature as the ground specified in clause (a). This decision has been followed by the same High Court in subsequent cases (g). The High Courts of Patna (2) and Lahore (a) have followed the Calcutta decisions. The Oudh Court also holds that other sufficient grounds must be *ejusdem generis* with a formal defect (b). The High Court of Bombay held in some cases that the Court should not allow a suit to be withdrawn after the parties were ready for trial if such withdrawal might operate to the prejudice of the defendant (c). But this view was dissented from in a later case in which the Court followed the Calcutta decisions (d). In a recent case the same High Court held that it is wrong to grant leave to withdraw a suit with liberty to file a fresh suit after the evidence is concluded though the hearing may be adjourned for final arguments (e). In Allahabad (f) leave to withdraw has been granted where the plaintiff fails to give formal proof of a document which is essential for his success. In Madras there is a conflict of opinion whether the words 'other sufficient grounds' mean grounds analogous to a formal defect as held in Calcutta or include grounds which may not be analogous to a formal defect. In one case (g) the High Court held that the words 'other sufficient grounds' must be *ejusdem generis* with the words 'some formal defect' and that the Court had no power under this rule to give leave to the plaintiff after a substantial portion of his evidence had been heard. In a later case (h) however Sadashiva Ayyar J. said that the words 'other sufficient grounds' were not *ejusdem generis* with the words 'some formal defect' and that they included grounds which might not be analogous to a formal defect and that even if they did not objection to a suit on the ground of jurisdiction or insufficient Court fees were analogous to formal defects. It appears therefore that the majority of Judges are in favour of the view that the mere inability of the plaintiff to prove his case is not a sufficient ground within the meaning of this rule for giving him leave to withdraw with liberty to institute a fresh suit.

The Calcutta High Court has held that the plaintiff should not be allowed to withdraw his suit with liberty to bring a fresh suit after the suit has been heard and decided on the merits (i). Where a plaintiff sought to recover a sum of money upon certain allegations which were found untrue by the first Court and the first Court dismissed the suit and on appeal the District Judge came to the same conclusion but granted leave to the plaintiff to withdraw from the suit with liberty to institute a fresh suit the High Court held that the order should not have been made and set it aside (j).

On such terms as it thinks fit.—Where leave is granted to a plaintiff to withdraw from a suit with liberty to institute a fresh suit the defendant is

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>(j) <i>Mabulia v. P. Hemrao</i> (1910) 11 Cal L J 51 61 C 69 <i>Kal J. a. a. v. J. v. cha</i> (1917) 44 C 1 36 33 I C 60 <i>H. olat v. Uday</i> (191) 16 C W N 10 141 C 33 But see <i>Hrida v. R. m. n. tra</i> (191) 48 C 1 358 at p. 141 91 C 806 (1) A C 34 (F B) [order of Reference to F B B nch]</p> <p>(2) <i>Male d. a. l. v. S. ng. L. l.</i> (1914) 3 Pat L J 61 491 C 197 <i>Uch. v. B. s. a.</i> (1921) 61 t L J 112 61 I C 632 (1) A P 4</p> <p>( ) <i>Ishar Das v. Lal Singh</i> (19 ) Lah L J 290 90 I C 63 (5) A L 43</p> <p>(b) <i>T. J. Chab. y. v. Steo. Dajit</i> (19 8) 3 Luck 403 10 I C 827 ( ) A O 48</p> <p>(c) <i>Mah p. t. v. Nathu</i> (1909) 33 B m 7 6 41 C B 1 <i>I. ash. bai. v. A. l. p.</i> (1912) 3 W. va. 64 11 C 25 (See e. G. n. I. aft. r. th. h. ar. l. g. was finished)</p> | <p><i>Se. aha. v. a. das v. St. t. tal</i> (19 1) 45 Bom 37 334 39 68 I C 1004 (1) A B 257</p> <p>(d) <i>Lala Purnya t. v. Motiram</i> (19 6) 50 Bom 10 94 I C 777 ( ) A B 31</p> <p>(e) <i>Bhikaji v. Anant</i> (19 9) 31 Bom L R 613 ( ) A B 30</p> <p>(f) <i>Jh. l. L. v. B. sh. A. Das</i> (1918) 40 All 61 613 614 46 I C 71 <i>Cha. d. r. ka. L. t. v. S. m. ath</i> (19 8) 50 All 83 115 I C 14 ( ) A A 133</p> <p>(g) <i>i. je. v. Cop. n. a.</i> (1914) - Mad L J 480 26 I C 5</p> <p>(h) <i>Kannusawami v. Jagathan bai</i> (1918) 41 Mad 61 0 48 I C 26</p> <p>(i) <i>Ran. S. ran. v. F. dha</i> (19 8) 55 Cal 1067 113 I C 61 ( ) A C 68</p> <p>(j) <i>Pat. a. v. G. r. h. Chand. a.</i> (1919) 36 Cal 268 45 I C 241</p> |
|---|---|

a case however the Court should not act under this rule but return the plaint under O 7 r 10 to the plaintiff to be presented to the proper Court (u) But O 7 r 10 does not apply to Chartered High Courts In the case therefore of a Chartered High Court the Court may it seems act under this rule

**Other sufficient grounds** —Sec 97 of the Code of 1809 ran as follows —

If the plaintiff at any time before final judgment satisfies the Court that there are sufficient grounds for permitting him to withdraw from the suit with liberty to bring a fresh suit for the same matter it shall be competent to the Court to grant such permission on such terms as to costs or otherwise as it may deem proper

It is to be noted that sec 97 of the Code of 1859 did not contain the words some formal defect which occur in the present Code In *Watson v Collector of Rayshaye* (v) the plaintiff sued the defendant to set aside an auction sale of a putnee Taluk for arrears of rent A preliminary issue was framed whether the plaintiff was in a position to sue A commission was issued for the examination of witnesses but it was returned unexecuted as the witnesses had not been presented for examination Upon this the Court finding no excuse for the plaintiff's neglect dismissed the suit for want of evidence but with a reservation that the order made was not to be a bar to the plaintiff from proceeding as if the action has not been brought The plaintiff then brought a fresh suit in respect of the same cause of action The High Court of Bengal held that the second suit was barred as *res judicata* under s 2 of the Code of 1809 This decision was affirmed on appeal by the Privy Council In the course of the judgment their Lordships of the Privy Council referring apparently to sec 97 of the Code of 1859 said as follows —

There is a proceeding in those Courts (Courts of India) called a non suit which operates as a dismissal of the suit without barring the right of the party to litigate the matter in a fresh suit But that seems to be limited to cases of misjoinder either of parties or matters in contest in the suit to cases in which a material document has been rejected because it has not borne proper stamp and to cases in which there has been an erroneous valuation of the subject of the suit In all those cases the suit fails by reason of some point of form but their Lordships are aware of no case in which upon an issue joined and the party having failed to produce the evidence which he was bound to produce in support of that issue liberty has been given to him to bring a second suit except in the particular instance that is now before them

The passage cited above indicates their Lordships' view of the meaning of the words sufficient grounds in sec 97 of the Code of 1859 This decision was followed by the High Court of Bengal in *Madan Ram v Rai* (w) where it was held that a plaintiff cannot be permitted to withdraw with liberty to bring a fresh suit after issues have been joined and he has failed to produce the evidence to support his claim *Madan Ram's case* was also a case under the Code of 1859 The words by reason of some formal defect appeared for the first time in sec 313 of the Code of 1877 The decision in *Watson's case* was also followed by the High Court of Calcutta in *Akorda Co Ltd v Doorga Charan* (x) a case under the present Code The question in that case was whether a plaintiff can be permitted to withdraw from the suit with liberty to bring a fresh suit after he has adduced all his evidence and finds that the evidence is insufficient to establish his case It was contended for the plaintiff that the words other sufficient grounds were wide enough to entitle the Court to allow the plaintiff to withdraw from the suit under any circumstances that might be deemed sufficient by the Court but this contention was overruled

(u) (1918) 41 M L J 101 (S B) 461 C 65 *supra*  
(v) (1869) 13 M L A 160 S B (S B) L R 1 C 44  
see a

(w) (1841) 1 W R 401 (17) 1841  
(x) (1909) 11 Cal L J 4 1 C 18

and it was held that the Court had no power to allow a plaintiff to withdraw from the suit after evidence had been adduced and the evidence was found to be insufficient to support his case. In the course of his judgment Mookerji J. after referring to clauses (a) and (b) of sub rule (2) said: "The intention plainly is that a ground indicated in clause (b) must be of the same nature as the ground specified in clause (a). This decision has been followed by the same High Court in subsequent cases (y). The High Courts of Patna (z) and Lahore (a) have followed the Calcutta decisions. The Oudh Court also holds that other sufficient grounds must be *ejusdem generis* with a formal defect (b). The High Court of Bombay held in some cases that the Court should not allow a suit to be withdrawn after the parties were ready for trial if such withdrawal might operate to the prejudice of the defendant (c). But this view was dissented from in a later case in which the Court followed the Calcutta decisions (d). In a recent case the same High Court held that it is wrong to grant leave to withdraw a suit with liberty to file a fresh suit after the evidence is concluded though the hearing may be adjourned for final arguments (e). In Allahabad (f) leave to withdraw has been granted where the plaintiff fails to give formal proof of a document which is essential for his success. In Madras there is a conflict of opinion whether the words 'other sufficient grounds' mean grounds analogous to a formal defect as held in Calcutta or include grounds which may not be analogous to a formal defect. In one case (g) the High Court held that the words 'other sufficient grounds' must be *ejusdem generis* with the words 'some formal defect' and that the Court had no power under this rule to give leave to the plaintiff after a substantial portion of his evidence had been heard. In a later case (h) however Sadashiva Ayyar J. said that the words 'other sufficient grounds' were not *ejusdem generis* with the words 'some formal defect' and that they included grounds which might not be analogous to a formal defect and that even if they did not objection to a suit on the ground of jurisdiction or insufficient Court fees were analogous to formal defects. It appears therefore that the majority of Judges are in favour of the view that the mere inability of the plaintiff to prove his case is not a sufficient ground within the meaning of this rule for giving him leave to withdraw with liberty to institute a fresh suit.

The Calcutta High Court has held that the plaintiff should not be allowed to withdraw his suit with liberty to bring a fresh suit after the suit has been heard and decided on the merits (i). Where a plaintiff sought to recover a sum of money upon certain allegations which were found untrue by the first Court and the first Court dismissed the suit and on appeal the District Judge came to the same conclusion but granted leave to the plaintiff to withdraw from the suit with liberty to institute a fresh suit the High Court held that the order should not have been made and set it aside (j).

On such terms as it thinks fit—Where leave is granted to a plaintiff to withdraw from a suit with liberty to institute a fresh suit the defendant is

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>(j) <i>M. Bulla v. Ha. Hem g.</i> (1910) 11 Cal L J 51 61 C 69 H. P. A. v. C. P. ncha (191) 44 C 36 33 I C 60 <i>Hir Lal Uday C.</i> (191) 16 C W 10 141 C 33 <i>Butsee Hirid v. Nath. Lam h. dra</i> (191) 48 Cal 138 at p 141 91 C 806 (1) A C 34 (T B) <i>Lord s of R. f. ren. to Full Bench</i></p> <p>(z) <i>Mahe d. Ram v. S. g. Lal</i> (1913) 3 Pat L J 61 451 C 19 <i>U. ha. v. R. sara</i> (1913) 6 Pat L J 117 61 I C 639 (1) A P 4</p> <p>(a) <i>Ish. r. D. s. J. i. s. gh</i> (191) Lah L J 290 90 I C 63 (2) A L 43</p> <p>(b) <i>Tila C. b. y. v. Sheo D. J. l</i> (1918) 3 Luck 403 107 I C 897 (18) A O 48</p> <p>(c) <i>Mal. pat v. Nathu</i> (1909) 33 Bom 641 C 75 <i>B. i. h. h. ba. v. Sh. dapa</i> (1913) 3 L. m. 632 91 I C 23 (1a c gran ed aft r the heari g was finished)</p> | <p><i>Se. alo v. i. nd. i. v. St. tulal</i> (1911) 40 Do. i. 3 384 33 58 I C 1004 (1)</p> <p>(d) <i>Lala P. J. s. v. Mot ram</i> (1916) 50 Bom 19 94 I C 77 (6) A B 315</p> <p>(e) <i>Bhik. j. v. Anant</i> (1919) 51 Bom L R 613 (29) A L 30</p> <p>(f) <i>Jh. i. Lal v. Bui. shar Das</i> (1918) 40 All 61 613-614 46 I C 71 <i>Chandrika Lal v. Sami. th</i> (1918) 50 All 83 115 I C 14 (9) A A 133</p> <p>(g) <i>i. i. v. Copanna</i> (1914) ~ Mad L J 480 61 C 5</p> <p>(h) <i>Ka. in. i. a. v. Jay thambal</i> (1918) 41 Mad 01 0 48 I C 6</p> <p>(i) <i>Iam Saran v. Padha</i> (1918) 55 Cal 1067 113 I C 817 (29) A C 83</p> <p>(j) <i>Pad. a. v. G. r. i. d. Chandra</i> (1919) 46 Cal 168 45 I C 41</p> |
|---|--|

1 ordinarily entitled to the costs of the suit (l) The High Court of Madras has held that where leave is granted to a plaintiff to bring a fresh suit on payment of the defendant's costs on or before a specified date and he fails to do so he is precluded from bringing a second suit and if such suit is brought it should be dismissed (l) That Court also held that if leave is granted to bring a fresh suit on payment of the defendant's costs (without specifying any date) the plaintiff is precluded from bringing a second suit unless the costs are paid before the institution of the second suit The payment of costs after the close of the trial in the second suit is not a compliance with the condition (m) But the same Court has held that when it is absolutely impossible for the plaintiff to pay the costs on or before the date fixed by the Court as where the exact amount of costs cannot be ascertained in time the Court has power to extend the time (n)

The High Court of Calcutta has not taken the same strict view of the condition as to the payment of costs as the Madras High Court Thus in *Abdul Azi v Ebrahim* (o) where leave was granted to the plaintiff to bring a fresh suit on payment of the defendant's costs it was held that though the payment of costs was a condition precedent to the institution of a second suit non payment of costs before the institution of the second suit did not render the fresh suit bad ab initio and further that payment of costs before the trial of the fresh suit cured the irregularity In *Shillal v Gaya* (p) Sir Lawrence Jenkins while agreeing with the result of the ruling in *Abdul Azi v Ebrahim* based his decision on somewhat different ground In that case also permission was granted to the plaintiff to institute a fresh suit on payment of the defendant's costs The plaintiff did not pay the costs and brought a second suit The suit was dismissed by the Munsif for non payment of costs The plaintiff appealed to the Subordinate Judge Pending the appeal the plaintiff paid the defendant's costs The Subordinate Judge thereupon sent back the case to the Munsif for trial on the merits It was held that inasmuch as the permission to withdraw and bring a fresh suit was made conditional on a certain payment the original suit could not be deemed to be withdrawn until those costs were paid and it must therefore be deemed to be a pending suit which became disposed of as soon as payment was made In the course of the judgment the learned Judge said

When a plaintiff has obtained leave to withdraw upon payment of costs it is his duty to pay the costs at once for until they were paid there is no withdrawal with the permission of the Court In that view when the case came before the Munsif he was not entitled to dismiss it All he could do was to regard sec 10 (of the Code) as a bar to his proceeding with the trial of the suit In so far as he dismissed it he exercised a power that was not vested in him and I think the Subordinate Judge was right when on payment of the costs he set aside the decree of the Munsif and sent back the case in order that the Munsif should proceed with the trial for on the payment of those costs there was the withdrawal complete under O 23 It appears to me important in cases of this kind to have regard to the precise terms of the section and I think it will be well that the Court when giving permission to withdraw with liberty to bring a fresh suit should see that the orders are complete and the proper order in such circumstances is one which limits the time within which the payment should be made and which goes on to direct that on failure to pay within the time the original suit is dismissed with costs The High Court of Patna has followed the Calcutta decisions (q) The High Court of Madras has dissented from the view taken by the Calcutta High Court in *Shillal v Gaya* and

(l) *Kamla d v Gobbi* 1903 4 Bom 106  
(l) *F A v v* 1903 33 M d 50  
(m) *Sehaya v Larya* 1904 47 Mad 13  
(n) *Iera v Karpa* 1906 29 Mad 30

(o) 1904 31 Cal 96  
(p) 1914 19 Cal L J 931 C 10  
(q) *K J v A* 1918 3 F L J 63 64  
1904 19 Cal L J 931 C 10  
1904 19 Cal L J 931 C 10  
(d) 1904 19 Cal L J 931 C 10

held that the withdrawal operates not when the costs are paid but from the date of the Court's order granting permission to withdraw (r)

Where a plaintiff who had brought a suit for redemption against the mortgagee was allowed to withdraw the suit with liberty to bring a fresh suit *within two years* and he brought the fresh suit after two years the High Court of Bombay held that he was entitled to do so. The reason given was that a mortgagor has a right to sue for redemption at any time within the period of limitation unless his equity of redemption has in the meantime been extinguished (s)

Notice.—Though this rule does not specifically require that notice of an application under it must be given to the opposite party still it is an elementary rule of universal application that a judicial order which may possibly affect or prejudice any party cannot be made unless he has been afforded an opportunity to be heard. Hence if an order is made under this rule granting leave to the plaintiff to withdraw from a suit with liberty to bring a fresh suit without giving notice to the opposite party the order will be set aside under s 115 of the Code on the ground of material irregularity (t)

Permission need not be express.—The permission mentioned in this section need not be given in express terms. It is sufficient if it can be implied from the order read with the application on which the order was made (u)

Form of order.—Where leave is granted to the plaintiff to withdraw from the suit with liberty to bring a fresh suit the order must not be one *dismissing* the suit with liberty to bring a fresh suit but one *granting permission* to the plaintiff to withdraw from the suit with liberty to bring a fresh suit (v). Where leave is refused the Court should simply dismiss the application. It should not make an order disposing of the suit on the assumption that the plaintiff would withdraw the suit under sub-rule (1) if the application was refused (w)

Permission extends to one fresh suit only.—The permission granted in the original suit to bring a fresh suit in respect of the same subject matter extends only to the filing of one fresh suit and not more. Hence where leave is granted to a plaintiff to bring a fresh suit on payment of the defendant's costs and the plaintiff brings a fresh suit without paying the costs and the suit is dismissed the dismissal is a bar to the institution of a third suit in respect of the same subject matter (x)

Dismissal of suit coupled with liberty to bring a fresh suit.—There is no power in the Courts of India to *dismiss* a suit with liberty to the plaintiff to bring a fresh suit for the same matter (y)

Liberty to consolidate withdrawn suit with a pending suit.—A Court it seems has no power under this rule to grant permission to a plaintiff to consolidate the claim in the suit which is withdrawn with a claim in another suit pending at the time. But if such an order is made it cannot be said to be one made without jurisdiction and it is not a nullity (z). But there is nothing to prevent the Court from granting leave to a plaintiff to withdraw from two suits with liberty to bring a fresh suit consolidating the claims in the two suits (a)

- (r) *Seshayya v S. Bayya* (1924) 47 Mad L J 646 80 I C 433 (4) A M 877
- (s) *Ramchandra v Hanmania* (19 0) Bom L R 939 81 C 111
- (t) *Rayendra v Ati* (1917) 44 C I 451 39 I C 989
- (u) *Banerji Lal v Kishen* (19 0) 2 Lah L J 242 67 I C 100 dissenting from *Jai Singh v Hari Singh* (1910) 10 J Rec no 97 p 224 37 I C 18 A A di Ha v Lala Rai (19 0) 5 Pat 23 93 I C 1001 (26) A F 59
- (v) *Doucett v Wise* (1864) 1 W R 322
- (w) *Banwari Das v Muhammad* (188 9) 9 All 630

- (x) *Alha v Pu shotamdas* (1908) 3 Bom 345
- (y) *Ambudai v Shankar* (19 5) 7 Bom L R 43 87 I C 807 (2) A B 72
- (z) *Watson v Collector of Ajahye* (1869) 13 M I A 160 3 Beng L R P C 48 *Banwari Das v Alor mal* (1887) 9 All 699 *S. K. Lal v Bhukhi* (1889) 11 All 187 *Fateh Singh v Jaganath Baksh Singh* (1925) 5 I A 100 10 106 47 All 158 16 163 91 I C 80 (5) A P C 5
- (a) *Lakshma an v Aluthya* (19 1) 40 Mad L J 126 6 I C 833 *Tularam v Gopala* (1917) 3 Mad L J 431 40 I C 611
- (a) *Sahib Das v Admas* (1904) 2 Rang 66 81 I C 46 (4) A R 249



1 **Withdrawing with permission Additional relief in fresh suit.**—The effect of withdrawing a suit with the permission of the Court is to leave the parties in the same position as that in which they stood before the suit was brought. Therefore the plaintiff may include in the fresh suit a *relief* which he might have included in the first suit but which he had omitted to include in it (b)

**Withdrawing with permission after suit has abated against some of the defendants.**—Where a suit has abated against a defendant and it is then withdrawn with liberty to bring a fresh suit such permission does not entitle the plaintiff to join the legal representatives of such defendant as party defendants in the fresh suit (c)

**Withdrawing without permission Bar of fresh suit.**—Where a plaintiff withdraws from a suit without the permission of the Court he is precluded from instituting a fresh suit in respect of the same subject matter [sub rule (3)] and against the same defendant. The rule is mandatory and when a suit by an idol was withdrawn a second suit by a sebari or manager of the idol was held to be barred (d). See notes below Same defendant and Same subject matter

**Same defendant.**—Though the rule does not expressly say so the fresh suit that is barred must be a suit against the same defendant. A second suit will not be barred if it is brought against a different person. A obtains a decree against B and in execution of the decree attached certain property alleged to belong to B. C intervenes under O 21 r 55 alleging that the property belongs to him. C's application is rejected and he brings a regular suit against A alone to establish his title to the property. C then withdraws from the suit without obtaining permission of the Court to bring a second suit for the same subject matter. After the suit has been withdrawn the attachment falls through. A then re-attaches the same property in execution of the same decree and the property is sold and purchased by D. C does not appear to contest the second execution proceeding after the withdrawal of his suit. He then institutes a suit against D to recover possession of the property alleging that the property is his sole and exclusive property. The suit is not barred under this rule as B the judgment debtor was not a party to the first suit (e)

**Same subject matter.**—As already stated if a suit is withdrawn without the permission of the Court the plaintiff is precluded from bringing a fresh suit in respect of the same subject matter. The expression used in the corresponding s 373 of the Code of 1882 was matter. A Calcutta case under the Code of 1882 said that matter did not mean property but that it had reference to the right in property which the plaintiff seeks to enforce. In that case A had instituted a suit to establish his right to sell certain property in satisfaction of a decree against B but he withdrew the suit without obtaining leave to bring a fresh suit. Subsequently he instituted another suit to establish his right to sell the same property in satisfaction of another decree against B. It was held that the second suit was not barred. The Court said. Now though the property in respect of which the present suit is brought is the same as that in respect of which the former suit was brought still that would not be sufficient to make the present suit one for the same matter as that for which the former suit was brought within the meaning of s 373 for the cause of action in the two suits was different (f). In a Madras case under the present Code where the next reversionary heir of a deceased Hindu instituted a suit against the widow of the deceased and an alieness from her of her husband's property for a declaration that the alienation was not binding on the estate and on the death of the widow withdrew the suit without obtaining leave to bring a

(b) *P. A. i. Lal v. Srin. ti. Barn* (1882) 1 All 7  
(c) *S. Sha. v. S. R. ar. ya. a* (1911) 35 M 1 613 IC 60  
(d) *Pa. ga. harya v. G. ru. Feoli* (—) A A 693

(e) *M. Bhada v. Ram. Ch. ru* (1882) 8 C 1 81  
(f) *Kam. i. v. P. m. Nath* (1894) 21 Cal 65  
C. pol. t. hunder v. Purna. Ch. dra (1899)  
4 Cal W N 310 See also A. M. F. m  
v. H. a. B. idro (1919) Punj. Rec. no. 136  
p. 3 at pp. 34355 351 C 48

fresh suit it was held that the subsequent suit which he brought against the alienee for possession of the same property was not barred. Wallis C.J. in delivering the judgment of the Court said: "The terms subject matter and the same matter which occurred in the corresponding section 373 of the old Code have not been defined and must we think be construed strictly in a penal provision of this character. Without attempting an exhaustive definition of all that may be included in the term subject matter we are of opinion that where as in the present case the cause of action and the relief claimed in the second suit are not the same as the cause of action and the relief claimed in the first suit the second suit cannot be considered to have been brought in respect of the same subject matter as the first suit." (g) The contrary however was held by the Chief Court of the Punjab in a case in which the facts were almost similar to the Madras case (h). In a Bombay case (i) A sued to eject L but finding that the notice to quit was defective withdrew the suit without obtaining the leave of the Court. Subsequently A gave a formal notice to quit and brought a fresh suit for ejectment. It was held that the suit was not barred under this rule as the previous suit was not for the same subject matter as the second suit. Scott C.J. said: "We are of opinion that subject matter means to use the words of Order I Rule 1 the series of acts or transactions alleged to exist giving rise to the relief claimed. Obviously the first series of acts or transactions which formed the basis of the first suit was incomplete or the plaintiff would have been able to prosecute his suit to decree. It was incomplete because there was no notice to quit. The second series of acts or transactions is complete because the notice to quit has been given and therefore the two suits are not in respect of the same subject matter. But the withdrawal of a prior suit for a declaration of title to certain war bonds is a bar to a subsequent suit for consequential relief in respect of the same bonds [that is for recovery of possession]." (j)

A suit for partition however stands on a different footing the cause of action in such a suit being a recurring cause of action. Hence the withdrawal of a suit for partition of joint property though without permission of the Court is no bar to a second suit for partition of the same property against the same defendants (l).

**Withdrawing without leave of Court but with consent of defendant—**In a case decided under s. 97 of the Code of 1859 it was observed by Norman J. that where a plaintiff withdraws his suit without the permission of the Court but with the consent of the defendant he is not precluded from instituting a fresh suit in respect of the same subject matter (k). The observations of Norman J. on this point have been doubted in a recent case (m). The doubt seems to be well founded.

**Withdrawing from suit pending arbitration—**When the matters in dispute in a suit are referred to arbitration by an order of the Court made under Schedule II para. 3 the Court has no power under this rule to grant permission to the plaintiff to withdraw from the suit with liberty to institute a fresh suit. The provisions of this rule do not apply to such a case for when once a matter is referred to arbitration the Court is precluded from dealing with it in the same suit save in the manner and to the extent provided in Schedule II. A sues B for possession of certain property. The matters in difference between the parties are referred to arbitration by an order of the Court. The Court has no power either before or after the award is made to grant

(g) *Singh Pedd v Subba Reddy* (1916) 39 Mad 937 35 I C 185 overruling *Aduttan v Achutan* (1908) 21 Mad 8.  
(h) *Jita Singh v Hari Singh* (1916) Punj Rec no 97 p. 34 37 I C 128.  
(i) *Pakmah v Maddeo* (1918) 4 Bom 15 43 I C.  
(j) *Maung Mu v Maung Kon* (1923) 1 Rang 618 7 I C 393 (4) A R 127.

(k) *Radhe Lal v Murchand* (1904) 40 All 80 80 I C 933 (24) A A 905 dissenting from C. K. J. v *Mann Lal* (1901) 93 All 19.  
(l) *Juggabundo v Watson & Co* Bourke's Rep F R 111 p. 16.  
(m) *Gopala Krishna v Purna Chandra* (1898) 4 Cal W N 110.

1 permission to the plaintiff to withdraw from the *suit* with liberty to bring a fresh suit (x) But where a reference to arbitration has been made *without the intervention of the Court* (that is not by an order of the Court) and one of the parties to the reference applies to the Court under Schedule II para 20 to file the award the provisions of this rule apply and it is open to the applicant to withdraw the application though numbered and registered as a *suit* under that para 20 under sub r (1) of this rule (o)

**Power of appellate Court to give leave to plaintiff to withdraw from suit**—It has been held by the High Courts of Allahabad (p) Madras (q) and Bombay (r) that where a plaintiff's suit is dismissed and he appeals from the decree the appellate Court has power to allow the plaintiff appellant to withdraw from the suit with liberty to bring a fresh suit in respect of the same subject matter see s 107 (2) The contrary view seems to be implied in a Calcutta decision (s) But an appellate Court has no power to grant such leave *before* the appeal is admitted (f)

**Erroneous order granting leave to withdraw and jurisdiction**—An order for withdrawal of a suit with leave to institute a fresh suit made in circumstances not within the scope of this rule that is made in a case where there is no formal defect or other sufficient ground within the meaning of this rule cannot be treated as an order made without jurisdiction [though it may be challenged in revision on the ground of material irregularity—see notes below Revision] such order is consequently not null and void (u) The order not being a nullity a fresh suit instituted upon leave so granted is maintainable it is not barred as *res judicata* Further the Court trying the subsequent suit is not competent to enter into the question whether the Court which granted the plaintiff permission to withdraw the first suit with liberty to bring a fresh suit had power to make the order and had properly made it (v)

**Appeal**—An order under this rule granting leave to a plaintiff to withdraw from a suit or to abandon a part of his claim with liberty to institute a fresh suit is not appealable Such an order is not one of the appealable orders mentioned in O 43 r 1 nor is it a decree within the meaning of s 2 (2) (w)

**Letters Patent appeal**—An order of a single Judge of a High Court granting leave to withdraw from a suit with liberty to bring a fresh suit is a judgment within the meaning of cl 15 of the Letters Patent and appealable as such (x) Similarly an order of a single Judge of a High Court dismissing an application for the revision of an order giving leave to withdraw a suit with liberty to bring a fresh suit is a judgment within the meaning of that clause and is appealable as such (y)

**Revision**—Though an order granting leave to a plaintiff to withdraw from a suit with liberty to bring a fresh suit is not appealable it is open to revision if it falls within s 115 of the Code An order is open to revision under that section if the Court which

(a) *Sheo rite v De d t* (188 ) 9 All 168 *Debi Churn v B p a* (190 ) 7 Cal W N 146

(o) *Gauri Sh nhar v Maunda Koer* (1904) 31 Cal 516

(p) *Afsal v Akbari* (1915) 37 All 36 3 I C 857 *Canga Ram v Ak r* (1885) 8 All 8

(q) *Kamajya v Pap yya* (1917) 40 Mad 259 37 I C 414 (F P)

(r) *Chhanubh v Dakhyl* (19 0) 44 Bom 504 7 I C 530 *Shekh Har n v Maho m d* (19 1) 45 Bom 06 59 I C 10

(s) *Kali P asanna v Panchanan* (1916) 44 Cal 367 33 I C 6 0

(t) *Eknath v Ranaji* (1911) 35 Bom 261 10 I C 813

(u) *Hrudaj Vath v Pam Chand a* (19 1) 48 Cal 138 58 I C 806 (1) A C 34 (F B)

(v) *ov truling Kals P asa na v Puri hanan* (1917) 41 Cal 367 33 I C 670 *Rajkum r v Ram Khelagan* (19 ) 1 Pat 90 61

I C 33 (2) A P 44 (F B) *Janki L i v Bishu har Das* (1918) 40 All 61

46 I C 71 *Shekh Hass n v Mahomed* (19 1) 44 Bom 06 215 16 61 59 I C

210 (21) A B 28

(w) (19 1) 45 Cal 138 58 I C 806 *supra* (19 ) 1 Pat 90 64 I C 337 (2) A P 43

s *pra Perum l v Karuppan* (1911) 21 Mad L J 574 8 I C 263 *Chhajjua v Khy h Ram* (191 ) 9 All L J 58 14

I C 15

(x) *Genda Mal v Purbiu Lal* (1895) 17 All 97 *Jog d ntre v Sarup Sundari* (1894) 18

Cal 32 *Abd d Hussain v Kari Sahu* (1900) Cal 36

(y) *va andas v Shantilal* (19 1) 45 Bom 377 58 I C 1004 (21) A B 267

(z) *A ju v Gopanna* (1914) 17 Mad L J 480 58 I C 57 *R ma Aiyar v Venkatachella* (1907) 30 Mad 311

made it had no jurisdiction to make it as in the undermentioned case ( ) or if the Court acted illegally or with material irregularity in making the order

An order granting leave to a plaintiff to withdraw from a suit with liberty to bring a fresh suit in circumstances not within the scope of the present rule that is in a case in which there is no formal defect or other sufficient ground for making it as where the order is made on the ground of the plaintiff's inability to prove his case cannot be treated as an order made without jurisdiction [see notes Erroneous order granting leave to withdraw and jurisdiction] The High Court therefore has no power to interfere with such an order on the ground that it was made without jurisdiction (a) But it has been held in a series of cases that the High Court will interfere with such an order on the ground of material irregularity and will set it aside in revision (b) Similarly the High Court will interfere and set aside in revision on the ground of material irregularity an order granting leave to a plaintiff to withdraw from a suit with liberty to bring a fresh suit if the order was made *ex parte* (c) or if leave was granted without assigning any reasons (d) or if leave was granted on the ground that there was a formal defect or other sufficient ground but no inquiry was made as to whether there was in fact a formal defect or other sufficient ground (e) In a Patna case, the High Court held that where the defendant himself alleges a formal defect the Court has jurisdiction to pass any order it pleases under this rule (f) But this seems to be an extreme view In a Madras case where the plaintiff deliberately undervalued his suit and paid insufficient court fees and brought the suit in a District Munsif's Court and then applied for leave to withdraw from the suit with liberty to bring a fresh suit and leave was granted, the Court was held to have acted with material irregularity and the order was set aside in revision (g) In a Calcutta case the first Court dismissed the plaintiff's suit on a finding that the plaintiff's allegations were untrue On appeal the District Judge came to the same conclusion but granted leave to the plaintiff to withdraw from the suit with liberty to bring a fresh suit The High Court held that the order was not properly made and set it aside (h)

In Allahabad it has been held that the High Court will interfere in revision if the lower Court has not applied its mind to the circumstances of the case and the provisions of this rule in other words if it has not exercised a judicial discretion (i) But if the lower Court has exercised a judicial discretion, the High Court will not interfere in revision merely because the High Court itself might have taken a different view of the matter (j)

Effect of reversal of order granting leave to withdraw—Where a fresh suit is filed before the reversal in revision of an order granting leave to the plaintiff to withdraw from the suit with liberty to bring a fresh suit the procedure is to declare the fresh

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>(c) <i>C/ooudhury Ram v Mahe h</i> (19 ) 1 Pat 3<br/>6 I C 12 ( ) A P 53</p> <p>(a) <i>Jhunku L v Buihashar Das</i> (1918) 40 All<br/>612 46 I C 71</p> <p>(b) <i>Jharda Co Ltd v Durga Chandra</i> (1910)<br/>11 C I L J 45 5 I C 187 <i>Mabla v</i><br/><i>Rani Hemang</i> (1910) 11 C I L J 51<br/>6 I C 69 <i>Pura Lal v Uday Chand a</i><br/>(191 ) 16 C W N 30 7 14 I C 33 <i>Hriday</i><br/><i>Nath v Akday L</i> (1917) 5 Cal L J 454<br/>39 I C 963 <i>U A v Banu n</i> (19 1)<br/>6 Pat L J 11 6 I C 639 (21) A P<br/>47 <i>Bai K shaba v Shidaga</i> (1913) 37<br/>Bom 68 11 C 3 <i>Jah r Das v Lal</i><br/><i>Singh</i> (19 5) Lah L J 290 90 I C 63<br/>(25) A L 497 <i>Ajva v Gopri na</i> (1914)<br/>7 M d L J 489 26 I C 7</p> <p>(c) <i>Tayend a v At l</i> (1917) 44 C 1 4 4 39 I C<br/>989</p> <p>(d) <i>Mul mun d v J r</i> (1888) 11 M d 3 3<br/><i>R Am t Lal v D a m S ng</i> (1922) 20<br/>All L J 90 64 I C 949 (22) A A 185<br/><i>Subas n v Ashuto h</i> (1923) 32 Cal L J</p> | <p>3 1 84 I C 372 (24) A C 751 <i>Ba n th</i><br/><i>v Baban</i> (19 7) 49 All 459 103 I C 23<br/>(27) A A 63—<i>Kamta Singh v Bi gyan</i><br/><i>Das</i> (19 8) 50 All 192 106 I C 431 (28)<br/>A A 98</p> <p>(e) <i>Nathu Ram v Moosamrat Sheo Coer</i> (1918)<br/>31at L J 460 46 I C 179 <i>Mahendra</i><br/><i>R m v S g Lal</i> (1918) 31at L J 651<br/>48 I C 10</p> <p>(f) <i>Shasha v Briya</i> (1918) 3 Pat L J 630<br/>44 I C 496</p> <p>(g) <i>Kan uo m v Jagathambal</i> (1918) 41 Mad<br/>701 46 I C 265</p> <p>(h) <i>Padma v Gursh Chand a</i> (1919) 46 Cal 168<br/>40 I C 241 [in cond appeal]</p> <p>(i) <i>Radi a v Tula</i> (1912) 10 All L J 393 17<br/>I C 847 <i>Gang v Musam t i s ni</i> (19 5)<br/>47 All 310 8 I C 175 (2 ) A A 466</p> <p>(j) <i>Jh Lu Lal v Bial a D r</i> (1918) 40 All<br/>612 46 I C 71 <i>Patan Lal v Mu h mod</i><br/>(18-1) 19 All L J 47 60 I C 893 ( )<br/>A A 6 (the facts of the case are not<br/>reported)</p> |
|--|---|

suit null and void and to direct the lower Court to proceed with the original suit from the stage which it had reached when the order granting leave was made by that Court (l)

### Sub rule (4) Co plaintiffs

**Co plaintiffs**—By sub r (4) it is enacted that nothing in this rule shall be deemed to authorize the Court to permit one of several plaintiffs to withdraw without the consent of the others. This sub rule limits the jurisdiction of the Court to grant permission to withdraw a suit to cases where all the plaintiffs join in the application. Where the Court in contravention of this sub rule allows two out of four plaintiffs without the consent of the other two to withdraw from a suit with liberty to bring a fresh suit it acts without jurisdiction and a second suit in respect of the same subject matter is barred. But if the suit that was withdrawn was a suit for partition the second suit it has been held will not be barred for a cause of action in a suit for partition is a recurring one and a joint owner has a right to come to Court at any time provided he proves that he has a subsisting joint title and possession in the property within the period of limitation (i)

### Rule does not apply

**Bengal Rent Act**—The provisions of this rule do not apply to suits instituted under the Bengal Rent Act 10 of 1859 which is a complete Code in itself (m)

**Probate proceedings**—This rule does not apply to probate proceedings the provision in s 55 of the Probate and Administration Act 5 of 1881 [now Indian Succession Act 39 of 1925 s 208] being qualified by the words so far as the circumstances of the case will admit (n)

**Execution proceeding**—See r 4 below

**2 [S 374]** In any fresh suit instituted on permission granted under the last preceding rule, the plaintiff shall be bound by the law of limitation in the same manner as if the first suit had not been instituted

Limitation law not affected by first suit

**Limitation**—The fresh suit must be instituted within the period of limitation. It will not lie after the period of limitation even though the suit that was permitted to be withdrawn was within the period of limitation (o). But if the first suit was brought in a Court that had no jurisdiction to entertain it that Court would have no power under rule 1 above to give leave to withdraw with liberty to bring a fresh suit. If it does give leave to the plaintiff to withdraw from the suit with liberty to bring a fresh suit the order is one made without jurisdiction. Hence if a second suit is instituted though upon leave so granted the case will be governed not by the provisions of this rule but by those of sec 14 of the Limitation Act 1908 and the time during which the first suit was prosecuted will be excluded in computing the period of limitation for the second suit (p)

**3 [S 375]** Where it is proved to the satisfaction of the Court that a suit has been adjusted wholly or in part by any lawful agreement

Compromise of suit

- (l) *Nattunil Pam v Shea Roer* (1918) 3 Pat L J 403 46 I C 19  
(i) *M s s Minat Ram Das v Bhusan at Balu*  
R 1 (19) 31 Pat 28 ( ) A F 489  
(m) *C l m Malom d Si bendra* (1903) 3 Cal

- 990  
(n) *Banwa Lal v Kullen* (19 0) - Lah L J 4 6 I C 100  
(o) *Farad l v Shom shu* (1905) 29 Bom 219  
(p) *Ra deo v Goneshna an* (1908) 35 Cal 94

or compromise, or where the defendant satisfies the plaintiff in respect of the whole or any part of the subject matter of the suit, the Court shall order such agreement, compromise or satisfaction to be recorded, and shall pass a decree in accordance therewith so far as it relates to the suit

**Alterations in the rule**—This rule differs from the corresponding s 375 of the Code of 1880 in three respects namely —

- 1 The words where it is proved to the satisfaction of the Court that have been added into the rule to set at rest the conflict of opinion noted below in the commentary under the head Where a compromise set up by one party is denied by the other
- 2 The words the Court shall order such agreement to be recorded have been substituted for the words such agreement shall be recorded The object is to bring out the word order prominently as an appeal is now given from an order made under this rule recording or refusing to record an agreement See O 43 r 1 cl (m) and notes below Appeal
- 3 The words and such decree shall be final so far as it relates to so much of the subject matter of the suit as is dealt with by the agreement compromise or satisfaction which occurred in the old section after the words so far as it relates to the suit have been omitted See notes to s 96 Sub s (3) consent decree not appealable

**Scope of the rule**—The agreement compromise or satisfaction contemplated by this rule may (1) relate to the whole suit or (2) it may relate only to a part thereof or (3) it may also comprise matters that do not relate to the suit When the agreement relates to the whole suit the Court must on being invited by the parties record the agreement and pass a decree in accordance with the agreement and the suit stops there Where the agreement relates to a part only of the suit the Court must on the application of the parties pass a decree in accordance with the agreement and the suit may be proceeded with as to the rest Where the agreement besides relating to the suit or a part thereof comprises matters that do not relate to the suit the decree must comprise only such terms of the agreement as relate to the suit but not the rest As to the case where a decree comprises matters not relating to the suit see below notes Where the decree comprises matters that do not relate to the suit

**Procedure to be followed under this rule**—It is important to note that a consent decree under this rule can be passed only after an order is made directing the compromise to be recorded This is not a mere matter of form as the aggrieved party has a right of appeal against such order under O 43 r 1 cl (m) (g) See notes below Appeal

**Where a compromise set up by one party is denied by the other**—If a party to a suit alleges that the suit has been adjusted by a lawful agreement and applies to the Court to record the agreement and to pass a decree in accordance therewith but the opposite party to the suit denies the agreement or wishes to recede from it the question arises whether the Court has power in the one case to decide if the agreement was effected and to pass a decree accordingly and in the other case to pass a decree in spite of the opposite parties reluctance Under the old section both branches of this question were answered in the affirmative by the High Courts of Bombay Madras and

(2) *P. Ban Sardar v. Bhup v. d. Nath* (1918) 43 Cal 8 33 I C 69 *Sabutu v. Sasi*

(1917) 6 Pat 108 10 I C 71 (2) A P 351

Calcutta (r), but in the negative by the High Court of Allahabad (s). According to the Allahabad decisions the Court had no power under the old section to record an agreement and to pass a decree in accordance therewith unless both the parties consented before the Court to have the agreement recorded. Thus even where there was an agreement to adjust the suit the Court could act under that section only if both the parties were in agreement at the moment of moving the Court and if they were not then in accord the agreement could only be enforced by a fresh suit for specific performance. The conflict arose from the words "if a suit be adjusted wholly or in part by any lawful agreement or compromise with which s 375 commenced." The present rule gives effect to the Bombay Madras and Calcutta decisions. The words "where it is proved to the satisfaction of the Court that a suit has been adjusted wholly or in part" clearly show that the Court has power under this rule where an agreement or compromise is denied to decide whether as a fact the alleged agreement or compromise was made and if it is established that it was made to record it (t).

**Submission and award**—It was held in two Bombay cases under the Code of 1882 that when the matters in difference in a pending suit are referred to arbitration without the intervention of the Court and an award is made the submission and the award must be treated as an adjustment of the suit by an agreement within the meaning of s 373 of that Code and might be recorded as an adjustment under that section (u). In the later of the two cases (1) Starling J said that it was open to the plaintiff to proceed under s 525 (now sch II para 20) but that it was not obligatory upon him to do so as there was no express provision in the Code of 1882 that no other course than that prescribed by s 595 should be followed.

The present Code however does contain such a provision for it is enacted by s 80 that save in so far as is otherwise provided by the Arbitration Act 1899 or by any other law for the time being in force all references to arbitration whether by an order in a suit or otherwise and all proceedings thereunder shall be governed by the provisions contained in the second Schedule. In a Bombay case decided under this Code it was held by Davar J that where in a pending suit the parties go to arbitration without the intervention of the Court and an award is made the provisions of para 20 of Schedule II do not apply to the award, but that the submission and the award may be recorded as an adjustment under this rule. As to s 80 it was said that the words "any other law for the time being in force" were wide enough to include the provisions of O 23 r 3 (w). Four years later Sir Norman Macleod another judge of the same High Court held in *Shahajshah v Tyab Hays Ayub* (x) that the words "any other law for the time being in force" in s 80 do not include the present rule and that having regard to the provisions of that section a submission and an award could not be recorded as an adjustment under this rule and that the correct procedure was to apply to the Court to file the award under paragraphs 20 and 21 of Sch. II. The above decisions were reviewed by Sir Norman Macleod in *Manila v Goculdas* (y). The learned Judge came to the conclusion that his decision in *Shahajshah's case* was erroneous and said "They [that is the parties] may make the agreement an order of Court and then paras 1 to 15 of Schedule II apply. If they do not make the agreement an order of Court they cannot ask for the agreement to be filed under para 17 they cannot ask for the award if made to be filed under para 20

- (r) *Goculdas Maifatsing C v Scott* (183) 18 Bom 29. *Sailey v Frez* (1896) 20 Bom 304. *Appa ann v Varad* (1) 301. 19 Mad 419. *Sr dhoyan v Purmathan* (1900) 23 Mad 101. *Broj dwi dh v Pannanath* (189) 24 Cal 908.
- (s) *Ba dhu v Shah Muhammad* (183) 14 All 350.
- (t) *S tal J l Balad r* (1916) 33 All 80 81. 31 I C 932.
- (u) *Samibai v Prer j* (1896) 20 Bom 304.

- Pragad s v Gurdas* (190) 26 Bom 6. The correctness of the decision were docted in *R Khanb v Adami* (1900) 33 Bom 60. 1 I C 6.
- (v) (190) 26 Bom 6. 80 s'p s.
- (w) *H r Lba v Jannadu* (1913) 37 Bom 639. 19 I C 86.
- (x) (1916) 40 Bom 388. 37 I C 140.
- (y) (1915) 4 Bom 245. 59 I C 53. (21) A B 310. overruled (1916) 40 Bom 386. 37 I C 140 s'p s.

and 21 If an award is made and both parties accept the award they can apply for a consent decree in terms thereof and there is no need to apply for an order recording the terms of the adjustment If the plaintiff disputes the award for any reason and proceeds with the suit the defendant may plead the award and have the case set down for hearing on the issue whether the award is binding as an adjustment If the defendant disputes the award, the plaintiff may have the case set down for trial on the issue whether the adjustment could be recorded. Either party may file a suit to enforce the award and apply for a stay of the original suit The ground of the ruling in *Mansilal's case* is that a submission and an award properly made in accordance with the submission amounts to an adjustment within the meaning of this rule and as such it may be enforced under the general law of contract The result according to that ruling is that where parties to a suit refer their disputes to arbitration without the intervention of the Court and an award is made an application to press a decree in terms of the award is an application to record a compromise within the meaning of this rule Further if an objection is taken to the award on the ground of misconduct on the part of the arbitrator the Court acting under this rule has jurisdiction under this rule to enquire into the charge of misconduct If the Court does make the inquiry and refuses to record the submission and award the order is not open to revision under s 115 above ( ) The High Court of Calcutta has dissented from the decision in *Mansilal's case* and held that the words any other law for the time being in force in s 89 do not include the present rule further that where in a pending suit the parties go to arbitration without an order of the Court the award cannot be enforced under this rule or Schedule II or under the Arbitration Act also that if a submission to arbitration of matters in difference in a pending suit is to take place there is no provision for it other than the provisions in Schedule II (a) The result according to the Calcutta decisions is that if an award is made under a reference without an order of the Court in a pending suit the Court should not take any notice of the award, and the suit may be proceeded with on the application of either party (b) The High Court of Lahore has held that an award made without the intervention of the Court in a pending suit cannot be recorded as an adjustment under this rule unless all parties agree thereto (c) A Full Bench of the High Court of Allahabad has dissented from the Calcutta rulings and held that a submission and an award may be recorded as an adjustment under this rule (d) And so has a Full Bench of the Madras High Court (e) The Bombay High Court has recently reconsidered the matter in a Full Bench without altering its opinion (f) but it is submitted with respect that the view taken by the Calcutta High Court is correct In a recent Bombay case (g) Rangnekar J expressed his preference for the view taken by the Calcutta High Court If a party does not object to the submission and award being recorded as an adjustment under this rule he is estopped from objecting that the Court had no power to do so under this rule (h)

A mere agreement to refer to arbitration matters in difference in a pending suit where the parties have not gone beyond the agreement to refer and no award has been made cannot be treated as an adjustment of the suit within the meaning of this rule (i)

- (2) *Thakurda v. L. Luthra* (19 3) 5 Bom L R 45 75 I C 10 (23) A B 401  
(a) *Ama chand v. Banerjee & Lall* (19 2) 49 Cal 608 69 I C 804 (22) A C 404  
(b) *D. Kari Tea Co. Ltd. v. The India General Steam Navigation Co. Ltd.* (19 0) 5 C W N 17 61 I C 912 *Gumoni v. T. Rini* (19 7) 55 Cal 5 8 104 I C 360 (7) A C 847  
(c) *Hari Parshad v. Soogni* (19 1) 3 Lab L J 162, 67 I C 123, (21) A L J 2  
(d) *Gajendra Singh v. Durga* (1925) 47 All 637 59 I C 768 (25) A A 503 But see *Bajaj v. Ch. v. Narain* (19 7) 50 All 51 10 I C 608 (27) A A 614  
(e) *Subbaraya v. Venkatrama* (1928) 51 Mad 800 113 I C 63 (18) 4 M. L. 5

- Ayyannamma v. Pamaswami* (19 ) 53 Ma 1 L J 444 104 I C 674 (27) A M 11 6  
(f) *Chenabappa v. Basil ngappa* (1927) 51 Bom 908 10 I C 95 (17) A B 565 F B  
(g) *Dinlarras v. Yash antrai* (19 9) 31 Bom L R 1403 1414  
(h) *Kondi v. Chunilal* (19 9) 53 Bom 75 113 I C 229 (9) A B 1  
(i) *T. Ancoy v. F. L. C. and* (1903) 30 Cal 218 *Venkatachala v. Rangach* (1913) 36 Mad 563 1 I C 37 *Vyanakales v. Ramchandra* (1914) 38 Bom 687 27 I C 46 See also *Khumchand v. Lhogtal* (192 ) 48 Bom 854 67 I C 918 (2) A B 456



- 3 Further a decree obtained upon an award on a reference to the presiding judge and another individual must be regarded as a consent decree and it is not subject to the provisions of Sch. II (j)

**Agreement adjusting a suit**—Where in the course of a suit the pleaders for both parties agreed that if a certain fact appeared upon a certain document the Court should decree the suit otherwise the suit should be dismissed it was held that the agreement was not one *adjusting* the suit within the meaning of this rule for it was not complete and left something to be done by the Court viz to ascertain whether a certain fact appeared upon a certain document (k) But an agreement that the parties will consent to a decree being passed in terms to be stated by a person named is an adjustment of the claim (l) Where a defendant made an offer to the plaintiff that if a certain witness in the case would eat *lachcha* food served by the plaintiff the suit should be decreed and the plaintiff accepted the offer and the witness ate the food served by the plaintiff it was held that the offer and its acceptance amounted to a contract and that the suit should be decreed It was also held that the present rule did not apply to such a case (m)

**Agreement to take oath under the Oaths Act**—It was agreed in the course of the hearing of a suit between the plaintiff and the defendant that the plaintiff should take a certain oath on a certain date and that if he did so there should be a decree for him but that if he failed to do so his suit should be dismissed but it was held the agreement does not amount to an adjustment of the suit so as to entitle the defendant to have the suit dismissed on plaintiff's failure to take the oath The Court should not dismiss the suit but should record the refusal and the reasons thereof under s 12 of the Oaths Act 10 of 1873 and proceed with the trial (n)

**Lawful agreement or compromise.**—Where both parties to a suit apply to the Court under this rule to pass a decree in accordance with the compromise arrived at between them the Court has no power to refuse to pass the decree on the ground that it considers the compromise is too favourable to one of the parties (o) An agreement may be lawful although it is voidable for fraud or undue influence (p) The rule does not refer to such agreements but if the agreement or compromise is unlawful as where it is opposed to public policy the Court should refuse to pass a decree in accordance with the compromise even if the parties consent (q) If a decree is passed under this rule on a compromise which is not lawful the Court should not enforce the decree in execution proceedings Thus a sale of an office attached to a temple is against public policy Hence if in a suit against the holder of such an office a compromise is arrived at whereby the holder of the office consents to the office being sold in satisfaction of the debt due to the plaintiff and a decree is passed on the compromise the Court should notwithstanding the consent decree refuse to sell the office in execution (r) It is clear that if the matter had rested in contract only the Court could not have enforced the sale in a suit brought for that purpose The mere fact that the contract is embodied in a decree does not alter the incidents of the contract By private agreement converted into a decree parties cannot empower themselves to do that which they could not have done by private agreement alone (s) Therefore a decree passed on a compromise with a minor (t) or with a guardian *ad litem* of a minor after the minor has attained majority (u)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| (j) <i>Chakrabarti v. I. T. A. S.</i> (1919) 4 Mad 625 6 9 51 I C 8 7  | (p) <i>Qad v. Faal</i> (19 8) 30 All 48 110 I C 373 (29) A A 494        |
| (k) <i>Muhammad v. Cheda Lal</i> (1892) 14 All 141   | (q) <i>Sund v. Mohi v. Yogav. agurullal</i> (1915) 38 Mad 859 31 I C 72 |
| (l) <i>Himanchal v. Jatur</i> (1924) 46 All 710 80 I C 16 (24) A A 5 0   | (r) <i>Lakshma aye mi v. Fa gamma</i> (1903) 3 Mad 31                   |
| (m) <i>Rani S. dar v. Ja. Karan</i> (19 ) 4 All 456 87 I C 174 (25) A A 71   | (s) <i>Grr t v. W. Ce t al Py Co v. Ch leb</i> (1899) A C 114           |
| (n) <i>Etakott v. Etakot</i> (1909) 31 Mad 1 Sec 61 o P rhu v J s t (19 ) 44 All 117 61 I C 645 (2 ) A A 180 (mlnor) | (t) <i>G. g. d v. R meshwar</i> (19 ) 6 Pat 368 10 I C 449 (27) A P 1   |
| (o) <i>Motiram v. Iesu</i> (1896) 2 Bom 238  | (u) <i>Sa y si v. Yerranndaidu</i> (19 8) 51 Mad 763 (28) A M 294       |

is a nullity. The principle is that where a decree is based on an agreement of compromise the Court must be taken to adopt the agreement with all its incidents (v).

The contract of the parties is not the less a contract and subject to the incidents of a contract because there is superadded the command of a judge (u). On this principle in a case where A sued B on a mortgage and C who was a second mortgagee was joined as a party defendant and A and B entered into a compromise whereby A agreed to pay B more than he was entitled to the Court refused to pass a decree in terms of the agreement on the ground that the compromise was detrimental to the interests of C and that it was not therefore lawful within the meaning of this rule (x). See notes to s 11 above. Consent decree and estoppel. The following are further illustrations —

(a) B holds certain lands under a lease from A. The rent falls into arrears and A sues B for arrears of rent and for possession. It is subsequently agreed between the parties that B should continue to hold the lands as A's tenant but upon fresh terms arranged between the parties which include a forfeiture clause that if default should be made in payment of rent on the due dates the lease should be forfeited. A decree is passed in terms of the agreement under this rule. B commits default in payment of rent. A thereupon applies for possession of the land in execution of the decree. B offers to pay the arrears and applies that he may be relieved against forfeiture. It is clear that if the matter had rested in contract only the Court could have granted the relief. The mere fact therefore that the agreement has been recorded and a decree passed in accordance therewith does not preclude the Court from granting relief against forfeiture (y).

(b) The facts are the same as in the above illustration except that instead of proceeding in execution A institutes a fresh suit against B for possession on default of payment of rent. The same principle applies (z). It would seem that the proper procedure in cases where the forfeiture clause is in the form stated in ill (a) is to enforce the forfeiture not by an application to execute the consent decree but by a regular suit (a). The clause does no more than declare the right of forfeiture and to that extent the decree is declaratory and it is an elementary principle that a declaratory decree can only be enforced by a suit.

**Dekkhan Agriculturists Relief Act**—A Full Bench of the Bombay High Court has held that a compromise in a suit between parties one of whom is an agriculturist within the meaning of the Dekkhan Agriculturists Relief Act (XVII of 1880) is not rendered illegal by want of compliance with the provisions of sec 15B of that Act (b) and that the compromise may be recorded under this rule. But the same High Court has also held that the present rule does not exclude the operation of the special provisions of s 12 of that Act and the Court can under that section go behind the transaction although the whole of the claim is admitted by the agriculturist defendant (c).

**Compromise of probate proceedings**—Unless a will is proved in some form no grant of probate can be made merely on the consent of parties. Hence an agreement or compromise as regards the genuineness and due execution of a will if its effect is to exclude evidence in proof of the will is not lawful within the meaning of this rule and no probate can be granted merely because the caveator consents to the grant. Such an agreement is against public policy for its object is to exclude inquiry into the

(v) *Nagappa v Venkata Rao* (1901) 1 Mad 660.

(w) *Hentworth v B H & Co* (1897) 2 B & C 81.  
See also *Condon v Leyland* (1884) 7 T C D 63, 638.

(x) *Mah v Osa* (1937) 38 Cal LJ 801 C 307 (4) A C 19.

(y) *Nagappa v Venkata Rao* (1901) 24 M d

26. See Transfer of Property Act 188

s 114.

(z) *Kshaba v Hs Cor d* (1907) 31 Bom 15 overruled *Shirali v Mahabliya* (1936) 10 Bom 43.

(a) 31 Bom 15. *See supra*.

(b) *Shir y g ppa v Goe lappa* (1913) 37 Bom 613 O I C 969.

(c) *Gor v v Ba l s* (19 ) 46 Bom 560 67 I C \*53 ( ) A B 331.

genuineness of the will which it is the duty of the Probate Court to make (d) It is therefore open to the caveator before probate is granted to withdraw from the compromise and to require that the will be proved (e) For the same reason if an executor as the result of a compromise withdraws his petition for probate he is not precluded by the provisions of r 1 above from presenting another petition for probate though the first petition was withdrawn without the permission of the Court (f)

Form of decree where compromise includes matters which do not relate to the suit—In *Hemant Kumar v Midnapore Zamindars Co* (g) where a decree comprised lands outside the suit their Lordships of the Privy Council observed as follows —

A perfectly proper and effectual method of carrying out the terms of this [rule] would be for the decree to recite the whole of the agreement and then to conclude with an order relative to that part that was the subject of the suit or it could introduce the agreement in a schedule to the decree but in either case although the operative part of the decree would be properly confined to the actual subject matter of the then existing litigation the decree taken as a whole would include the agreement Thus in fact is what the decree did in the present case It may be that as a decree it was incapable of being executed outside the lands of the suit but that does not prevent it being received in evidence of its contents

It is clear from this passage that where a suit is adjusted by a lawful agreement between the parties the proper course is to recite the agreement in the decree or to annex it as a schedule to the decree but in either case the operative part of the decree should be confined to the actual subject matter of the suit It would be wrong to refuse to incorporate in the decree matters which form part of the compromise because they are extraneous to the suit such matters should be excluded only from the operative part of the decree

Where in a testamentary suit consent terms are proposed some of which fall within the testamentary jurisdiction and others do not the decree may properly embody all the terms in a schedule for reference but its operative part should be confined to such terms as are within its jurisdiction and the Testamentary Court should leave the parties to take separate proceedings in the ordinary original civil jurisdiction to enforce the remaining terms if necessary (h)

Matters which relate to the suit—As already stated that when a compromise comprises matters extraneous to the suit the operative part of the decree should be confined to matters that relate to the suit But what are matters that relate to the suit? In *Gobinda v Duarka Nath* (i) Mitra J said

The question whether any particular term relates to the suit must be decided from the frame of the suit the relief claimed and the relief allowed by the decree on adjustment by lawful agreement The mutual connection of the different parts of the relief granted by a consent decree is an important element for consideration in each case in deciding whether any portion of the relief is within the scope of the suit No hard and fast rule can be laid down each case being governed by its own facts In a later Calcutta case (j) Pankaj J said In some of the decisions section 375 [now O 23 r 3] has been applied by making a distinction between property in

d) *Ghullabha v Nandub* (1897) 21 Bom 33  
 21 *nmohin v Ranga* (1904) 31 Cal 357  
 (e) *Ja akbat v Gay a nd* (1916) 1 P t L J 377 37 I C 1  
 (f) *Jug shir v J g (Dars)* (1914) 2 P t L J 535 40 I C 345  
 (g) (1919) 46 I A 40 48 47 C 1 485 49  
 53 I C 534 *Giban v P mesh* (19-3) 38 C 1 I J 2 65 I C 47 U P Ayas  
 v M Pan Me (19 8) 5 Ra g 60 107  
 I t 163 (28) A R 43  
 (h) *Bai Mo glab v Ba R mball xmi* (19 0) Bom L R 1286 59 I C 344  
 (i) (1908) 35 C 1 837 841  
 (j) *Sh shi Bh san v Ha Nara n* (19 1) 48 Cal 10 9 10 4 1075 46 I C 0 (1) A C 90

suit and property extraneous to the litigation. Where a suit is *merely for the recovery of specific properties* that distinction will be adequate and will be equal to the distinction between matters which relate to the suit and matters which do not. In some cases however suits are not for the recovery of property but to establish particular rights and I certainly prefer the opinion expressed in the case reported in 35 Cal 63<sup>1</sup> to the effect that the facts have to be looked at as a whole in order to decide whether matters have been introduced into the suit that do not relate to the suit. As to the latter class of case it may be stated that as a general rule all terms which form the consideration for the adjustment of the matters in dispute whether they form the subject matter of the suit or not become related to the suit and can be embodied in the decree. Thus where A sued B on a promissory note and a compromise was arrived at between the parties whereby B agreed to pay the amount of the note by instalments and the amount was also made a charge on certain immovable property of B it was held that there was nothing in the present rule to preclude the Court from making the amount a charge on B's property even though the relief claimed was for a money decree only. The charge though not claimed as a relief related to the suit (l). It formed the consideration for the time allowed for payment of the sum decreed by instalments and thus constituted an integral and necessary part of the adjustment of the claim in the suit (l). It has similarly been held that where A and B are joint tenants of certain land and A having paid up the entire rent sues B for contribution and a compromise is arrived at whereby B in consideration of A abandoning his claim gives up his share of the land to A the term as to B giving up his share is a term which relates to the suit (m). Where in execution of a decree obtained by A against B A attaches certain property and C claiming the property as his own brings a suit against A for a declaration of his title to the property and a compromise is arrived at between the parties whereby A admits C's ownership of the property and C agrees to execute a mortgage of the same property in favour of A for the amount of the decree obtained by A against B the term as to the execution of the mortgage is a term which relates to the suit (n). But where A sued B to restrain B from building a projected house in such a way as to interfere with A's enjoyment of light and air and a compromise was arrived at between the parties whereby B undertook not to build his house higher than it originally was and also agreed not to let water into the passage between the houses it was held that the arrangement as to the passage did not relate to the suit and that the operative part of the decree should be confined to the undertaking as to the house (o). But the parties can get over the difficulty by amending the pleadings with the leave of the Court so as to comprise in the pleadings and the decree matters that did not relate to the original suit but are comprised in the compromise (p). In a Patna case where the plaintiff claimed Rs 7000 with interest at the rate of 9½ per cent per annum and a consent decree was passed whereby the defendant agreed to pay Rs 2500 with interest at the rate of 9 per cent per annum if the amount was paid on a specified date but at 24 per cent per annum if it was not paid on or before that date the Court refused execution of the decree with interest at 24 per cent on the ground that that part of the compromise which provided for the payment of interest at the rate of 24 per cent per annum was outside the scope of the suit and allowed execution with interest at

(1) *Joti v Izari* (190) 30 M d 48 *Rama v Sobarja* (195) 49 M d L J 490 494 88 I C 648 (5) A M 1101 *Natesa Chait v Igu* (1910) 33 M d 10 31 C 01 *Bhara v Ma* d *gla* (1907) 17 Mad L J 00 *Saba pathy v Iamaliya* (191) 38 M d 9 23 I C 581 *Iyeg v Koorur* (1914) 27 Mad L J 173 2 I C 58 *Patnagarani v Rammol* (1914) 27 M d L J 388 24 I C 135 *Ghau Sambhu* (1918) 31 At L J 25 268 40 I C 356

(l) *Gobinda Chandra v Dwarika Nath* (1908) 35 Cal 837 *Purna v Madhub* (1901) C W N 485  
(n) *Jach v Chaita* (1919) 24 C W N 38 41 C 538  
(n) *Sa dam v Belry Lal* (190) 2 C W N 68 61 I C 535 *Bha v S n th* (191) 5 C W N 808 66 I C 273 (2) A C 38  
(o) *Ruttonsey v Foadai* (1883) 7 Borr 304  
(p) *Mohibullah v Imami* (1897) 9 All 20

3 9 per cent only (g) This decision cannot be supported either on principle or on authority so far as the ground on which it is based is concerned See notes below Execution of decree based on a compromise

**Parties**—If persons other than parties to the suit are parties to the compromise it cannot be recorded unless those persons are brought on the record as parties to the suit This is because the Court has to be satisfied before recording a compromise under this rule that there is a lawful compromise and this is not possible in the absence of those that are not parties to the suit (r) In a case where the first defendant transferred his interest in the subject matter of the suit to the second defendant who effected a compromise with the plaintiff the Privy Council held that the fact that the first defendant remained on the record did not give him sufficient interest to entitle him to raise any objection to the compromise or to appeal from the decree (s)

**Compromise pending arbitration**—The Calcutta High Court has held that where the matters in dispute in a suit are referred to arbitration under an order of reference made by the Court and pending the reference the parties adjust the suit by an agreement in writing signed by them and the arbitrators the agreement does not amount to an award Nor can it be recorded as an adjustment under this rule unless the arbitration has been superseded by an order of the Court the mere fact that the time for making the award has expired does not amount to a supersession of the arbitration there must be an order of supersession under para 8 of Schedule II (t) In a Madras case where the lower Court had under somewhat similar circumstances recorded the adjustment under the present rule it was held that as the time for making the award had expired when the adjustment was recorded the Court must be deemed to have exercised its power to supersede the arbitration under para 8 of Schedule II (u)

**Execution of decree based on a compromise**—This rule requires that where the Court is invited to pass a decree in terms of an agreement or compromise the agreement or compromise should be lawful and further that the operative part of the decree should be confined to the actual subject matter of the suit But what if a decree is passed on an agreement that is not lawful or that the operative part of the decree comprises matters that do not relate to the suit Is the Court bound to execute the decree literally according to its terms? The decisions on the subject may be summarized as follows—

*First where a consent decree is based on an agreement or compromise that is not lawful*—As to this it has been held that so far as the decree embodies unlawful terms of a compromise it is inoperative and will not be enforced (v) The subject has already been dealt with above in the notes Unlawful agreement or compromise

*Next where a consent decree embraces matters that do not relate to the suit*—Where a decree passed on a compromise includes terms that relate to the suit all the terms may be enforced in execution of the decree But where it contains terms that do not relate to the suit there is a conflict of opinion whether those terms can be enforced in execution According to the Allahabad and Madras decisions such terms can be enforced in execution of the decree (w) It is not open to the party against whom the decree is sought to be executed to object to the decree on the ground that it contains matters foreign to

(g) *Ga rri Dutt v Dol* (1917) 2 Pat L J 83  
43 I C 459

(r) *Dooly CA d v Mohan Lal* (1914) 51 C I 43  
83 I C 606 (4) A C 2

(s) *S' I v BA te v Y ra mla* (1907) 54  
I A 111 51 Bom 44 101 I C 0 (27)  
A PC 57

(t) *Dool, Chand v M A n Lal* (1914) 51 C I 43  
41 J 440 93 I C 606 (4) A C 2

(u) *Ang v Marappa* (1903) 4 Mad L J 76  
78 I C 609 (3) A M 576

(v) *Lakshmi Narayana v Ra gamma* (1903) 6  
M I 31

(w) *M A b Bak v Imami* (1887) 9 All 9  
*Ma ayy of Sr Meenak hi Derana am v*  
*Abi I Kas m* (1907) 30 Ma I 421 S ba-  
*pat v I a m I I ga* (1915) 33 M d 99  
23 I C 541 Seal o C ri D iv Dol n  
(1917) I L J 673 43 I C 459

the suit. Such an objection it has been said by the Madras High Court must be taken by way of appeal from the decree [and now by way of appeal under O 43 r 2 (m) from the order recording the compromise] and it cannot be taken in execution of the decree (x). On the other hand the High Court of Calcutta has said that such terms cannot be enforced in execution of the decree but they may be enforced as a contract by a separate suit (y). Such a suit however according to the Allahabad High Court would be barred under s 47 the question in the view taken by that Court being one relating to execution (z). In *Hemanti Kumari v Midnapur Zamindars Co* (a) where a decree comprised lands outside the suit the Judicial Committee observed. A perfectly proper and effectual method of carrying out the terms of [the present rule] would be for the decree to recite the whole of the agreement and then to conclude with an order relative to that part that was the subject of the suit or it could introduce the agreement in a schedule to the decree but in either case although the operative part of the decree would be properly confined to the actual subject matter of the then existing litigation the decree taken as a whole would include the agreement. This in fact is what the decree did in the present case. *It may be that as a decree it was incapable of being executed outside the lands of the district* but that does not prevent it being received in evidence of its contents. The correct view it is submitted is that the decree may be executed as to the operative part alone which as stated above is to be confined to the actual subject matter of the suit. As to the rest it may be enforced as a contract by a separate suit.

**Appeal**—An order under this rule recording or refusing to record a compromise is appealable under O 43 r 1 (m). The Court may under this rule either record a compromise or it may refuse to do so. If an order is made recording the compromise the Court must pass a decree in accordance with the compromise. If an order is made refusing to record the compromise the suit will be proceeded with. But in either case as stated above an appeal will lie from the order. Where an order is made recording the agreement an appeal may be preferred on any of the following grounds—

- 1 That there was no compromise at all or no such compromise as the Court ordered to be recorded (b)
- 2 That the compromise is not lawful (c)
- 3 That the compromise recorded by the Court comprises matters that do not relate to the suit (d)

A compromise entered into by a pleader without the authority of his client is no compromise at all (e) and as such it comes under group (1) above.

It has been held by the High Courts of Lahore (f) and Madras (g) that the fact that a decree has been passed in accordance with the compromise does not preclude an appeal from the order recording the compromise. On the other hand it has been held by the High Court of Calcutta that an appeal from the order is incompetent if the appeal

- (x) *Ma age f Sri Mee akshi D ro tanam v Abdul Kasim* (190 ) 30 Mad 41  
*Patnagarani v J i a mal* (1914) 27 M d L J 598 41 C 13
- (y) *Jas mudd n v Bh ban* (190 ) 34 Cal 456  
463 *P rna C lu ra v Al Madl b* (1901) 5 Cal W N 495
- (z) *Moh bulla v Im mi* (188 ) 9 All 9
- (a) (1919) 46 I A 240 246 47 C I 48 49  
53 I C 534 1st app from 19 C W 347  
8 I C 89
- (b) *Coruldas v James Scott* (189 ) 16 B m 20 21  
*T l nand v F t A D n* (1918) 1unj Rec no 83 p 27 4 I C 230  
[where no consent was given at all by some of the parties to the suit]
- (c) *Coruldas v James Scott* (189 ) 16 Bom 20

- \*1. *Str dha an v Puramathan* (1900) 3 Mad 101
- (d) *I e k teppa v Thimma* (189 ) 18 Mad 410  
*Pr gd s v G dhard a* (190 ) 26 Bom 76  
9 *Ma age of Sr Veenaal hi Deras t an v Abd l la n* (1907) 30 Mad 41 43  
*M homed Ro hu v Raim t Uah* (1914) Punj Rec no 96 p 355  
24 I C 630
- (e) *The at v S l m l* (1917) 41 Mad 33  
41 I C 49
- (f) *M homed R sh d v Faimat Uah* (1914) Punj Rec no 96 p 35 24 I C 630  
*Megh R j v Telen Ram* (194) 6 Lah L J 18 80 I C 698 ( 4) A L 460
- (g) *Sat na at Moorchi v Bit harjya* (19 ) 48 Mad L J 743 87 I C 124 (25) A M 606

is filed after the passing of the decree (h) See notes to s 96 Sub sec (3) above consent decrees not appealable and notes above under the head Scope of the rule

O 43 r 1 (m) does not apply to an order setting aside an award under a reference made through the intervention of the Court Such a case falls within Schedule II of the Code (i)

Registration—As to registration of decrees based on a compromise see Mulla's Registration Act p 78 *et seq*

Execution proceedings—See r 4 below

#### 4 [S 375 A] Nothing in this Order shall apply to any proceedings in execution of a decree or order

Proceedings in execution of decrees not affected

Proceedings in execution—One effect of this rule is that the provisions of r 3 shall not apply to execution proceedings The reason is that O 21 r 2 and s 47 taken together provide a complete procedure for recording compromises arrived at in execution proceedings (j) This rule also prevents the provisions of r 1 from applying to proceedings in execution Hence where an application for execution of a decree has been made the Court has no power to allow the applicant to withdraw the application under r 1 (2) above with permission to make a fresh application (l) For the same reason the applicant cannot withdraw his application under r 1 (1) above though he may apply for its dismissal if he does not wish to proceed farther with it (i) The High Court of Bombay has held that a compromise of a suit for partnership accounts after the passing of a preliminary decree and during the pendency of an enquiry before the Commissioner for taking accounts is not a compromise of a proceeding in execution Such a compromise may therefore be recorded under r 3 above (m) In Rangoon it has been held that an agreement between the mortgagor and the mortgagee after the preliminary decree for sale and before the final decree whereby the mortgagee agrees to allow an extension of time to the mortgagor for payment of the decretal amount is within O 21 r 2 and not within r 3 above (n) The High Court of Patna has held that an application to set aside a sale under O 21 r 90 is not a proceeding in execution, and that a compromise arrived at between the parties that on the judgment debtor paying a certain sum into Court by a particular date the Court sale should be set aside may therefore be recorded under r 3 above (o) But the correctness of this decision is doubtful

### ORDER XXIV

#### Payment into Court

1 [S 760, R S C O 21, r 1] The defendant in any suit to recover a debt or damages may, at any stage of the suit, deposit in Court such sum of money as he considers a satisfaction in full of the claim

Deposit by defendant of amount in satisfaction of claim

- (h) *Be g i Coal Co v Ap r Coll erie* (19 4) 41 C W N 9 8 87 I C 48 (A) A C 41  
(i) *Munsh v G Lar* (19 4) 9 C W N 79  
(j) *IC 773 (25) A C 9 3*  
(j) *Choudh ry v Choudhury* (19 1) 6 Pat L J 3 54 6 I C 608 (1) A P 107  
(k) *M l v Be i* (1914) 36 All 1 2 I C 951

- (l) *Choudhury v Al hesh* (19 1) Pat 3 6 I C 1 (A) A P 5 5  
(m) *Pr gd a v G rdhardas* (190 ) 6 Bom 6  
(n) *Ahmed v A L A R Chelli r F rm* (19 3) 6 Hang 3 110 I C 873 (A) A R 194  
(o) (19 1) 6 Pat L J 3 6 I C 608 (1) A P 107 *supra*

**Payment into Court with denial of liability**—There is no provision in his rule enabling a defendant to pay money into Court *with a denial of liability* in other word *without prejudice to his contentions* as there is in the corresponding English rule see R S C O 22 rr 1 and 6

**Mere willingness to pay**—A mere averment of willingness to pay made in the written statement is not equivalent to payment into Court and it does not stop interest from running (p)

**Suit to recover a debt or damages**—This order applies only to a suit to recover a debt or damages and not to any other suits. Where a suit is instituted against a defendant to recover a debt or damages he may pay into Court such amounts *as he considers a satisfaction in full of the plaintiff's claim*. By such payment into Court the defendant may be benefited (1) in respect of interest for which see r 3 and (2) in respect of costs for which see r 4 and illustrations thereto

**Suit for injunction**—A suit for an injunction to restrain a defendant from building so as to interfere with the plaintiff's light and air but *not including any claim for damages* is not a suit for debt or damages within the meaning of this rule. No doubt the Court has in such a suit a discretion under s 10 of the Specific Relief Act I of 1877 to award damages in lieu of injunction but this circumstance does not make the suit one for damages within the meaning of this rule (q). But it has been held by the High Court of Bombay in view of the long established practice of that Court that where a defendant in a suit for an injunction pure and simple pays into Court a sum which he considers a satisfaction in full of the plaintiff's claim though it be with defence denying liability and the Court allows damages only to the plaintiff and that too to the extent of the amount deposited by the defendant the principle underlying r 4 below ought to regulate the discretion of the Court (which it has under s 35) in directing the payment of costs (r).

**Suit for accounts**—This rule does not apply to suits for accounts (s).

**Suit to recover debt or damages together with other relief**—This rule applies to suits to recover debt or damages though there may be other reliefs claimed in the suit e.g. injunction (t).

**At any stage of the suit**—This means *before decree* as indicated by the words *in full of the claim* and the subsequent rules. See notes to r 3 below. Execution proceedings.

**Payment into Court and insolvency of defendant**—In England it has been held that when money is paid into Court *admitting liability* the plaintiff in the event of the defendant's bankruptcy is a secured creditor in respect of it and when liability is denied he is a secured creditor to the extent to which his claim is admitted by the trustee in bankruptcy or proved (u).

2 [S 377] Notice of the deposit shall be given through the Court by the defendant to the plaintiff, and the amount of the deposit shall (unless the Court otherwise directs) be paid to the plaintiff on his application

Notice of deposit

Compare R S C O 22 rr 4 and 5

Form—For form of notice see App H form no 3

(p) *H v Abd I R Iman v H v Noor Mal*; sF (189) 16 Bom 141 10  
(q) *Laxman v Moroba* (189) 21 Bom 10  
(r) *Laxman v Moroba* (1897) 21 Bom 10

(s) *N. Moh v Erens* (1883) 2 C D 611  
(t) See *Moon v Dickinson* (1890) 63 L T 371  
(u) *Is Gordon* [189] 1 Q B 516



Unless the Court otherwise directs —These words show that the Court has a discretion to refuse to allow monies to be paid out. That discretion however should be exercised reasonably. Where the money sued for and paid into Court is due on a promissory note it would be unreasonable in the absence of special circumstances not to allow the plaintiff to take the money out. The fact that the payment into Court is accompanied by a denial of liability on the ground of minority is not such a circumstance (v). Where there are conflicting claims as where the amount deposited in Court is claimed by different parties no party can withdraw the amount without an order of the Court (u).

**3 [S 378]** No interest shall be allowed to the plaintiff on any sum deposited by the defendant from the date of the receipt of such notice, whether the sum deposited is in full of the claim or falls short thereof.

Interest on deposit not allowed to plaintiff after notice

**Tender**—A plea of tender before action must in order to stop interest be accompanied by a payment into Court after action otherwise the tender is ineffectual (x).

**Execution proceedings**—The principle of this rule applies to proceedings in execution therefore if money is paid into Court by a judgment debtor no interest should be allowed to the decree holder on the amount so paid although such amount may not in fact be the whole amount due under the decree (y).

**4 [S 379]** (1) Where the plaintiff accepts such amount as satisfaction in part only of his claim, he may prosecute his suit for the balance, and, if the Court decides that the deposit by the defendant was a full satisfaction of the plaintiff's claim the plaintiff shall pay the costs of the suit incurred after the deposit and the costs incurred previous thereto, so far as they were caused by excess in the plaintiff's claim.

Procedure where plaintiff accepts deposit as satisfaction in part

(2) Where the plaintiff accepts such amount as satisfaction in full of his claim, he shall present to the Court a statement to that effect and such statement shall be filed and the Court shall pronounce judgment accordingly, and, in directing by whom the costs of each party are to be paid, the Court shall consider which of the parties is most to blame for the litigation.

Procedure where plaintiff accepts deposit as satisfaction in full

(r) *Dwork Bass v Gresh Chander* (1899) 6 Cal 66

(w) *Haji Abd I Rahman v Haji Noor M Ahmed* (189) 16 Bom 141

(x) *Haji Abd I Rahman v Haji Noor M Ahmed*

(199) 16 Bom 141 *Rajah Chandra*  
v *B K Rao* (1908) 3 C I W N 103

(y) A C 874

(y) *A I v Mubham mad* (1917) 40 All 1543  
I C 50

*Illustrations*

(a) *A* owes *B* Rs 100. *B* sues *A* for the amount having made no demand for payment and having no reason to believe that the delay caused by making a demand would place him at a disadvantage. On the plaint being filed *A* pays the money into Court. *B* accepts it in full satisfaction of his claim but the Court should not allow him any costs the litigation being presumably groundless on his part.

(b) *B* sues *A* under the circumstances mentioned in illustration (a). On the plaint being filed *A* disputes the claim. Afterwards *A* pays the money into Court. *B* accepts it in full satisfaction of his claim. The Court should also give *B* his costs of suit. *A*'s conduct having shown that the litigation was necessary.

(c) *A* owes *B* Rs 100 and is willing to pay him that sum without suit. *B* claims Rs. 150 and sues *A* for that amount. On the plaint being filed *A* pays Rs 100 into Court and disputes only his liability to pay the remaining Rs 50. *B* accepts the Rs 100 in full satisfaction of his claim. The Court should order him to pay *A*'s costs.

Compare P & C O 2- r 6

Apportionment of costs.—See notes to r 1. Suit for injunction on p 829 above

## ORDER XXV

*Security for Costs*

- 1 [Ss 380, 382] (1) Where, at any stage of a suit, it appears to the Court that a sole plaintiff is, or (when there are more plaintiffs than one) that all the plaintiffs are residing out of British India, and that such plaintiff

When security for costs may be required from plaintiff

does not, or that no one of such plaintiff does possess any sufficient immovable property within British India other than the property in suit, the Court may, either of its own motion or on the application of any defendant, order the plaintiff or plaintiffs, within a time fixed by it, to give security for the payment of all costs incurred and likely to be incurred by any defendant.

- (2) Whoever leaves British India under such circumstances as to afford reasonable probability that he will not be forthcoming whenever he may be called upon to pay costs shall

Residence out of British India

be deemed to be residing out of British India within the meaning of sub rule (1)

- (3) On the application of any defendant in a suit for the payment of money, in which the plaintiff is a woman, the Court may at any stage of the suit make a like order if it is

1 satisfied that such plaintiff does not possess any sufficient immovable property within British India

**Object of the rule**—The object of the rule is to provide for the protection of defendants in certain cases where in the event of success they may have difficulty in realizing their costs from the plaintiff ( )

**Application of the rule**—Security for the costs of a defendant may be required from a plaintiff in the following two cases —

- I (a) Where the plaintiff resides out of British India or where there are two or more plaintiffs all the plaintiffs reside out of British India and
- (b) where none of the plaintiffs has sufficient immovable property within British India other than the property in suit
- II (a) Where the plaintiff is a woman
- (b) where her suit is for the payment of money and
- (c) she does not possess sufficient immovable property within British India

**Discretion of Court in requiring security for costs from non resident plaintiff**—The word may implies discretion In the exercise of this discretion the Court will not order security for costs from a plaintiff residing out of British India in cases in which he cannot be rendered liable for the defendant's costs e.g. an administration suit by the plaintiff as a creditor or a legatee in which the plaintiff's claim is admitted or a suit on a mortgage or a promissory note where there is no defence In such cases no security for costs will be ordered even though the plaintiff resides out of British India and has not sufficient immovable property within British India not even though the plaintiff be a woman (a)

**Resides**—The residence intended in this rule is residence under such circumstances as will afford a reasonable probability that the plaintiff will be forthcoming when the suit is decided Mere presence in British territory at the time of suit is not residence (b) Thus a resident of a Native State staying in Bombay for the sole purpose of taking proceedings to get his wife back cannot be said to reside in Bombay within the meaning of this rule (c) See notes to s. 20 above Actually and voluntarily resides

**Trading corporations**—The residence and domicile of an incorporated trading company are determined by the situation of its principal place of business By the principal place of business is meant the place where the administrative business of the company is conducted This may not be the place where its manufacture or other operations are carried on Dicey's Conflict of Laws 3rd ed p 164

**British India**—Aden is within British India (d) The Kathiawar States are not within British India (e) nor is the Cantonment of Wadhwan (f) nor the Cantonment of Secunderabad (g) nor the Rajkot Civil Station (h) See notes to s. 1 British India p 4 above

**Immovable property**—A plaintiff who is entitled under a will to a beneficial interest in a part of the surplus income derived from immovable property cannot

- (c) *Frencha d l the goods of (1899) 1 Cal 832 at 1 836*
- (a) *Pemch d l in the goods of (1894) 1 Cal 832 836*
- (b) *M Ahmed Shafi v Lald n (18 9) 3 Bom*
- (c) *Il f v A les (19 ) 46 B m 89 64*  
1 C 03 (2 ) A B 209

- (d) Aden Laws Regulation 1891 s 2
- (e) *Hemch ad v t m S ka tal (1906) 33 I A 1 8 Bom L R 1 9*
- (f) *Emp or v Ch m tal (1912) 14 Bom L R 8 6 17 I C 534 41 ating from 2 ruccam v B B & C f Rj (1885) 9 Bom 44*
- (g) *Hoos ti v toud ti (1914) 1 Cal 1 7*
- (h) *Q Emp s v Ad t (1896) 10 Bom 1 20*

be said to possess immovable property within the meaning of this rule (i) Leasehold property is immovable property within the meaning of this rule (j)

**Poverty of plaintiff**—Vere poverty is no ground for requiring a plaintiff to give security for the costs of the suit (l) But it is otherwise if he is not the real litigant and issuing on behalf of another who is not a party to the suit (l) In a recent Bombay case a suit was brought by a Parsi father and his minor daughter as plaintiffs for damages for the defendant's breach of his promise to marry the daughter The father was an undischarged insolvent and it was alleged that the suit was really the father's suit and that he was seeking to make money out of his daughter's engagement The Court upon these grounds ordered the father to furnish security for the costs of the defendant (m) In the last mentioned case the Court relied upon a dictum of Bowen L. J. in *Courell v Taylor* (n) that in order to prevent abuse if an insolvent sues as nominal plaintiff for the benefit of somebody else he must give security

**Inherent power to order security for costs**—The case for security for costs from a puppet plaintiff is clearly outside the scope of this rule It can only be brought in under the inherent power of the Court In one case the Calcutta High Court said that it had such power (o) In a later case the same High Court said that the Court had no such power the reason given being that the inherent power of the Court cannot be invoked in matters for which the Code does actually provide (p) See notes above Poverty of plaintiff

**Where leave has been granted to plaintiff to sue as a pauper**—The Court has no power under this rule to require security for costs from a person to whom leave has been granted under O 33 r 8 to sue as a pauper for to do so would be to render the leave nugatory (q) If an order is made requiring a plaintiff to furnish security for the costs of the defendant and leave is subsequently granted to the plaintiff to continue the suit as a pauper the order ceases to operate as regards antecedent costs provided leave is granted before the time limited for giving security has expired (r)

**Where the plaintiff is a minor**—The power as to requiring security for costs is a discretionary one and except in exceptional cases neither a minor plaintiff nor his or her next friend should be required to give security for costs (s) not even if both the minor and his next friend are residing out of British India and do not own immovable property in British India (t)

**Where the plaintiff is a woman**—The necessity for the provisions of sub r (3) arises from the provisions of s 56 by which it is enacted that no woman can be arrested or detained in the civil prison in execution of a decree for the payment of money (u) But the Court has a discretion in the matter and in the exercise of its discretion it will not as a general rule require security for costs from a woman plaintiff if the result of such an order will be practically to defeat the suit where it has been instituted bona fide (v)

(i) French Ind in the goods of (1894) 1 Cal 83

(j) *Russchall v Jadubram* (1873) 10 Beng L R App 2

(l) *Ma cly v Gooli* (18 9) 3 Bom 41  
K A J A sen Rajoo v Solomon (1887) 14 Cal 533

(m) *Pam Com v Coondoo v Chudker Co to Mokerj* (18 7) Cal 33 & I A 23  
[a case under the Code of 18 9 whi h did not contain ny provision for sec rity for costs] A K J A sen ooljayoo v Solomo (1887) 14 Cal 33 Hs th v I n K ar (1913) 18 Cal W 119 O I C 701

(n) Bom J v Vusserwanj (1903) 27 Bom 100

(o) (1885) 31 Ch D 34 34

(p) *Harikath v Ram Kuma* (1913) 18 Cal W 110 20 I C 703

(q) *Bh irabend a v Uda Va ai* (19 3) 50 Cal 8 3 854 866 79 I C 98 (-1) A C 51

(r) *Musammat Hafiza v Abdul Karim* (1908) 1 C W N 184 See also *Vussereood n Buxwa v Ujj l B was* (18 1) 17 W R 63 [no security for costs from pauper appell nt]

(s) *Bai Laxm v Harj ran* (1912) 36 Bom 415 1 I C 538

(t) *Bai Ior ba v Desai* (1899) 23 Bom 100  
*Bfan Bai v Lodd Gov nd* (1908) 18 Mad L J 155

(u) *Bh sha ker v Muly* (1910) 3 Bom 339 11 I C 51

(v) *Pres l nd in the goods of* (1894) 21 Cal 85 836

( ) *Nam b i v Daji Govind* (1911) 3 Bom 41 81 C 19  
*S naba v T whoseandas* (1908) 3 Bom 60 606

**Persons exempted from attending Court**—Amongst those so exempted are women who according to the custom and manners of the country ought not to be compelled to appear in public (see s 132) This is a right which no Court has power to refuse (f) Such women ought to be examined on commission even though they may have appeared in public before (g) and though an allegation of immorality is made against them (h) A woman may have entirely abandoned the protection of the *parda* and yet she may be exempted under s 132 from giving evidence in Court if the Court is satisfied having regard to the class and community to which she belongs that she should not be compelled to appear in the witness box (i) A religious preceptor is not one of the persons exempted from attending the Court (j)

**May issue**—See notes to r 4 below under the head **May issue**

**Sickness or infirmity**—If sickness or infirmity is alleged the character and gravity of that sickness or infirmity must be ascertained and the risk consequent upon a refusal to issue a commission must be taken into consideration At the same time the importance of having witnesses present before the Court should not altogether be lost sight of (k) The application may be granted even if the defence consists of an equitable counterclaim If it is found that the vendor is unable to attend Court by reason of sickness or infirmity the Court has discretion to grant or refuse the application Such discretion cannot be revised under sec 115 above (l)

**Evidence taken on commission under this rule**—Where evidence is taken on commission under this rule the procedure laid down in r 8 below should be strictly observed (m)

**Arbitration**—It is competent to the Court to issue a commission for the examination of witnesses though the matters in difference in the suit have been referred to arbitration under Schedule II of this Code (n)

**Appeal**—See notes to rule 3 below **Appeal**

**Revision**—See notes above **Sickness or infirmity**

**2 [S 384]** An order for the issue of a commission for the examination of a witness may be made by the Court either of its own motion or on the application, supported by affidavit or otherwise, of any party to the suit or of the witness to be examined

Order for commission

**3 [S 385]** A commission for the examination of a person who resides within the local limits of the jurisdiction of the Court issuing the same may be issued to any person whom the Court thinks fit to execute

Where witness resides within Court's jurisdiction

(f) *Rafimay ne sa v Sita k II dm* (19-8) ( 8) A C 814

(g) *Mforesh (hu der v Af E Lall* (1899) 6 Cal 60 *Chan ik r v Moh sh Ch nder* (1899) 6 Cal 651 *Bal Leshwari v J n na d* (1918) 4 Cal 697 41 I C 610

(h) *B od ni v Kala Chand* (1901) 5 C I W N p cxxiii

(i) *Salomon v Jyot a* (1918) 44 C I 49 44 I C 15

(j) *Panach nd v Manoharlal* (1916) 4 Bom 136 144 14 43 I C J

(k) *Pan hi r v P nch an* (19 4) 39 Cal L J 98 60 84 I C 9 ( 4) A C 971

(l) *Pha nd a v Pramatha* (19 8) 55 Cal. 13 106 I C 880 (-8) A C 4 1

(m) (19 8) 5 Cal 748 106 I C 880 (23) A C 431

(n) *Rab ba v Palimaban* (1865) Bom L B 560

4 [S 386] (1) Any Court may in any O 26  
 suit issue a commission for the examination  
 of—

Persons for whose ex-  
 amination commi. kon may  
 be ue

- (a) any person resident beyond the local limits of its jurisdiction,
- (b) any person who is about to leave such limits before the date on which he is required to be examined in Court, and
- (c) any civil or military officer of the Government who cannot, in the opinion of the Court, attend without detriment to the public service

(2) Such commission may be issued to any Court, not being a High Court, within the local limits of whose jurisdiction such person resides, or to any pleader or other person whom the Court issuing the commission may appoint

(3) The Court on issuing any commission under this rule shall direct whether the commission shall be returned to itself or to any subordinate Court

Form—For form of commission to examine absent witness see App H form No 7

May issue—The Court has a discretion to grant or refuse a commission (o) But the discretion must be exercised judicially (p) If the Court fails to exercise the discretion judicially such failure is of itself no ground for interfering with the decree in appeal the appellate Court should not interfere unless it is shown if the lower Court has exercised its discretion judicially the decision would have been different from what it was (q)

Commission for the examination of witnesses—Ordinarily in the case of a witness not under the control of the party asking for a commission who resides beyond the limit fixed under O 16 r 19 (b) a commission should issue as a matter of right unless the Court is satisfied that the party is merely abusing its authority to issue process It is not for the Court to decide whether the party will be benefited thereby or not that is a matter entirely for the party (r)

Plaintiff asking for a commission to examine himself—Suppose a plaintiff residing in Delhi institutes a suit in Bombay and then applies to the Bombay Court for the issue of a commission for his examination in Delhi In such a case the Court will refuse the application unless a very strong case is made out because the Bombay tribunal is that chosen by the plaintiff himself (s)

(o) *Bey Lyre* (1864) 1 Hydr 68 *Cock v Allcock* (1888) 1 Q B D 19

(p) *Hirree Dass v Meer Moosum* (1871) 15 W R 447 *Muz v Hemcland* (1892) 23 Bom 66 *P. Chakar v Pa chanan* (19 4) 33 C L J 598 601 602 84 I C 9 (24) A C 91

(q) *Alku n sa v F p Lal* (1898) 5 Cal 807 2 I A 117

(r) *Jag atla v Sar thamb l* (19 3) 46 Mal

574 577 71 I C 530 ( 3) A M 31 *Siam v S braya* (1911) 21 M d L J 889 12 I C 74 *A irith Vall v Dhun pat S gh* (18 3) 0 W R 253 *Hu ee Dass v Al er Moosum* (18 1) 15 W R 447

(s) *Poss v Woodf rd* (1894) 1 Ch 38 4 *New v Bur s* (1894) 64 L J Q B 104 *Kesley v Wall y* (1893) 9 Times Rep 571 *Nawab Sa yad v Herbert* (19 4) 31 at 863 84 I C 993 ( ) A I 1

6,  
9

**Reading depositions in evidence**—Evidence taken on commission cannot be used without the consent of the opposite party unless the conditions of clause (a) are fulfilled or the record shews that the discretion under clause (b) has been exercised by the Court (k)

According to the practice prevailing on the Original Side of the High Court of Calcutta evidence taken on commission is not treated as evidence in the suit until it has been tendered and read as evidence in the suit by the party on whose behalf it has been taken. It follows that evidence taken under a commission at the instance of one party cannot be used by the opposite party until it is tendered and read as evidence by the party on whose behalf it has been taken (i). On the other hand the practice in the Courts in the Mofussil of Calcutta is to treat the deposition of a witness examined on commission as evidence in the case even though it has not been formally tendered and this practice has been said to be not only perfectly consistent but also in strict accordance with the provisions of rules 7 and 8 (j).

**Admissibility of documents**—Where a document is produced before a Commissioner and no objection is taken to its admissibility no such objection can be taken before the Court hearing the suit to which the commission is returned (l). But if the admissibility of the document is objected to before the Commissioner the party who has objected to the admissibility of the document before the Commissioner on one ground is not precluded from objecting to its admissibility before the Court on any other ground (i).

### *Commission for local investigations*

**9 [S 392]** In any suit in which the Court deems a local investigation to be requisite or proper for the purpose of elucidating any matter in dispute, or of ascertaining the market value of any property, or the amount of any mesne profits or damages or annual net profits, the Court may issue a commission to such person as it thinks fit directing him to make such investigation and to report thereon to the Court.

Provided that, where the Local Government has made rules as to the persons to whom such commission shall be issued, the Court shall be bound by such rules.

**Commission when to be issued**—The words and the same cannot be conveniently conducted by the judge in person which occurred in the old section after the words net profits have been omitted in this rule. The effect of the alteration is that the issue of a commission for local investigation is no longer restricted to cases where the Judge is unable conveniently to make the investigation himself. As the rule now stands a Judge may issue a commission in any case where he deems it fit to do so irrespective of his own convenience (m).

- (h) *Mahim Chand v Naba Chandra* (19 7) 41 Cal 1 L J 98 99 I C 85 ( ) A C 43  
*Sat Chandra v Sat Chandra* (19 3) 28 Cal W N 3 7 73 I C 391 ( 3) A PC  
 73 *Phanindra v Pramadha* (19 8) 55 Cal 48 106 I C 850 ( 8) A C 41  
 (i) *J v S Lja* (1903) 9 C 1 933 *Hema t v Ba l E lora* (1905) 9 C W N 794

- (j) *Vijaya v do Lall* (1890) 6 Cal 501  
*Mian Gobinda v Shashindra Chandra*  
 (1908) 4 C 1 8 *Dhanu Lal v M l*  
 (1903) 36 C 1 366 1 I C 366  
 (l) *Striters v H l* (18 8) 6 C L R 109  
 (d) *Jou v C a K m* (1893) 9 C 1 932  
 (m) *S d p th v Per al* (1901) 44 Mad 640  
 6 I C 90 ( 1) A M 3 3

**Personal investigation by Judge**—A Judge has power to make a local investigation in person in any case in which he sees fit to do so (a) See O 18 r 18

**Commission for local investigation**—This rule does not authorise a Court to delegate to a Commissioner the trial of any *material issue* which the Court itself is bound to try (o)

**Commissioner's report**—Where in a suit as to a right of way a commissioner was appointed under this rule to prepare a map of the locality in question it was held that the statements of the village officers made to him with regard to the right of way were inadmissible in evidence (p)

**Interference with commissioner's report**—Interference with the result of a careful local investigation except upon clearly defined and sufficient grounds is to be deprecated (q)

**Amount of profits**—The report of a commissioner appointed by a Court of Revenue to ascertain the amount of actual collection in a suit for profits under s 164 of the Agra Tenancy Act is admissible in evidence having regard to this rule and rules 16 17 and 18 (r)

**Mesne profits—burden of proof**—See notes to O 20 r 12 Burden of proof on p 622 above

**Form**—For form of commission for local investigation see App H form no 9

**10 [S 393] (1)** The Commissioner, after such local inspection as he deems necessary and after reducing to writing the evidence taken by him shall return such evidence, together with his report in writing signed by him, to the Court

**(2)** The report of the Commissioner and the evidence taken by him (but not the evidence without the report) shall be evidence in the suit and shall form part of the record, but the Court or, with the permission of the Court, any of the parties to the suit may examine the Commissioner personally in open Court touching any of the matters referred to him or mentioned in his report, or as to his report, or as to the manner in which he has made the investigation

**(3)** Where the Court is for any reason dissatisfied with the proceedings of the Commissioner, it may direct such further inquiry to be made as it shall think fit

**Alterations in the rule**—The words or as to his report in sub rule (2) after the words mentioned in his report are new Sub rule (3) is also new

(a) (19 1) 44 Mad 640 6 I C 790 (21) A M

33 s pra

(o) S gls v Mookun (1893) 16 Mad 350

(p) Shtaur v Elimappa (1899) 24 Bom 43

(q) S t S o d r v Proso o Com (18 0)

13 M I A 60 6 Ban L R 677 Mo 1

v Bh H der (1871) 15 W R 423

R n Amrita v Munshi (1903) 3 C W N

318 89 I C 75 (24) A C 60

(r) B khawa v Sheo Prasad (1917) 39 All

694 4 I C 70 The provisions of O

26 re appld to suits under the Agra Tenancy Act of 1901



**Further evidence after commissioner's report**—This rule does not contemplate the tender of further evidence after the Commissioner's report except the examination of the Commissioner himself but it does not forbid it. It is consistent with either course and the point must be decided on general principles according to the facts of each case (s)

### *Commissions to examine accounts*

**11 [S 394]** In any suit in which an examination or adjustment of accounts is necessary, the Court may issue a commission to such person as it thinks fit directing him to make such examination or adjustment

Commission to examine or adjust accounts

**Commission to examine accounts**—The words of this rule clearly indicate that no order can be made for the appointment of a commissioner unless the examination or adjustment of accounts is considered necessary (t)

The commissioner to whom a suit is referred by a Judge on the original side of the High Court of Bombay is entitled to decide questions of law which may arise while taking accounts (u)

**Form**—For form of commission to examine accounts see App H form no 9

**12 [S 395]** (1) The Court shall furnish the Commissioner with such part of the proceedings and such instructions as appear necessary, and the instructions shall distinctly specify whether the Commissioner is merely to transmit the proceedings which he may hold on the inquiry, or also to report his own opinion on the point referred for his examination

Court to give Commissioner necessary instructions

(2) The proceedings and report (if any) of the Commissioner shall be evidence in the suit, but where the Court has reason to be dissatisfied with them, it may direct such further inquiry as it shall think fit

Proceedings and report to be evidence Court may direct further inquiry

### *Commissions to make partitions*

**13 [S 396, 1st para]** Where a preliminary decree for partition has been passed, the Court may, in any case not provided for by section 54, issue a commission to such person as it thinks fit to make the partition or separation according to the rights as declared in such decree

Commission to make partition of immovable property

(s) *Grih Cja d r v Shash Shikhar sur r Roy* (1900) 7 Cal 951 966 7 I A 110  
*Sabapathy v Terum I* (1911) 44 Mad 640 6 I C 90 (21) A M 33  
 (t) *Bharat Chandra v Suran Chandra* (1935)

Cal 66 90 I C 944 (5) A C 1062  
 (u) *Lazim v Hw sai dhar* (1911) 41 Bom 19 36 I C 618 See also *Watson v Ag Mehmed* (1934) 11 A 340

**Alteration in the rule**—The singular person has been substituted for the plural persons. Under the old section it was held that the use of the plural person showed that the Court could not issue a commission to make partitions to a single Commissioner (v) The substitution of the singular person for the plural persons clearly shows that under the present rule the commission may be issued to a single Commissioner

**Form**—For form of commission to make a partition see App H form no 10

**14 [S 396 2nd and 3rd paras ]** (1) The Commissioner shall, after such inquiry as may be necessary, divide the property into as many shares as may be directed by the order under which the commission was issued, and shall allot such shares to the parties, and may, if authorized thereto by the said order, award sums to be paid for the purpose of equalizing the value of the shares

Procedure of Commissioner

(2) The Commissioner shall then prepare and sign a report or the Commissioners (where the commission was issued to more than one person and they cannot agree) shall prepare and sign separate reports appointing the share of each party and distinguishing each share (if so directed by the said order) by metes and bounds Such report or reports shall be annexed to the commission and transmitted to the Court, and the Court, after hearing any objections which the parties may make to the report or reports, shall confirm, vary or set aside the same

(3) Where the Court confirms or varies the report or reports it shall pass a decree in accordance with the same as confirmed or varied, but where the Court sets aside the report or reports it shall either issue a new commission or make such other order as it shall think fit

**Alteration in the rule**—The words shall confirm vary or set aside the same at the end of sub rule (2) and the whole of sub rule (3) have been substituted for the words shall either quash the same and issue a new commission or (where the Commissioners agree in their report) pass a decree in accordance therewith Under the wording of the old section it was held that the Court must either accept the report or reject the report and that it had no power to vary it (w) The word vary has been added into sub rule (2) to enable the Court to modify the report in a proper case

**Resistance to Commissioner**—Where a commission has been issued to make a partition the circumstance that the plaintiff or his agent resists the Commissioner is not sufficient to justify the dismissal of the suit (x)

(v) *M I I nd v Mula mad Ali* (1907) 9 All

(w) *J nk v Gauri* (1906) 8 All

(x) *Mestun un n saah v Lot fan* (1910) 3 All

319 51 C 572

*General provisions*

**15** [S 397] Before issuing any commission under this Order, the Court may order such sum (if any) as it thinks reasonable for the expenses of the commission to be, within a time to be fixed, paid into Court by the party at whose instance or for whose benefit the commission is issued

Expenses of commission  
to be paid into Court

**16** [S 398] Any Commissioner appointed under this Order, may, unless otherwise directed by the order of appointment,—

Powers of Commis-  
sioners

- (a) examine the parties themselves and any witness whom they or any of them may produce, and any other person whom the Commissioner thinks proper to call upon to give evidence in the matter referred to him,
- (b) call for and examine documents and other things relevant to the subject of inquiry,
- (c) at any reasonable time enter upon or into any land or building mentioned in the order

**17** [S 399] (1) The provisions of this Code relating to the summoning, attendance and examination of witnesses, and to the remuneration of, and penalties to be imposed upon witnesses, shall apply to persons required to give evidence or to produce documents under this Order whether the commission in execution of which they are so required has been issued by a Court situate within or by a Court situate beyond the limits of British India, and for the purposes of this rule the Commissioner shall be deemed to be a Civil Court

Attendance and examina-  
tion of witnesses before  
Commissioner

(2) A Commissioner may apply to any Court (not being a High Court) within the local limits of whose jurisdiction a witness resides for the issue of any process which he may find it necessary to issue to or against such witness, and such Court may, in its discretion, issue such process as it considers reasonable and proper

*Sub rule (2) — This sub rule is new. It enables the Court within the local limits of whose jurisdiction a witness resides to issue a summons for his examination on the application of the Commissioner. In the absence of any such provision in the old section*

it was held that where a witness failed to appear before a Commissioner pursuant to a notice issued by him the only course left open to the Commissioner was to return the commission to the Court from which it was issued and the latter Court would then send the commission to the Court within the local limits of whose jurisdiction the witness to be examined resided (y)

18 [S 400] (1) Where a commission is issued under this Order the Court shall direct that the parties to the suit shall appear before the Commissioner in person or by their agents or pleaders

(2) Where all or any of the parties do not so appear, the Commissioner may proceed in their absence

Form—See App H form no 7

## ORDER XXVII

*Suits by or against the Government or Public Officers in their official capacity*

1 [New] In any suit by or against the Secretary of State for India in Council, the plaint or written statement shall be signed by such person as the Government may, by general or special order, appoint in this behalf, and shall be verified by any person whom the Government may so appoint and who is acquainted with the facts of the case

**Suits by or against Government**—Suits by or against the Government must be instituted by or against the Secretary of State for India in Council see s 79 above

**Notice in suits against Secretary of State or public officer**—See s 80 above

2 [S 417] Persons being *ex officio* or otherwise authorized to act for the Government in respect of any judicial proceeding shall be deemed to be the recognized agents by whom appearances, acts and applications under this Code may be made or done on behalf of the Government

**Recognised Agents**—In the Punjab all Government pleaders are authorised to act for Government as their recognised agents without any power of attorney Such pleaders are recognised agents within the meaning of this rule (z)

(y) *M. Bom d v W. Ind. Al* (1836) 3 Cal 404  
(z) *East India Railways Co v P. Jari Lal* (1909)

**3 [S 418]** In suits by or against the Secretary of State for India in Council, instead of inserting in the plaint the name and description and place of residence of the plaintiff or defendant, it shall be sufficient to insert the words "The Secretary of State for India in Council"

**4 [S 419]** The Government pleader in any Court, or such other person as the Local Government may for any Court appoint in this behalf, shall be the agent of the Government for the purpose of receiving processes against the Secretary of State for India in Council issued by such Court

**5 [S 420]** The Court, in fixing the day for the Secretary of State for India in Council to answer to the plaint, shall allow a reasonable time for the necessary communication with the Government through the proper channel, and for the issue of instructions to the Government pleader to appear and answer on behalf of the said Secretary of State for India in Council or the Government, and may extend the time at its discretion

**6 [S 421]** The Court may also, in any case in which the Government pleader is not accompanied by any person on the part of the Secretary of State for India in Council, who may be able to answer any material questions relating to the suit, direct the attendance of such a person

**7 [S 423]** (1) Where the defendant is a public officer and, on receiving the summons, considers it proper to make a reference to the Government before answering the plaint, he may apply to the Court to grant such extension of the time fixed in the summons as may be necessary to enable him to make such reference and to receive orders thereon through the proper channel

(2) Upon such application the Court shall extend the time for so long as appears to it to be necessary

8 [Ss 426, 427] (1) Where the Government under- O 2  
takes the defence of a suit against a public  
officer, the Government pleader, upon  
being furnished with authority to appear  
and answer the plaint, shall apply to the Court, and upon  
such application the Court shall cause a note of his authority  
to be entered in the register of civil suits

(2) Where no application under sub rule (1) is made by  
the Government pleader on or before the day fixed in the  
notice for the defendant to appear and answer, the case shall  
proceed as in a suit between private parties

Provided that the defendant shall not be liable to arrest,  
nor his property to attachment, otherwise than in execution  
of a decree

## ORDER XXVIII

### *Suits by or against Military Men or Airmen*

1 [S 466] (1) Where any officer, soldier or airman O 2  
actually serving the Government in a  
military or air-force capacity is a party  
to a suit, and cannot obtain leave of  
absence for the purpose of prosecuting or  
defending the suit in person, he may authorize any person to  
sue or defend in his stead

(2) The authority shall be in writing and shall be signed  
by the officer soldier or airman in the presence of (a) his  
commanding officer, or the next subordinate officer, if the  
party is himself the commanding officer, or (b) where the  
officer, soldier or airman is serving in military or air force  
staff employment, the head or other superior officer of the  
office in which he is employed Such commanding or other  
officer shall countersign the authority which shall be filed in  
Court

(3) When so filed the countersignature shall be sufficient  
proof that the authority was duly executed, and that the officer,  
soldier or airman by whom it was granted could not obtain  
leave of absence for the purpose of prosecuting or defending  
the suit in person

*Explanation*—In this Order the expression "commanding officer" means the officer in actual command for the time being of any regiment, corps detachment or depot to which the officer, soldier or airman belongs

Changes in the rule—The words *or airman* have been added in the heading of this Order and in this rule after the word *soldier* by the Repealing and Amendment Act 1927. The words *or air force* in this rule were inserted after the word *military* by the same Act

2 [S 465] Any person authorized by an officer, soldier or airman to prosecute or defend a suit in his stead may prosecute or defend it in person in the same manner as the officer, soldier or airman could do if present, or he may appoint a pleader to prosecute or defend the suit on behalf of such officer, soldier or airman

Person so authorized may act personally or appoint pleader

Changes in the rule—See note to r 1 Changes in the rule

3 [S 467] Processes served upon any person authorized by an officer, soldier or airman under rule 1 or upon any pleader appointed as aforesaid by such person shall be as effectual as if they had been served on the party in person

Service on person so authorized or on his pleader to be good service

Changes in the rule—See note to r 1 Changes in the rule

## ORDER XXIX

### *Suits by or against Corporations*

1 [S 435] In suits by or against a corporation, any pleading may be signed and verified on behalf of the corporation by the secretary or by any director or other principal officer of the corporation who is able to depose to the facts of the case

Companies authorized to sue and be sued in the name of an officer or trustee—All reference has been omitted in this and the next following rule to companies authorised to sue and be sued in the name of an officer or of a trustee as such companies if any there be are very rare

Foreign corporation—The procedure prescribed by this rule applies to foreign corporations also. A foreign corporation can claim the benefit of this rule although not registered under the Indian Companies Act or under an Act of Parliament (a). Thus a plaint in a suit by the Singer Manufacturing Company which is a company incorporated

in the United States may be verified by an agent holding a general power of attorney from the company as a principal officer of the company within the meaning of this rule (b) The fact that the Agent also acts for another foreign firm is not material (c)

**Suit by an unregistered or unincorporated society**—A suit by an unregistered or unincorporated society must be brought in the names of all the members of the society (d) Where there are numerous members the suit may be instituted by one or more of them with the permission of the Court on behalf of all [O 1 r 8]

**Suit by or against a registered company**—A suit by or against a registered company must be instituted in the name of the company A suit against two companies described as the India General S N and R Co Ltd and the Rivers S N Co Ltd by their joint Agent A E Rogers is substantially a suit against Rogers and it is in contravention of the provisions of this rule The words by their joint agent A E Rogers should be omitted (e) But if the relief is really sought against the Company and the error is one of misdescription a suit nominally against the Agent may be treated as a suit against the Company (f)

**Other principal officer of the corporation**—The manager at Lucknow of the local branch of the Delhi and London Bank was authorised by a power of attorney to manage the affairs of the Bank and to substitute any person for himself In pursuance of this power he gave a power of attorney to the accountant of the Bank to manage the affairs of the Bank but the power omitted words giving authority to sue It was held that the accountant was under the circumstances the principal officer of the Bank and that he could as such sign and verify the plaint in a suit filed by the bank (g)

**Principal Officer able to depose to the facts of the case**—The Calcutta High Court has held that as regards every pleading on behalf of a company or corporation the fitness to verify of the person purporting to verify it must be proved by affidavit (h) Note the difference in punctuation between this rule and r 3 below

**Dismissal of suit**—Where in the case of a suit by a corporation the plaint is signed and verified by an officer other than a principal officer of the corporation the suit should be dismissed (i) Similarly the suit should be dismissed if in the case of an unregistered or unincorporated society the suit is brought in the names of some only of the members of the society (j) See notes above

## 2 [S 436] Subject to any statutory provision regulating service of process, where the suit is against a corporation, the summons may be served—

Service on corporation

(a) on the secretary, or on any director, or other principal officer of the corporation, or

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>(b) <i>Steger Man factu &amp; Co v Jay M hum mad</i> (191 ) Punj Rec no 8 p 33 10 I C 141</p> <p>(c) <i>Seha n Corporation Ltd v Chemu ne Fatrick Lon H yden Aktengeneils haft</i> (1911) 2 K B 510 See also <i>Acturas is kabat D mpsk b He cul s v G d Tru k Pacific R way</i> (191 ) 11 K B 22</p> <p>(d) <i>Pa hanti v Gau s hua</i> (1898) 20 All 167 <i>Hrudaj Nath Roy v Akhil Chandra Roy</i> (1929) 49 C L J 37 (29) A C 465</p> <p>(e) <i>India Ge r l S A d H Co Ltd v Lal Moha</i> (1918) 43 (al 44) 31 I C 3</p> <p>(f) <i>R dh Lal v East I d a R urav</i> (19 6) 1 at 1 S 90 I C 680 ( 6) A I 40</p> | <p>(g) <i>Delhi a d Lond n Ba l v Olik m</i> (1894) 1 (al 69 20 I A 139 <i>Allen B th v tr m Mat</i> (19 5) 7 Lah L J 66 68 88 I C 46 ( ) A L 338</p> <p>(h) <i>Int rn tional C nt nental Caoutchou Compagn s v Mehta d Co</i> (19 7) 31 C W 4 1039 10 I C 568 ( 7) A C 80 <i>Sreenath v East Indian Laule y Coy</i> (139 ) 2 C I 268</p> <p>(i) <i>Yus f Beg v The Board of Foreign Miss o s of th Presd t r an Chu ch</i> (1894) 16 All 40</p> <p>(j) <i>Pancha ti v Gauri Kuar</i> (1898) 20 All 167</p> |
|--|---|



- (b) by leaving it or sending it by post addressed to the corporation at the registered office, or if there is no registered office then at the place where the corporation carries on business

Service by post.—The language of the old section has been enlarged so as to allow of service by post on corporation and by this means the rule is brought into line with the provisions of s 148 of the Indian Companies Act of 1913

**3** [ S 436, last para ] The Court may, at any stage of the suit, require the personal appearance of the secretary or of any director, or other principal officer of the corporation who may be able to answer material questions relating to the suit

Power to require  
personal attendance of  
officer of corporation

### ORDER XXX

*Suits by or against Firms and Persons carrying on business in names other than their own*

**1** **1** [New R S C O 48A, r 1] (1) Any two or more persons claiming or being liable as partners and carrying on business in British India may sue or be sued in the name of the firm (if any) of which such persons were partners at the time of the accruing of the cause of action, and any party to a suit may in such case apply to the Court for a statement of the names and addresses of the persons who were, at the time of the accruing of the cause of action, partners in such firm, to be furnished and verified in such manner as the Court may direct

(2) Where persons sue or are sued as partners in the name of their firm under sub rule (1), it shall, in the case of any pleading or other document required by or under this Code to be signed, verified or certified by the plaintiff or the defendant, suffice if such pleading or other document is signed, verified or certified by any one of such persons

Suits by or against firms.—The whole of this Order is new. It is a reproduction almost *verbatim* of the principal rules comprised in O 48A of the English rules. The rules as to the attachment of partnership property and the execution of decree against firms will be found in O 21 rr 49 and 50 above

In applying English decisions under the corresponding rules in England it must be remembered that there is a distinction between the English and the Indian law as to the liability of partners. According to the English law the liability is joint according to the Indian law it is joint and several. See Indian Contract Act 1872, ss. 42 to 45

Under sec 45 of the Contract Act one of two joint promisees cannot sue alone. This order modifies that section and if the promisees are partners enables one to sue alone but only if he sues in the name of the partnership (1)

This Order deals with the mode of suing firms. Rule 1 provides that two or more persons claiming or being liable as partners may sue or be sued in the firm name. Rule 3 provides that where a suit is instituted by partners in the name of their firm the plaintiffs shall on demand in writing by the defendant declare in writing the names and places of residence of the partners. If the plaintiffs fail to comply with the demand the Court may stay further proceedings. If the demand is complied with the suit will proceed as if all the partners had been named as plaintiffs in the plaint. As regards *signature and verification* where a suit is brought in a firm name it is provided by r 1 sub r (2) that it will suffice if the pleading or any other document required to be signed or verified is signed or verified by *any one* of the partners. It is not necessary that all the partners should sign or verify it. As regards *appearance* in a suit brought against a firm it is to be noted that a firm cannot appear as a firm and the partners should therefore appear individually in their own names but all subsequent proceedings should continue in the name of the firm (r 6). Where a suit is brought against a firm no partner can put in a personal defence (1). He can only file a written statement *for and in the name of the firm*. The decree also must be in the name of the firm (m) though all the partners may not have appeared (n).

**Firm**—As to the definition of a firm it is laid down in sec 239 of the Indian Contract Act 1872 that persons who have entered into partnership with one another are called collectively a firm. The Calcutta High Court has held that a partnership firm is not a person but merely a collective name of the individuals who are members of the partnership and as such cannot be a partner in another firm (o). If so a firm consisting of individuals and minor firms or of minor firms exclusively cannot be a firm within the meaning of this rule.

**Minor**—In England an infant's contract is voidable and he may be a partner. He is not however personally liable for the debts of the firm but a creditor who has obtained judgment against the firm in the proper form that is a judgment against the defendant firm other than 4 B an infant partner may levy execution against the partnership property (p). If the action is not brought against the firm in the firm name but is brought against the partners as nominee the infant partner ought not to be joined as a party (q). In India a minor's contract is void and a minor cannot be a partner. He may however be admitted to the benefits of partnership in which case his share in the property of the firm is liable for the obligations of the firm but he is not personally liable see Indian Contract Act 1872 s 247. The share referred to in s 247 is the right of the minor to participate in the property of the firm after its obligations are satisfied (r). When a minor has been admitted to the benefits of partnership a reference by the firm to arbitration will bind the minor to the extent of his share in the property of the firm (s). See O 21 r 30.

**Suit against manager and owner of a firm**—In a Bombay case (t) the plaintiff filed a suit against C A manager and owner of the shop of V C. It turned out that C K had died before the suit was filed and the plaintiff applied to bring the heirs of

- (k) *Hris S gh v Frr K* Cf d (19 3) 8  
Lal 1 100 I C 71 ( ) A I 115  
(l) *Fll s v W d* n [1899] 1 Q B 714  
(m) *Harro v I oul n p b Uers* [1893] Q B  
34 3  
( ) *Ly agt Ltd v Cl rl d Co* [1891] Q B  
55  
(o) *Seodoyal v J h rm H* (19 3) 8 Cal 549  
557 5 8 5 I C 81 (24) A C 4  
(p) *Lovell v Beaucl mp* [1894] A C 407  
(q) *Chandlen v Ia lrs* (1800) 3 Lap 6

- (r) *C y st Cha n v ArisAnadlan* (19 ) 49  
I A 10 116 43 C 1 560 563 67 I C 1 4  
( ) A PC 37  
(s) *Bul mbe v Ca ga* (19 3) 5 Lah L J 5 71  
I C 34 ( ) A L 21  
(t) *M l l v Ch nd nal* (19 3) 25 Bom L R  
1091 77 I C 10 ( ) A D 15 Distin  
g l h R mp tad v Caurat kar (19 3)  
5 Bom L R 7 8 I C 494 (24) A B  
103

**r 1 C K** on the record The period of limitation had by that time expired and so the lower Court dismissed the suit as time barred The High Court reversed the decree on the ground that the suit was in substance a suit against the firm

At the time of the accruing of the cause of action '—These words show that a suit may be brought by or against a firm in the firm name though the firm may have been dissolved before the date of the suit provided the cause of action arose before dissolution (u)

**Carrying on business in British India** —This rule applies to all partnerships carrying on business in British India Therefore a firm which carries on business in British India may be sued in the firm name under this rule although it be a foreign firm the members of which are resident out of the jurisdiction (t) The only question to be considered in order to see whether the case comes within the rule is whether the firm carries on business [in British India] (w) If it does the partners may be sued in the firm name If it does not the partners cannot sue (x) or be sued (y) in the firm name The expression carry on business has no special legal significance It must be interpreted in the ordinary business sense (z) A firm in England cannot be said to carry on business in Bombay merely because it has employed an agent in Bombay to collect orders for the firm *the agent having no authority to accept or reject the orders* (a) it does not make any difference that the name of the firm is affixed to the agent's office (b) See notes to s 20 Carries on business

**Suit by firm on promissory note passed to a member**—A firm may sue on a promissory note passed to one of its members though the note has been passed to him in his name (c)

**Firm as agriculturist**—The definition of agriculturist in sec. 2 of the Dekkhan Agriculturists Relief Act 1879 can only apply to a firm sued under the provisions of O 30 r 1 if that firm by itself or by its servants or by tenants earns its livelihood wholly or principally by agriculture carried on within the limits of a district to which the Act extends The mere fact that one or all the members of a firm earn their livelihood principally from agricultural income does not make the firm itself an agriculturist within the meaning of that Act (d)

**Statement of names and addresses**—Rule 2 enables a defendant to obtain disclosure of the names of the partners in a plaintiff firm by a statement in writing by the plaintiffs or their pleader Under r 1 any party to the suit may apply to the Court for a statement of the names of the partners in the plaintiff or defendant firm to be furnished and verified in such manner as the Court may direct (e) It is perhaps not altogether easy to reconcile the two rules but r 2 is applicable to the case only of plaintiff whereas r 1 applies generally (f) Where an affidavit has been filed under r 1 or a declaration made under r 2 the Court has no power to require the deponent or declarant to attend to be cross examined on the affidavit or declaration nor has the Court any power to direct the separate trial of an issue as to whether a person whose name has been disclosed in the affidavit or declaration was a partner in the firm at the time the cause of action accrued (g) But the statement of names disclosed in

- (u) *D. & Co. v. Morris* (1883) 10 Q.B.D. 403  
*Puln v. Majender* (1911) 34 Cal. J. 40  
*S. I. C. 10 (-1) A C 744*  
*Il r. a. das v. Nitogara das* (1911) 49 Cal. 394  
*96 I.C. 38 (-1) A C 390*  
 (v) *H. v. r. r. c. y. d. Co. v. B. & Co. v. B. & Co. v. B. & Co.* (1894) 1 Q.B. 84  
 (w) *Id. p. 68*  
 (x) *Y. P. t. A. Oul Jull v. Yelmahomed* (1918) 30 Bom. L.R. 117  
*109 I.C. 99 (-8) A.B. 192*  
 (y) *Ion H. l. l. d. v. R. & Co.* (1914) 1 Ch. 74  
 (z) *G. v. Anders n. & C.* (1881) 11 Q.B. 100

- 11 per Lord Esh v. M. R.  
 (a) *Gr. v. A. d. r. o. n. d. Co.* (1880) 11 Q.B. 108  
 (b) *H. v. l. v. o. d. n. & Co.* (1896) 33 C.D. 604  
 (c) *Br. v. l. v. B. d. h. Nath* (1918) 55 Cal. 51  
*105 I.C. 549 (-8) A.C. 148*  
 (d) *D. v. amey v. B. l. r. u. h. a.* (1919) 53 Bom.  
*87 (-5) A.B. 38*  
 (e) *B. d. s. & Co. v. Shama D. & Co.* (1915)  
*1 v. l. l. e. c. n. o. 8 p. 6* 47 I.C. 440  
 (f) *Alrhamah & Co. v. Du. l. o. p. l. n. e. m. a. t. i. c. Type*  
*Co.* (1901) 11 A.B. 46  
 (g) *Alrhamah & Co. v. D. l. p. P. n. e. m. a. t. i. c. Type*  
*Co.* (1901) 11 A.B. 46

the affidavit or declaration will be treated as embodied in the plaint and will be a necessary part of the cause of action and if the plaintiffs fail in establishing it, the suit will fail (h)

**Suit by or against individual partners**—See Indian Contract Act 1872, ss. 43 and 45

**2 [Aen R S C, O 48 A, r 2]** (1) Where a suit is instituted by partners in the name of their firm, the plaintiffs or their pleader shall on demand in writing by or on behalf of any defendant, forthwith declare in writing the names and places of residence of all the persons constituting the firm or whose behalf the suit is instituted

(2) Where the plaintiffs or their pleader fail to comply with any demand made under sub rule (1), all proceedings in the suit may, upon an application for that purpose, be stayed upon such terms as the Court may direct

(3) Where the names of the partners are declared in the manner referred to in sub rule (1), the suit shall proceed in the same manner, and the same consequences in all respects shall follow, as if they had been named as plaintiffs in the plaint

Provided that all the proceedings shall nevertheless continue in the name of the firm

**Disclosure of partners names**—See notes to r 1 above for names and addresses. If the plaintiff firm has not made a full disclosure of partners the proper procedure is not to dismiss the suit but to allow the defendant a further declaration making a full disclosure and thus to remedy the defect

**Proceedings to continue in name of firm**—See notes to r 1 above for proceedings against firms on p 850 and r 6 below. Subsequent proceedings to continue in name of firm.

**3 [Aen R S C O 48 A r 3]** Where persons are sued as partners in the name of a firm, summons shall be served

- (a) upon any one or more of the partners of the firm
- (b) at the principal place at which the business is carried on within British India, or at any person having, at the time of service, the control or management of the business there

as the Court may direct, and such service shall be deemed good service upon the firm so sued, whether all or any of the partners are within or without British India.

Provided that, in the case of a partnership which has been dissolved to the knowledge of the plaintiff before the institution of the suit, the summons shall be served upon every person within British India whom it is sought to make liable

■

**Service of summons**—This rule is to be read with r 1 above and with O 21 r 50. It applies only to suits against partners *in the name of their firm*. It provides a special mode of service upon firms *carrying on business in British India* whether the partners reside within or without British India (j). One mode of service authorized by the rule is service upon anyone or more of the partners the other is service as the principal place of business of the partnership within British India upon the manager of the business. If the summons is not served in either of these ways the service is irregular (k). If it is served in either of these ways the service is good service upon the firm whether all or any of the partners are within or without British India. The service being good service upon the firm any decree that may be passed in the suit against the firm may be executed against the property of the firm. When the firm has been dissolved the only method of service is under clause (a) on a partner (l) and if service by registered post has been ordered the registered letter should be addressed to a partner and not to the firm name at the place where the business used to be carried on (m).

If the service is effected in the first mode prescribed by the rule that is if the service is upon a partner it is good service upon the firm as well as upon that partner personally but it is not service upon any other member of the firm so as to make such member a person who has been individually served as a partner etc within the meaning of O 21 r 50 sub r (1) cl (c). If the service is effected in the second mode prescribed by the rule that is upon a manager at the place of partnership business and the manager is not a partner the service is good service upon the firm but it is not service upon any member of the firm so as to make such member a person who has been individually served as a partner etc within the meaning of O 21 r 50 sub r (1) cl (c) (n). This distinction is important for the purposes of execution for under O 21 r 50 where a decree has been passed against a firm execution can at once issue without leave of Court against the property of the firm and also against the separate property of any individual partner who was served with the writ. But execution cannot be issued without leave of Court against the separate property of any partner who was not served with the writ and did not appear (o).

**Dissolution of partnership before institution of suit**—Where there has been dissolution to the knowledge of the plaintiff he cannot make an outgoing partner liable unless he served the writ of summons upon him. A sues the firm of B & Co upon a promissory note passed to him by the firm. When the note was given the firm consisted of three partners X, Y and Z but Z had retired from the firm before the institution of the suit and X knew before he instituted the suit that Z had so retired. Z resides in British India but he is not individually served as required by the proviso to this rule

(j) *Gaity & Sons & Co* [189] 11 Q B 109  
(k) See *Wrester & Co v Ba & Co*  
[1894] 1 Q B 84  
(l) *Hj & Co v Diaper & Co* [189] 49 C 1  
36 ( ) A C 30

(m) (189) 49 Cal 394 62 I C 36 (22) A C 390 *supra*  
(n) *In re Ida* (1896) 17 Q B D 5  
(o) *Baunab v Ba & Co of Bengal* (1914) 19 C W Y 1008 101 26 I C 466

Z does not appear. A obtains a decree against the firm. The decree cannot be executed against the personal property of Z. Nor can A apply under O 21 r 50 sub r (2) for leave to execute the decree against the personal property of Z. So also on the death of a partner his personal estate cannot be made liable unless his legal representative is joined (p). This is because the present rule overrides O 21 r 50 and the latter rule only applies where there has been no dissolution to the knowledge of the plaintiff (q). The above ruling would not apply to the case of a partner who had left the firm before the institution of the suit without the knowledge of the plaintiff. If the plaintiff was not aware of the dissolution when he filed his suit the decree binds all the partners in the firm whether they have been served individually or not (r).

Service on manager, subsequent service on partner.—Where a summons is served upon a manager and subsequently upon a partner it is the date of the latter service from which time is to be counted for the appearance of the defendant firm (s).

Principal place at which the partnership business is carried on.—See notes to r 1 above. Carrying on business in British India.

As the Court may direct.—These words do not occur in the corresponding English rule. According to the English rule the summons may be served upon a partner or upon the manager at the plaintiff's option. Under the present rule it would seem that the plaintiff has no such option and that he should obtain the directions of the Court as to the mode of service. If the method of service prescribed by the Court is followed then *prima facie* there has been service on the firm (t). It is conceived however that omission to obtain such directions would not vitiate the service but would constitute at the most an irregularity within the meaning of s 90 above.

Notice to be given to the person served as to the capacity in which he is served.—See r 5 below and notes thereto.

4 [New] (1) Notwithstanding anything contained in section 45 of the Indian Contract Act 1872, where two or more persons may sue or be sued in the name of a firm under the foregoing provisions and any of such persons dies, whether before the institution or during the pendency of any suit, it shall not be necessary to join the legal representative of the deceased as a party to the suit.

(2) Nothing in sub rule (1) shall limit or otherwise affect any right which the legal representative of the deceased may have—

(a) to apply to be made a party to the suit, or

(b) to enforce any claim against the survivor or survivors.

Joinder of legal representative.—A passes a promissory note for Rs 5000 to a firm consisting of three partners B C and D. If B dies C and D alone cannot sue

(p) *Muthada v Ebbalum* (1977) 51 Bom 986

10 I C 871 (7) A B 541

(q) *Hogam v (or) Sons B. Ch. J. & Co* (1894)

1 Q B 9

(r) *Gordhadas v Gaurmeland* (19 ) 7 Bom

L R 541 87 I C 1051 (5) A B 331

(s) *Ali v Beckley* (1890) 25 Q B D 543

(t) *Intermaria & Colonial Cotton Co v*

*Mellin* (19 ) 54 C L 107 105 I C 356

( ) A C 58

to recover the amount of the note. The suit must under s. 45 of the Contract Act, be bought by C and D along with B's legal representative. The effect of the present rule is that where the suit is brought in the firm name it is not necessary to join B's legal representative as a party plaintiff (u). But the legal representative may apply to be made a party plaintiff. The mere fact that he does not apply will not affect his right to claim the benefit of any decree that may be passed in favour of C and D. If the suit is against the firm and one of the partners dies before or during the suit the decree can be enforced against the share of the deceased in the partnership property. But if the legal representatives are not joined it cannot be enforced against the personal estate of the deceased partner (r).

**5** [New R S C, O 48A, r 4] Where a summons is issued to a firm and is served in the manner provided by rule 3, every person upon whom it is served shall be informed by notice in writing given at the time of such service, whether he is served as a partner or as a person having the control or management of the partnership business, or in both characters, and, in default of such notice, the person served shall be deemed to be served as a partner.

Notice in what capacity served

**Notice in what capacity served**—Where a suit is brought against a firm in the firm name the summons will be issued against the firm. Such summons may be served either upon any one or more of the partners or upon the person in control of the business [r 3]. The present rule provides that the person served should be informed by notice in writing given at the time of service whether he is served as a partner or as a person in management of the business or in both characters. In default of notice the person served will be deemed—not merely presumed—to be served as a partner. If he contends that he is not a partner the proper course for him to adopt is to appear under protest under r 8 below denying that he is a partner. If he does not do so he will be deemed to have been served personally as a partner within the meaning of O 21 r 50 sub-r 1 cl. (c) and execution may be granted against him personally (w).

**Service on manager**—If service is effected on the person in control of the business and no notice is served as provided by this rule the service is not effective and cannot be made so [Annual Practice notes to O 48A r 4].

**Appearance under protest**—Where a summons is served upon a person as a partner but such person appears under protest denying that he is a partner the plaintiff may disregard the appearance altogether and proceed as if the summons had not been served that is, he may have service subsequently effected upon a partner or partners or upon any person having the control of the business as provided by r 3. The mere fact that the person served as a partner denies that he is a partner under protest does not preclude the plaintiff from firm (r 8 below).

Where a summons is served upon a person appears with denial of partnership management of the business the proper service is then one under r 3.

(u) *It is*

(v) *It is*

Forms of notice — Take notice that the summons served herewith is served on you—

- (i) as a partner in the defendant firm of *AB & Co*
- (ii) or as the person having the control or management of the partnership business of *AB & Co*
- (iii) or as a partner in the defendant firm of *AB & Co* and also as the person having the control or management of the partnership business of *AB & Co*

6 [New R S C, O 48A r 5] Where persons are sued as partners in the name of their firm, they shall appear individually in their own names, but all subsequent proceedings shall, nevertheless, continue in the name of the firm

Appearance of partners

Appearance of partners — Though all proceedings in a suit instituted against a firm in the firm name must be conducted in the firm name the partners should so far as appearance is concerned appear individually in their own names. The reason of the rule is that a firm cannot appear as a firm. Where a suit is brought against a firm in the firm name the appearance of one partner is the appearance of the firm (z)

The only person entitled to appear in a suit against a firm are—

- (i) persons who allege they are partners of the firm sued or were partners at the time the cause of action arose and
- (ii) persons who are served as partners but deny that they are partners of the firm sued or were partners of the firm at the time the cause of action accrued. Such persons may appear under protest. See rr 7 and 8 below

A person served as a manager of the partnership business need not appear unless he is a member of the firm sued (r 7 below). A managing partner of a business firm has an implied authority in the ordinary course of business to appoint solicitors to defend a suit brought against the firm in the firm name and to instruct them to enter an appearance for the other partners as well. No suit will therefore lie against the solicitors at the instance of the other partners for entering an appearance in their name without their express authority (y)

The expression individually is not synonymous with in person hence no partner can be forced under this rule to appear in person (z)

All subsequent proceedings shall continue in the name of the firm — Where persons are sued as partners in the firm name the plaint (a) and every subsequent proceeding must be headed with the firm name as defendants. The proceedings in a suit so brought continue in the name of the firm even though the names of the partners are disclosed (b). The written statement must be headed in the firm name and the decree also must be against the firm in the firm name. The Court cannot in such a suit pass any personal decree against a partner unless he is sued personally along with the firm (c)

Defence — Where a suit is brought against a firm in the firm name on a claim against the partnership the partners ought if they can agree to put in one written statement. But if they cannot agree on one defence each partner is entitled to put in a separate

- (1) *Lysaght Ltd v Clark & Co* [1891] 1 Q B 55 56
- (2) *Tomlinson v Brotham* [1896] 1 Q B 386
- (3) *Bridges & Co v Syme* D n & c (1918) 67 I C 10 (A C)

- (a) *Asstng v Grunn* (19 5) 7 Bon L R 998 94 I C 969 ( ) A B 494
- (b) *Pulvin v Male* d a (19 1) 34 Cal L J 405 67 I C 10 (A C)
- (c) *Taylor v Collier* (188 ) 30 W R (Eng) 91

Punj Rec no 8 p 6 47 I C 4



to recover the amount of the note. The suit must, under s. 45 of the Contract Act, be brought by *C* and *D* along with *B*'s legal representative. The effect of the present rule is that where the suit is brought in the firm name it is not necessary to join *B*'s legal representative as a party plaintiff (u). But the legal representative may apply to be made a party plaintiff. The mere fact that he does not apply will not affect his right to claim the benefit of any decree that may be passed in favour of *C* and *D*. If the suit is against the firm and one of the partners dies before or during the suit the decree can be enforced against the share of the deceased in the partnership property. But if the legal representatives are not joined it cannot be enforced against the personal estate of the deceased partner (v).

## 5 [New R S C, O 48A, r 4] Where a summons is issued to a firm and is served in the manner provided by rule 3, every person upon whom it is served shall be informed by

Notice in what capacity served

notice in writing given at the time of such service, whether he is served as a partner or as a person having the control or management of the partnership business, or in both characters, and, in default of such notice, the person served shall be deemed to be served as a partner.

**Notice in what capacity served**—Where a suit is brought against a firm in the firm name the summons will be issued against the firm. Such summons may be served either upon any one or more of the partners or upon the person in control of the business [r 3]. The present rule provides that the person served should be informed by notice in writing given at the time of service whether he is served as a partner or as a person in management of the business or in both characters. In default of notice the person served will be deemed—not merely presumed—to be served as a partner. If he contends that he is not a partner the proper course for him to adopt is to appear under protest under r 8 below denying that he is a partner. If he does not do so he will be deemed to have been served personally as a partner within the meaning of O 21 r 50 sub r 1 cl (c) and execution may be granted against him personally (w).

**Service on manager**—If service is effected on the person in control of the business and no notice is served as provided by this rule the service is not effective and cannot be made so [Annual Practice notes to O 48A r 4].

**Appearance under protest**—Where a summons is served upon a person as a partner but such person appears under protest denying that he is a partner the plaintiff may disregard the appearance altogether and proceed as if the summons had not been served that is he may have service subsequently effected upon a partner or partners or upon any person having the control of the business as provided by r 3 above. The mere fact that the person served as a partner denies that he is a partner and appears under protest does not preclude the plaintiff from otherwise serving the summons on the firm (r 8 below).

Where a summons is served upon a person both as a partner and manager and such person appears with denial of partnership but does not deny that he is the person in management of the business the plaintiff is entitled to a decree against the firm for the service is then one under r 3 cl. (b) and such service is good service upon the firm.

(u) *Hari S. Gh v Karam Chaudhary* (1907) 8 Lah 100 J C. 1 (2) A L 115.  
(v) *M. Thirudai v. Lakshmi* (1917) 1 Bom 98.

105 J C 871 (7) A D 581.  
(w) *Bauab v. H. K. of B. gal* (1914) 19 C W N 1008 81 C 266.

**Forms of notice** — Take notice that the summons served herewith is ~~serve~~ to you—

- (i) as a partner in the defendant firm of *AB & Co*
- (ii) or as the person having the control or management of the partnership business of *AB & Co*
- (iii) or as a partner in the defendant firm of *AB & Co* and also as the person having the control or management of the partnership business of *AB & Co*

**6 [New R S C O 45A r 5]** Where persons are sued as partners in the name of their firm, they shall appear individually in their own names, but all subsequent proceedings shall, nevertheless, continue in the name of the firm

**Appearance of partners** — Though all proceedings in a suit instituted against a firm in the firm name must be conducted in the firm name the partners should, so far as appearance is concerned appear individually in their own names. The reason of this rule is that a firm cannot appear as a firm. Where a suit is brought against a firm in the firm name the appearance of one partner is the appearance of the firm (x)

The only person entitled to appear in a suit against a firm are—

- (i) persons who allege they are partners of the firm sued or were partners at the time the cause of action arose and
- (ii) persons who are served as partners but deny that they are partners of the firm sued or were partners of the firm at the time the cause of action accrued. Such persons may appear under protest. See rr 7 and 8 below

A person served as a manager of the partnership business need not appear unless he is a member of the firm sued (r 7 below). A managing partner of a business firm has an implied authority in the ordinary course of business to appoint solicitors to defend a suit brought against the firm in the firm name and to instruct them to enter an appearance for the other partners as well. No suit will therefore lie against the solicitors at the instance of the other partners for entering an appearance in their name without their express authority (y).

The expression individually is not synonymous with in person hence no partner can be forced under this rule to appear in person (z).

All subsequent proceedings shall continue in the name of the firm. — Where persons are sued as partners in the firm name the plaint (a) and every subsequent proceeding must be headed with the firm name as defendants. The proceedings in a suit so brought continue in the name of the firm even though the names of the partners are disclosed (b). The written statement must be headed in the firm name and the defence also must be against the firm in the firm name. The Court cannot in such a suit pass any personal decree against a partner unless he is sued personally along with the firm (c).

**Defence** — Where a suit is brought against a firm in the firm name on a claim against the partnership the partners ought if they can agree to put in one written statement. But if they cannot agree on one defence each partner is entitled to put in a separate

(1) *Lys ght Ltd v Clell & Co* [1891] 1 Q B 556

(y) *To nia n v Broad m th* [1896] 1 Q B 386

(z) *Br d j & Co v Shamas Di & Co* (1918) 1unj Rec no 8 p 76 47 I C 4

(a) *Ajt ng v Crum n g* (19 ) 7 Bom L R 938 94 I C 969 ( ) A B 494

(b) *I n Mahend a* (19 1) 34 Cal L J 40

67 I C 10 ( ) A C  
(c) *Tayl v Coll er* (188 ) 30 W R (Eng) 01

written statement. In any case the written statement should be a written statement of the firm but where the partners cannot agree on one defence and a partner puts in a separate defence the proper form would be written statement of the defendant firm of AB & Co by X1 one of the partners appearing in the suit. It may be asked what is the plaintiff to do if he finds a series of inconsistent defences put in by the different partners? The answer is that to entitle him to judgment against the partnership he must to use a homely phrase beat all the defences—that is to say he must show and satisfy the judge at the trial that not one of the defences prevents a judgment being entered against the partnership (d). What would happen if some of the partners did not appear at all? In case say one partner alone chooses to appear he would be entitled and would be bound to put in a written statement for the firm. He might if he choose add by so and so one of the partners served and appearing but his defence would be the defence of the firm and the suit would be tried upon that defence and in that case judgment could be obtained against the firm. Of course if the partner chose to put in an improper defence and so rendered the partnership liable in a case where it ought not to be made liable he might thereby as between himself and his co partners be committing a breach of duty for which he would be liable to them but so far as the plaintiff is concerned the plaintiff would be able to obtain judgment against the firm. A partner is not entitled in a suit against a firm in the firm name to put in a personal defence he can only put in a defence for and in the name of the firm (e). But where a partner is sued personally along with the firm he may put in a personal defence besides defence for the firm (f).

**Decree**—Where a suit is brought against a firm in the firm name the decree must be against the firm in the firm name (g). From this it follows that if one of the partners fails to appear no decree can be passed against him separately for want of appearance (h) and if any one partner does appear no decree can be passed against the firm for want of appearance (i) the appearance of one partner being the appearance of the firm (j). It can never be said that a decree against a firm is *ex parte* against one of the partners because he has not appeared. As soon as a decree is passed against a firm the assets of the firm are liable to satisfy it (k). The firm name is only a compendious way of describing in the writ the partners who compose the firm and a plaintiff who sues a firm sues the partners (l). But though the decree against the firm makes them all liable as to the partnership property it can only be decided in execution proceedings whether a particular partner is personally liable to satisfy the decree (m). See O 21 r 50 and notes to r 8 below. As to minor partner see notes to r 1. Minor

**7 [New R S C, O 48A r 6]** Where a summons is served in the manner provided by rule 3 upon a person having the control or management of the partnership business, no appearance by him shall be necessary unless he is a partner of the firm sued.

No appearance except by partners

See notes to r 6 above      Appearance of Partners

- (d) *Per R mer L J Ellis v Wade* (1899) 1 Q B 14 71  
 (e) *Fitz v Wad* (1899) 1 Q B 714 *Inter alia* (Col lal (o l h e (o v M hta (19 7) 54 (al 10 105 I C 3 6 ( ) A C 24  
 (f) *T vlor v Collier* (1884) 30 W R (Eng) 81  
 (g) *Ju l n v Ju l h Id* (1884) 8 Q B 1 4 4  
 (h) *Jack v L t h Id* (1884) 8 Q B 1 4 4  
 4 8

- (i) *Adam v Torr end* (1884) 14 Q B D 101  
 (j) *Lysaght Ltd v Cl k & Co* [1891] 1 Q B 55 5 6  
 (k) *Id ppa v Pragg* (19 1) 6 Bom L R 384 80 I C 7 13 ( 4) A B 366  
 (l) *F m Fra ad v d a dji* (19 1) 42 Cal 601 L R 1 3 A C 408  
 (m) (19 1) 4 B m L R 384 80 I C 3 C 1) A B 366 a pr

8 [New R S C O 48A r 7] Any person served with summons as a partner under rule 3 may appear under protest, denying that he is a partner, but such appearance shall not preclude the plaintiff from otherwise serving a summons on the firm and obtaining a decree against the firm in default of appearance where no partner has appeared

**Appearance under protest**—Where a person served with a summons as a partner denies that he is a partner he may enter appearance under protest under this rule. Where an appearance is entered under protest its effect is to nullify the service altogether as regards the defendant firm (n). In such a case the plaintiff may disregard the appearance under protest altogether and have the summons served upon one who is admittedly a partner or one who has the control or management of the defendant firm as provided by r 3 above and having obtained a decree against the firm he may apply for leave to execute it against such person under O 21 r 50. But the plaintiff is not bound to adopt this course. He may take out a chamber summons and contend that the party who appeared under protest is a partner or was a partner at the time the cause of action accrued and apply on that basis to strike out of such appearance the denial of partnership. See Annual Practice notes to O 48A rr 4 and 7. In a case where the plaintiff did not take out a summons to decide whether the party appearing under protest was a partner he was allowed an adjournment to serve the firm. But as it was not equitable that the claim should be left hanging over the protesting party pending proceedings under O 21 r 50 the Court directed that the issue whether or not he was a partner should be tried in the suit (o).

**Party appearing under protest not entitled to file written statement on his own behalf**—A party appearing under protest under this rule is not entitled to file a written statement on his own behalf even one denying that he is a partner (p).

**Party appearing under protest not entitled to dispute liability of firm**—In England a party appearing under protest is not allowed to plead in the alternative that if he is a partner the firm he is not liable (q).

**Defence to party appearing under protest in proceeding under O 21 r 50**—A party appearing under protest is entitled to take any defence in a proceeding against him under O 21 r 50 in addition to the defence that he was not a partner of the defendant firm, unless to do so will be to negative the provisions of a rule of procedure (r).

9 [New R S C O 48A, r 10] This order shall apply to suits between a firm and one or more of the partners therein and to suits between firms having one or more partners in common, but no execution shall be issued in such suits except by leave of the Court, and, on an application for leave to issue such execution, all such accounts and enquiries may be directed to be taken and made and directions given as may be just

- (n) *International Colonial Corporation Ltd v Malta* (1971) 1 All ER 107, 101 C 386 (1) 4 C 78. *Cherry v Infocom* (1976) 50 BOM 66, 99 IC 49 (1) 61 A B 58.  
(o) *Thalida v Hans* (1971) 71 M L R 149, 141 C 688 (1) A B 48.  
(p) *International Commercial Corporation Ltd v*

- Malta & Co* (1971) 101 C 356 (1) A C 386.  
(q) *Ward v McFarlane* (1971) 101 C 386 (1) A C 386.  
(r) *Chhattoo Lal Bhusar & Co v* (1971) 56 Cal 10 (1) A C 386.

**Scope of the rule**—This rule provides that suits between a firm and one of its members or between two firms with a common member may be instituted in the firm name provided the firms carry on business in British India (r 1) But no execution can be issued in such a suit *except by leave of the Court*

**10 [New R S C, O 48 A, r 11]** Any person carrying on business in a name or style other than his own name, may be sued in such name or style as if it were a firm name, and, so far as the nature of the case will permit, all rules under this Order shall apply

Soft against person carry  
ing on business in name  
other than his own

**Scope of the rule**—A person trading by himself as a firm or in an assumed or trading name may be sued in his trade name but he cannot sue in that name (s) The words as if it were a firm and so far as the nature of the case will permit shew that the case is not identical for one man cannot constitute a firm (t) If a sole proprietor dies a suit after his death must be brought against his legal representatives (u) It cannot after his death be brought against him in his trade name If the suit is brought against him in his trade name the suit is one against a dead man and a nullity (v) If he dies *pending the suit* the suit will abate unless his legal representative is brought on the record within 90 days from the date of his death (w) This rule does not enable a plaintiff to sue the proprietor of a newspaper in the name of the newspaper (x)

**Non resident foreigner**—As to the corresponding English rule it has been held that it does not apply where the person carrying on business in a name other than his own is a foreign subject resident out of the jurisdiction though he may carry on business through an agent within the jurisdiction The decision proceeded upon the broad ground that an English Court has no jurisdiction over foreigners residing abroad merely because they carry on business within the jurisdiction and that the words any person though large enough to include a foreigner refer only to an English subject (y) The question as to whether the Courts of this country have jurisdiction over foreigners residing abroad merely because they carry on business here through an agent arose in the recent Privy Council case of *Annamalai v Murugasa* (z) but the point was not decided by their Lordships In both Courts in India it was assumed that the Court had jurisdiction but their Lordships said This assumption appears to their Lordships to require more attention than it had received

**Application of foregoing rules**—By the latter part of this rule all the foregoing rules of this Order relating to proceedings against firms are to apply to a person trading in a name other than his own so far as the nature of the case will permit By virtue of r 1 this rule does not apply unless the business is carried on in British India By virtue of rr 1 and 2 the person sued in his trade name may be required to disclose his real name and private address By virtue of r 3 the summons may be served upon the person sued or upon any person having the control or management of the business but in the latter case execution cannot be issued against the personal property of the persons sued except by leave of the Court [O 21 r 50] As regards appearance the person sued must appear in his own name (r 5)

(s) *Mason v Mogridge* (183) 3 Times R p 80  
(t) *Imprat b v G rruha E r* (19 3) 2 Bom L J 7 85 I C 404 (1) A B 102  
(v) *Il b b Bar v Sam I Fu & Co* (19 ) 23 All L J 961 89 I C 2 (76) A A 161  
(w) 3 Bom L R 7 85 I C 464 (74) A B 109  
s pro

(u) *P m J go d v 4 ady & Co* (19...) 43 Cal 5 4 63 I C 84 ( ) A C 404  
(x) *D Bern l v New York Herald* (1893) - Q B 97 (foot note)  
(y) *St Loba (As v a d C rry Co v Hoyer-*  
*m n Ag mcy* (1893) Q B 96  
(z) (1903) 26 Mad 644 30 I A 0

## ORDER XXXI

*Suits by or against Trustees, Executors and Administrators*

**1 [S 437]** In all suits concerning property vested in a trustee, executor or administrator, where the contention is between the persons beneficially interested in such property and a third person, the trustee, executor, or administrator shall represent the persons so interested, and it shall not ordinarily be necessary to make them parties to the suit. But the Court may, if it thinks fit, order them or any of them to be made parties.

Representation of  
beneficiaries in suits  
concerning property vested  
in trustees etc.

**Scope of the rule.**—This rule applies only where the contention is between the beneficiaries and a third person. It does not apply where the contention is between beneficiaries and trustees or between the beneficiaries *inter se*. In suit between beneficiaries and a third person the trustees sufficiently represent the beneficiaries (a) though the beneficiaries are an unascertained and unascertainable class (b) or persons (c). As to declaratory decrees it is provided by s 43 of the Specific Relief Act 1877 that a declaration made under s 42 of that Act is binding where any of the parties are trustees or the persons for whom if in existence at the date of the declaration such parties would be trustees. Compare RSC 16 r 8.

**When beneficiaries may be added as parties.**—Beneficiaries should always be made parties when the executors are wholly uninterested in the case as where they have fully administered the estate (d) or where they have an interest adverse to that of the beneficiaries (e). Where a suit was brought by an executor and the names of the beneficiaries who took possession of the estate pending the suit were substituted as plaintiffs it was held that it did not amount to a substitution of new plaintiffs within the meaning of s 22 of the Limitation Act (f).

A purchases certain property at an execution sale in the name of B. If the judgment debtor seeks to set aside the sale A is by virtue of this rule not a necessary party to the proceeding (g).

**2 [S 438]** Where there are several trustees, executors or administrators, they shall all be made parties to a suit against one or more of them.

J inler f trustees  
executors and administra  
tors

Provided that the executors who have not proved their testator's will, and trustees, executors and administrators outside British India, need not be made parties.

**Trustees.**—The word trustees has been newly added in this rule.

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>(a) See as to beneficiaries under a will <i>Arden v Harb</i> 4 (1884) 8 Bism 24</p> <p>(b) <i>Fussell v D</i> 49 (1884) 7 Ch D 37</p> <p><i>Re St Leo</i> (1888) 33 Ch D 50</p> <p>(c) <i>Cudj v Cur n House</i> [1901] Ch 479</p> | <p>(d) <i>Clegg v Rowland</i> (1866) L R 3 Eq 368 33</p> <p>(e) <i>B f rd v R n a bba</i> (1890) 13 Mad 19</p> <p>(f) <i>Jahab v Broja</i> (1903) C W N 81</p> <p>(g) <i>B rada v Chu der</i> (190 ) 9 Cal 68</p> |
|---|---|

**Several trustees executors or administrators**—This rule applies only to suits against and not to suits by trustees executors or administrators. It provides that all executors who have proved the will should be made parties to the suit. The Court may however entertain an application as for a receiver even though all proving executors are not made parties to the suit (h). An executor who has neither proved nor intermeddled with the estate cannot be sued as representing the estate (i). See Indian Succession Act 39 of 1925 sec 311.

**Outside British India**—These words have been substituted for the words beyond the local limits of the jurisdiction of the Court (j).

**Administration decree**—A decree for general administration cannot be passed without a general administrator (k).

**3 [S 439]** Unless the Court directs otherwise, the husband of a married trustee, administratrix or executrix shall not as such be a party to a suit by or against her

Husband of married executrix not to join

## ORDER XXXII

### Suits by or against Minors and Persons of Unsound Mind

**1 [S 440 1st para]** Every suit by a minor shall be instituted in his name by a person who in such suit shall be called the next friend of the minor

Minor to sue by next friend

**Minor**—Every person domiciled in British India who has not completed the age of 18 years is a minor. In the case however of a minor of whose person or property a guardian has been appointed by a Court of Justice or whose property is under the superintendence of a Court of Wards the age of majority is deemed to have been attained on the minor completing his age of 21 years see Indian Majority Act IV of 1875 s 3.

**Object of having next friend or guardian ad litem**—As a minor is deemed incapable of prosecuting or defending a suit himself it is necessary that his interests in the suit should be watched by an adult person. Such person is in the case of a minor plaintiff called his next friend and in the case of a minor defendant his guardian ad litem or guardian for the suit. But neither the next friend nor the guardian ad litem is a party to the suit (l). The next friend or guardian ad litem may choose his own attorneys or change them (m). As to liability of next friend for costs see notes below.

**Title of suit**—Where a suit is brought on behalf of a minor the title of the suit should run thus *A B a minor by his next friend C D v X Y*. Where a suit is brought against a minor the title of the suit should be *F G v A B a minor by his guardian ad litem C D*. Where the title of a suit in a case was *A B for self and his minor daughter C D* instead of *A B and C D a minor by her next friend A B* and the objection was raised for the first time in appeal it was held that the error did

(h) *Hafizabai v Kailash* 1 (189) 29 Bom 83

(i) *M. Amild v J. K. A. G.* (1894) A.C. 437

(j) See *K. Mar S. ad ad v D. H. dra* (1905)

(k) C.I.L.J. 494

(l) See R. T. 119 (192) 11 C.T. 806

(m) *R. P. L. v. D. S. D. S.* (1903) 30 All 55 56

(n) *D. S. D. S. v. H. S. D. S.* (1901) 3 Cal 64

not affect the merits of the case and that it was not therefore fatal to the suit (n) [s 99] See notes to r 3 below under the head Where a minor defendant is substantially represented by a guardian ad litem

**Objection to authority of next friend**—Where a minor plaintiff has a cause of action no objection to the authority to sue of the next friend through whom the suit is brought will be entertained in appeal (o)

**When minor may sue without next friend**—A minor may sue in a Presidency Small Cause Court without a next friend when the amount claimed does not exceed Rs 500 and is due to him for wages or for work done as a servant Presidency Small Cause Court Act 15 of 1882 s 32

**Liability of next friend for costs**—Where a suit brought by a minor by his next friend is dismissed and the Court finds that the suit was not for the benefit of the minor the Court may direct the next friend personally to pay the costs (p) But if the Court finds that there were reasonable grounds for instituting the suit and the next friend has acted *bona fide* the Court will not mulct the next friend in costs and will direct the costs to come out of the property of the minor (q)

There is nothing in the Code to authorise a Court to decree costs against a guardian ad litem except in the case referred to in r 11 below (r)

**Suit on behalf of an alleged minor who in fact is not a minor**—A suit instituted on behalf of a person alleged to be a minor by his next friend. It is found that the plaintiff was not in fact a minor at the date of the institution of the suit In such a case the suit should, according to Allahabad decisions be dismissed (s) according to Calcutta (t) Madras (u) and Lahore (v) decisions the plaint should be returned for amendment. The latter seems to be the better opinion.

**Adult sued as minor**—Where an adult is sued as a minor by his guardian ad litem and a decree is passed against him he is estopped from disputing the validity of the decree if he knew of the suit before the decree was passed If his property is sold in execution of the decree he is estopped from impeaching the same if he knew of the suit or of the proceedings in execution before the sale (w)

**Minor suing as adult**—Where a suit is brought by a minor without a next friend, and the defendant is aware of the plaintiff's minority but does not object and the plaintiff attains majority before the decree is passed the decree is binding upon the parties (x)

**Estoppel**—A minor who representing himself to be a major collects rents and gives receipts therefor is estopped from again recovering the rents once paid to him by instituting a suit through a next friend (y) Similarly a minor who representing himself to be of full age sells certain property and executes a deed of sale is estopped from suing to set aside the sale on the ground that he was a minor at the date of sale (z) But if the purchaser knew that the vendor was a minor the purchaser could not be said to have been misled by the false representation as to the vendor's age and the suit to set aside the sale would not then be barred (a) A Court of Equity will deprive a fraudulent

- (n) *Alim v Jh lo* (1880) 1 Cal 48  
 (o) *H d R der I k i* (1884) 10 Cal 6 6  
 11 I A 6  
 (p) *Geer v Balla v Ch nde A t* (1894) 11 Cal 13  
 (q) *D t b v Jefferson* (1896) 10 Bom 49  
 (r) *Varas nha v Lalshimpat* (1881) 3 Mad 63  
*S t Ahmud v Am na* (19 8) 50 All 53  
 113 I C 434 (29) A A 18  
 (s) *Sh o v Bh t S gh* (1899) 0 All 90  
*R k t Am(n v St ka Lal* (19 3) 4 All 01  
 77 I C 30 (4) A A 54  
 (t) *Tagur f n v Obaudulla* (1894) 1 Cal 866

- (u) *Sh m ga v Var jana* (1917) 40 Mad 743  
 41 I C 510  
 (v) *Amud r a v Gamun* (19 6) 89 I C 363  
 (6) A L 8  
 (w) *Sesh giri v H mantha* (1915) 39 Mad 1031  
 3 I C 391  
*Ramachari v Durai s ma* (1899) 21 Mad 167  
 (x) *F t Bhu v Ahokar* (19 8) 5 Cal 71  
 111 I C 349 (8) A C 573  
 (y) *I a F t v Shew Vandan* (190 2) 29 Cal 16  
 (z) *Ca sh v Bapu* (189 2) 21 Bom 193  
 (a) *Mohar v Dh rmoda* (1903) 30 Cal 32 32  
 I A 111



minor of the benefit of the plea of infancy but he who invokes the aid of the Court must establish not only that a fraud was practised on him by the minor but that he was deceived into action by the fraud (b) It is clear that if the purchaser knew that the vendor was a minor he could not be said to have been deceived into action by the minor's misrepresentation as to his age

Where question of minority is in dispute—Where a person is sued as a major but he claims to be a minor the Court should frame an issue for the determination of the question of minority and for that purpose appoint a guardian for the alleged minor (c)

Attorney's Costs—An attorney is entitled to recover from the infant's estate the costs of a proper suit or defence of a suit in which the estate was involved. He is also entitled to have a charge declared on the estate for the amount of his costs (d)

2 [ S 442 ] (1) Where a suit is instituted by or on behalf of a minor without a next friend, the defendant may apply to have the plaint taken off the file, with costs to be paid by the pleader or other person by whom it was presented

Where suit is instituted without next friend plaint to be taken off the file

(2) Notice of such application shall be given to such person, and the Court, after hearing his objections (if any), may make such order in the matter as it thinks fit

Taking the plaint off the file—This rule contemplates the case where a suit is instituted without a next friend by a person who is alleged by the defendant to be a minor. In such a case the defendant may apply under this rule to have the plaint taken off the file. To bring his case within the rule the defendant must show that the plaintiff is a minor and that the suit was instituted without a next friend. Now the fact of minority—

(i) may either be apparent on the face of the plaint or

(ii) it may be ascertained upon objection by the defendant and enquiry by the Court

In case (i) the practice is to take the plaint off the file (e)

In case (ii) i.e. where the fact of minority is established after evidence has been taken on the point it may be found—

(a) that the plaintiff instituted the suit with the knowledge of the fact of minority and with the intention of deceiving the Court and evading the payment of costs in the event of failure or

(b) that the plaintiff had no such knowledge or intention

In case (a) the practice according to the Bombay decisions is to make an order under this rule directing the plaint to be taken off the file (f). According to the Calcutta decisions the Court should pass a decree dismissing the suit. The Calcutta High Court holds that the procedure prescribed by this rule namely taking the plaint off the file applies only to those cases where the fact of minority is apparent on the face of the plaint that is to say in case (i) and that it does not apply where the fact of minority is established on enquiry held by the Court upon that point (g). The difference between

(b) *Brahma Dutt v. Dharmodas* (1899) 6 C 1 381  
(c) *Narayana v. T. K. S. & Co. v. Sachidanatha*  
(1909) 31 Bom. L. R. 100  
(d) *W. K. V. Dhu. v. J. B. Dhu.* (1881) 7 C 1 140  
*N. M. Chandra v. Choudhry Deby Singh*  
(1894) 21 Cal. 8. *A. M. K. v. K. M. K.*  
*Hari v. K. M. K.* (1916) 43 Cal. 6 33 1 C  
(e) *N. M. Chandra v. Choudhry Deby Singh* (1894)

17 M. d. 93  
(e) *B. K. v. N. K. v. P. M. Lal* (1886) 13 C 1  
149. *R. K. v. N. K. v. Choudhry Deby Singh* (1894) 13  
14 m.  
(f) *R. K. v. N. K. v. Choudhry Deby Singh* (1899) 13 Bom.  
(g) *B. K. v. P. M. Lal* (1886) 13 Cal.  
1 2

the practice of the two Courts is important in this way that while an appeal lies from a decree dismissing a suit no appeal lies from an order directing a plaint to be taken off the file

In ca c (b) the practice is to stay proceedings and to allow sufficient time to enable the minor plaintiff to be represented by a next friend (h)

The Court should take notice of the irregularity and refuse to proceed even if the suit is *ex parte* (i) If the defendant appears and does not object the Court should not reject the plaint but should allow the plaintiff time to get himself properly represented (j) When a next friend is appointed the objection that the suit was originally instituted without a next friend can no longer be urged (k) If the plaintiff attains majority before the Court has decided that he is a minor there is no necessity to appoint a next friend (l)

Costs—When a suit is instituted by a minor without a next friend the pleader or any other person presenting the plaint is liable for costs and the Court should not render the property of the minor liable for costs (m)

Decree for a minor in a suit instituted by him without a next friend—Where a suit is instituted by a minor without a next friend and the defendant does not object to it he will be deemed to have waived his objection The defendant cannot in such a case after a decree has been passed against him object to the execution of the decree on the ground that the suit was instituted by the minor without a next friend. The absence of a next friend does not make the suit a nullity The institution of a suit by a minor without a next friend is merely an irregularity which can be waived by the conduct of the defendant (n)

3 [S 446, 1st para S 456] (1) Where the defendant is a minor, the Court, on being satisfied of the fact of his minority, shall appoint a proper person to be guardian for the suit for such minor

Guardian for the suit to be appointed by Court for minor defendant

(2) An order for the appointment of a guardian for the suit may be obtained upon application in the name and on behalf of the minor or by the plaintiff

(3) Such application shall be supported by an affidavit verifying the fact that the proposed guardian has no interest in the matters in controversy in the suit adverse to that of the minor and that he is a fit person to be so appointed

(4) No order shall be made on any application under this rule except upon notice to the minor and to any guardian of the minor appointed or declared by an authority competent in that behalf, or, where there is no such guardian, upon notice

- (h) *Be & I am Bh tt v Ra J I* (1896) 13 Cal 189 *Eatt b v Cl I I* (1889) 13 Bom 7 *Raraha v Man K I* (19 3) 44 Mad L J 1 4 I C 309 (23) A M 3
- (i) *M J S v M g v I* (19 3) 3 Rang 39 89 I C 80 (2) A R 3
- (j) *Al Am d v S d M an* (19 3) 4 Lah 309 51 C 10 8 (4) A L 184

- (k) *Sa k r v D I* (19 3) 43 M d L J 57 3 I C 401 ( ) A M 2 9
- (l) *Parachan v M I Lal* (19 3) 44 Mad L J 515 74 I C 309 (3) A M 5 3
- (m) *At uch nd v Collector of Sholapur* (1889) 13 Bom 234
- (n) *K malakh v Ramasami* (1896) 19 Mad 1 7

minor of the benefit of the plea of infancy but he who invokes the aid of the Court must establish not only that a fraud was practised on him by the minor but that he was deceived into action by the fraud (b) It is clear that if the purchaser knew that the vendor was a minor he could not be said to have been deceived into action by the minor's misrepresentation as to his age

Where question of minority is in dispute—Where a person is sued as a major but he claims to be a minor the Court should frame an issue for the determination of the question of minority and for that purpose appoint a guardian for the alleged minor (c)

Attorney's Costs—An attorney is entitled to recover from the infant's estate the costs of a proper suit or defence of a suit in which the estate was involved. He is also entitled to have a charge declared on the estate for the amount of his costs (d)

2 [S 442] (1) Where a suit is instituted by or on behalf of a minor without a next friend, the defendant may apply to have the plaint taken off the file, with costs to be paid by the pleader or other person by whom it was presented

Where suit is instituted without next friend plaint to be taken off the file

(2) Notice of such application shall be given to such person, and the Court, after hearing his objections (if any), may make such order in the matter as it thinks fit

Taking the plaint off the file—This rule contemplates the case where a suit is instituted without a next friend by a person who is alleged by the defendant to be a minor. In such a case the defendant may apply under this rule to have the plaint taken off the file. To bring his case within the rule the defendant must show that the plaintiff is a minor and that the suit was instituted without a next friend. Now the fact of minority—

(i) may either be apparent on the face of the plaint or

(ii) it may be ascertained upon objection by the defendant and enquiry by the Court

In case (i) the practice is to take the plaint off the file (e)

In case (ii) i.e. where the fact of minority is established after evidence has been taken on the point it may be found—

(a) that the plaintiff instituted the suit with the knowledge of the fact of minority and with the intention of deceiving the Court and evading the payment of costs in the event of failure or

(b) that the plaintiff had no such knowledge or intention.

In case (a) the practice according to the Bombay decisions is to make an order under this rule directing the plaint to be taken off the file (f). According to the Calcutta decisions the Court should pass a decree dismissing the suit. The Calcutta High Court holds that the procedure prescribed by this rule namely taking the plaint off the file applies only to those cases where the fact of minority is apparent on the face of the plaint that is to say in case (i) and that it does not apply where the fact of minority is established on enquiry held by the Court upon that point (g). The difference between

(b) *Brahma Dutt v. Dharmodas* (1839) 6 Cal 391  
(c) *Naray T. Ker v. D. C. v. Sachin Das* (1879) 31 J. M. L. R. 100  
(d) *W. K. v. D. H. A. v. B. D. v. B. D.* (1881) 7 Cal 140  
    *N. M. v. C. H. v. C. H. v. C. H.* (1894) 21 Cal 8  
    *H. v. C. H. v. C. H.* (1916) 43 Cal 66  
    *100 N. Cal. H. v. A. v. A.* (1941)

1 M d 45  
(a) *B. v. D. H. v. C. H. v. C. H.* (1846) 13 Cal 19  
    *Half Cal v. Chaudhary* (1883) 13 B m  
(f) *I. H. v. C. H. v. C. H.* (1889) 13 Pom  
(g) *B. v. C. H. v. C. H.* (1846) 13 Cal 19

the practice of the two Courts is important in this way that while an appeal lies from a decree dismissing a suit no appeal lies from an order directing a plaint to be taken off the file

In case (b) the practice is to stay proceedings and to allow sufficient time to enable the minor plaintiff to be represented by a next friend (A)

The Court should take notice of the irregularity and refuse to proceed even if the suit is *ex parte* (i) If the defendant appears and does not object the Court should not reject the plaint but should allow the plaintiff time to get himself properly represented (j) When a next friend is appointed the objection that the suit was originally instituted without a next friend can no longer be urged (l) If the plaintiff attains majority before the Court has decided that he is a minor there is no necessity to appoint a next friend (l)

Costs—When a suit is instituted by a minor without a next friend the pleader or any other person presenting the plaint is liable for costs and the Court should not render the property of the minor liable for cost (m)

Decree for a minor in a suit instituted by him without a next friend.—Where a suit is instituted by a minor without a next friend, and the defendant does not object to it he will be deemed to have waived his objection. The defendant cannot in such a case after a decree has been passed against him, object to the execution of the decree on the ground that the suit was instituted by the minor without a next friend. The absence of a next friend does not make the suit a nullity. The institution of a suit by a minor without a next friend is merely an irregularity which can be waived by the conduct of the defendant (n)

3 [S 446 1st para S 456] (1) Where the defendant is a minor, the Court, on being satisfied of the fact of his minority, shall appoint a proper person to be guardian for the suit for such minor

Guardian for the suit to be appointed by Court for minor defendant.

(2) An order for the appointment of a guardian for the suit may be obtained upon application in the name and on behalf of the minor or by the plaintiff

(3) Such application shall be supported by an affidavit verifying the fact that the proposed guardian has no interest in the matters in controversy in the suit adverse to that of the minor and that he is a fit person to be so appointed

(4) No order shall be made on any application under this rule except upon notice to the minor and to any guardian of the minor appointed or declared by an authority competent in that behalf, or, where there is no such guardian, upon notice

- (b) *De F m Ekt v Nam Lal* (1915) 13 Cal 19 *Paromba v Chelil* (1919) 13 Tm *F ruka v Jhansik* (1923) 44 Mad L.J. 515 4 I.C. 309 (23) A.M. 503
- (i) *M g v Manu* (1920) 3 Rang 239 89 I.C. 80 (20) A.R. 30
- (j) *Al Ahmad v J Manu* (1923) 4 Lah 390 51 C 1000 (24) A.L.J. 5

- (k) *Sa Tara v Doran* (1923) 43 Mad. L.J. 572 71 C. 491 (22) A.M. 200
- (l) *F ruka v Man Lal* (1923) 44 Mad. L.J. 515 4 I.C. 309 (23) A.M. 503.
- (m) *Amchand v Collector of Solapur* (1912) 13 Bom 234
- (n) *Kemalish v F marem* (1906) 19 Mad. 1

3 to the father or other natural guardian of the minor, or, where there is no father or other natural guardian, to the person in whose care the minor is, and after hearing any objection which may be urged on behalf of any person served with notice under this sub rule

Sub-rule (4) is new

**Guardian ad litem**—Where a guardian ad litem has once been appointed, his appointment endures for the whole of the litigation including proceedings in execution and appeal (o) The Calcutta High Court has held that a guardian ad litem appointed in the original suit does not continue as such in execution proceedings without fresh appointment (p) But it is submitted that this is erroneous for execution proceedings are a continuation of the suit

A guardian ad litem is *not a party* to a suit or appeal Therefore a suit or an appeal is not time barred merely because the order appointing a guardian ad litem is not made until after the expiration of the period of limitation prescribed for the suit or appeal (q)

**Proper person to be appointed guardian ad litem**—It is the duty of the judge himself to decide who is the proper person to be appointed as guardian ad litem (r)

**Plea of minority**—A sues B B alleges that he is a minor In such a case the Court should frame a preliminary issue on the question of minority and appoint a guardian for the purpose of the enquiry on the question of minority If the defendant is found to be a minor a guardian ad litem should be appointed for him but if he is found to be a major the guardian appointed for the inquiry should cease to act and the defendant may conduct his own case (s) So also if a dispute arises as to whether a minor is the legal representative of a deceased party the Court should appoint a guardian ad litem and decide the matter (t)

**Non representation**—The provisions of this rule as to the appointment of a guardian ad litem for a minor defendant are imperative Hence if a minor is sued without a guardian ad litem and a decree is passed against him the decree is a nullity and it cannot be enforced against him (u) For the same reason it cannot operate as *res judicata* (v)

The Allahabad High Court has held that a minor against whom a decree has been passed without the appointment of a proper guardian ad litem may if the facts of the case justify, in that very suit (1) appeal from the decree or (2) apply for a review of judgment or (3) apply for an order under r 5 (2) below according as the circumstances of the case may permit or he may bring a regular suit to set aside the decree and the sale (if any) in execution of the decree (w) A minor however cannot resist execution of the

- (o) *Juala v I rhu* (180) 14 All 55 1 e k ta  
v *Akarakamba* (1892) 31 1 18  
31uz ff 411 31h n v I rhu (190)  
9 All 640 *Rajkumar v Iam* (1811)  
(191) 6 1st L J 12 1 e 1 (3  
(22) A 1 2d 31 mba v *Kankaya*  
(1922) 44 All 619 1 e 4 7 (22) A A  
33 *Ra gel v Dharna* (193) 45 All  
63 3 1 C 879 (4) A A 9  
(p) *Salal d v Af a Begum* (1923) 25 C W N  
963 84 1 C 65 (3) A C 23  
(q) *Karm Karam v H Dayal* (194) 4 All  
3 1 p (Aand v *Iarodha* (190) 30 All  
55  
(r) *Ramchand a Das v Jol pras d* (190) 29  
All 63 8 N  
(s) *K Jos v Karam* 1901 (1893) 16 Mad  
344  
(t) *I Kma v I e as mi* (1904) 47 All 1 L  
J 30 10 1 C 94 (4) A M 13

- (u) *Dit A r v Ierol* (189) 4 Cal 75 *EA re*  
M I v H r A (ah) *Da* (1907) 4 All  
343 *Ha uman* 31 *Karm d* (1906) 4  
All 3 1 1 f v *Da* J m (1884) 1 Bom  
19 *I Ad-u* 1904 v *M A mmed*  
(1909) 36 I 4 164 31 All 5 3 1  
661 *Part d S* 194 v *EA 6 to* 1904  
(1913) 40 I A 14 3 All 4 7 21 1 C  
29 *Ihu* A d v *H pay* (1913) 17  
C W N 549 19 1 C 89 v *eyadra*  
*Jou d a* (1914) 19 C W N 53 2 1 C  
133 *S e d a v* *Ighore* (1920) 3 C W N  
3 6 I C 464 *I mapati v* *Shah*  
*M d* (193) 3 (al L J 426 1 C  
4 (3) A C 62  
(v) *Dum v Ialrya* (19 U) 41 Bom 6 4  
1 C 4  
(w) *Ra ge v I a m S* *Sh Da* (191) 29  
All 8 10 11 36 1 C 368 *A m Lal*  
*Gharu* (1901) 35 All 459 (ult)

decree on the ground that the decree is a nullity for a minor not represented by a proper guardian ad litem as where the guardian ad litem is a person whose interest is adverse to that of the minor [r 4] cannot be said to be a party to the suit within the meaning of s 47 above (x)

The Allahabad High Court has held that where a decree is a suit against a minor is set aside in a subsequent suit by the minor on the sole ground that he was not represented by a proper guardian ad litem the Court whose decree is set aside has inherent power to restore the suit and to proceed with the appointment of a fit and proper person as guardian ad litem for the minor defendant (y) But the Madras High Court has held that there is no such inherent jurisdiction (z) Again the Allahabad High Court has held that where an ex parte decree has been passed against a minor not properly represented the minor may apply to have the decree set aside under O 9 r 13 (a) The Madras High Court has held that no such application is competent the reason given being that a minor not properly represented in a suit cannot be regarded as a party to a suit and an application under O 9 r 13 can only be made by a party to the suit (b)

**Substantial representation**—When a minor defendant is not represented at all as in the cases referred in the preceding paragraph he is not a party to the suit and the decree as against him is a nullity That must be distinguished from another class of cases where the Court has recognised a guardian ad litem but has made no formal appointment or has made an appointment which is open to objection owing to some defect of procedure The rule in this latter class of cases is different for the decree will bind the minor unless it is shown that the defect of procedure has prejudiced him In this class of cases the leading case is that of *Walia v Banke Behari* (c) That was a suit brought against a minor but no order was applied for and none was made for the appointment of a guardian ad litem In the plaint however which was admitted by the Court the mother of the minor was described as his guardian Further the mother appeared throughout the proceedings in the suit as the minor's guardian A decree was passed against the minor and in the decree and the execution proceedings the mother was described as the minor's guardian In a suit brought by the minor on attaining majority to set aside the decree passed against him on the ground that no guardian ad litem had been appointed as required by the present rule it was held by their Lordships of the Privy Council overruling the decision of the Calcutta High Court that the Court in which the former suit was instituted had by its action given sanction to the appearance of the mother as a guardian ad litem and that the absence of a formal order of appointment was not fatal to the suit unless it was shown that the defect in procedure prejudiced the minor Their Lordships observed that there was nothing in the proceedings of that suit to suggest that the interests of the minor were not duly protected by the mother or that the defect in procedure had prejudiced the minor and they accordingly held that the decree was binding upon the minor The particular defects of procedure that have been condoned on the ground of no prejudice to the minor are—omission to make a formal order of appointment (d) an appointment made without the affidavit required by r 3 (3)

- (x) *Ialpada v Nar* (191) 44 C 1 67 35 IC  
6 (1) native defendant *Rashid un Nissa*  
*M J mimad* (1909) 31 All 572 36  
1 A 163 3 IC 864  
(y) *Dh gu v J o am Svla Das* (1917) 39 All 8  
6 IC 366  
(z) *P J a v J a g l s* (1919) 37 Mad L J  
333 3 IC 184 *Arumiga v Ter a*  
*jiapp* (194) 46 Mad L J 349 43  
1 C 6 (4) A M 483  
(a) (191) 39 All 836 IC 366 *supra*  
(b) (1919) 37 Mad L J 90 53 IC 184 *supra*

- (c) (1901) 30 Cal 10 1 30 IA 18  
(d) *Kedar v Prut b* (1893) 0 Cal 11 *Nar*  
*v Bhubane hwa t* (1898) 15 I A 195 16  
Cal 40 *Sresh Ch na v J gat Chund*  
(1897) 14 Cal 04 *Snd Ami v Sheukh*  
*Mansadi* (1916) 40 Bom 541 37 IC  
186 *Le haw si rind a v R n D bend a*  
(1919) 4 Pat L J 213 48 IC 245  
*ra n Das v Fall* (1915) *Punj Rec no*  
61 p 20 31 IC 47 *Phull v D ba*  
*P shad* (194) 5 Lah 33 45 IC 419  
(23) A L 575

being filed (e) or without notice to the minor under r 3 (4) (f) appointment of a Court guardian without notice to the person in whose care the minor is (g) But such irregularities will vitiate the decree if there is prejudice to the minor as in *Sadashir v Trimbuk* (h) and *Shah Abdul Karim v Thakurdas* (i) where no formal appointment was made and the minor's interest were not protected or in *Bhagwan v Param* (j) where a Nazir was appointed guardian without notice to the mother with whom the minor lived and he for want of funds took no steps to defend the suit The rule is well stated by Wallace J in *Tirumalacharyulu v Ammisetti* (k) as follows No irregularity by way of omission to send notice as required by O 32 r 3 shall operate to render void the presumed representation of the minor in a suit unless such omission has in fact prejudiced their defence and such prejudice is not a matter of assumption or presumption but of proof

**Notice**—Notice should be served both on the proposed guardian and on the minor and the wishes of the minor should be considered (l) But if there is no fraud or collusion failure to give notice to the minor is an irregularity which does not justify the Court in setting aside the decree (m)

**Service of summons**—There is no express provision in the Code for service on minors. Hence where the defendant is a minor he should be served with the summons in the way provided for service upon adults (n). But where a guardian ad litem has been appointed by the Court service of summons or of notice of hearing in the case of an appeal on such guardian is sufficient (o). As to service in suits brought against wards of Courts of Wards see Bengal Court of Wards Act 1879 s. 54 and Bombay Court of Wards Act 1900 s. 34.

**Fraud of next friend or guardian ad litem**—A decree passed against a minor properly represented is binding upon him as much as a decree passed against an adult but it is open to the minor to impeach the decree *by a suit* in cases where the next friend or guardian for the suit has been guilty of fraud or collusion in allowing the decree to be passed against him (7) or of culpable negligence which has brought prejudice to the minor (7)

**Probate proceedings**—Until a contest arises section 141 of the Code is not applicable to a probate proceeding so as to attract the applicability of this Order. But where a will of which probate is sought affects the interests of a minor it may be expedient as a rule of practice to appoint a guardian ad litem (*v*)

(e) *Muhammad Ali* (1910) 3 I A  
3 All 4 6 11 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 82 83 84 85 86 87 88 89 90 91 92 93 94 95 96 97 98 99 100 101 102 103 104 105 106 107 108 109 110 111 112 113 114 115 116 117 118 119 120 121 122 123 124 125 126 127 128 129 130 131 132 133 134 135 136 137 138 139 140 141 142 143 144 145 146 147 148 149 150 151 152 153 154 155 156 157 158 159 160 161 162 163 164 165 166 167 168 169 170 171 172 173 174 175 176 177 178 179 180 181 182 183 184 185 186 187 188 189 190 191 192 193 194 195 196 197 198 199 200 201 202 203 204 205 206 207 208 209 210 211 212 213 214 215 216 217 218 219 220 221 222 223 224 225 226 227 228 229 230 231 232 233 234 235 236 237 238 239 240 241 242 243 244 245 246 247 248 249 250 251 252 253 254 255 256 257 258 259 260 261 262 263 264 265 266 267 268 269 270 271 272 273 274 275 276 277 278 279 280 281 282 283 284 285 286 287 288 289 290 291 292 293 294 295 296 297 298 299 300 301 302 303 304 305 306 307 308 309 310 311 312 313 314 315 316 317 318 319 320 321 322 323 324 325 326 327 328 329 330 331 332 333 334 335 336 337 338 339 340 341 342 343 344 345 346 347 348 349 350 351 352 353 354 355 356 357 358 359 360 361 362 363 364 365 366 367 368 369 370 371 372 373 374 375 376 377 378 379 380 381 382 383 384 385 386 387 388 389 390 391 392 393 394 395 396 397 398 399 400 401 402 403 404 405 406 407 408 409 410 411 412 413 414 415 416 417 418 419 420 421 422 423 424 425 426 427 428 429 430 431 432 433 434 435 436 437 438 439 440 441 442 443 444 445 446 447 448 449 450 451 452 453 454 455 456 457 458 459 460 461 462 463 464 465 466 467 468 469 470 471 472 473 474 475 476 477 478 479 480 481 482 483 484 485 486 487 488 489 490 491 492 493 494 495 496 497 498 499 500 501 502 503 504 505 506 507 508 509 510 511 512 513 514 515 516 517 518 519 520 521 522 523 524 525 526 527 528 529 530 531 532 533 534 535 536 537 538 539 540 541 542 543 544 545 546 547 548 549 550 551 552 553 554 555 556 557 558 559 560 561 562 563 564 565 566 567 568 569 570 571 572 573 574 575 576 577 578 579 580 581 582 583 584 585 586 587 588 589 590 591 592 593 594 595 596 597 598 599 600 601 602 603 604 605 606 607 608 609 610 611 612 613 614 615 616 617 618 619 620 621 622 623 624 625 626 627 628 629 630 631 632 633 634 635 636 637 638 639 640 641 642 643 644 645 646 647 648 649 650 651 652 653 654 655 656 657 658 659 660 661 662 663 664 665 666 667 668 669 670 671 672 673 674 675 676 677 678 679 680 681 682 683 684 685 686 687 688 689 690 691 692 693 694 695 696 697 698 699 700 701 702 703 704 705 706 707 708 709 710 711 712 713 714 715 716 717 718 719 720 721 722 723 724 725 726 727 728 729 730 731 732 733 734 735 736 737 738 739 740 741 742 743 744 745 746 747 748 749 750 751 752 753 754 755 756 757 758 759 760 761 762 763 764 765 766 767 768 769 770 771 772 773 774 775 776 777 778 779 780 781 782 783 784 785 786 787 788 789 790 791 792 793 794 795 796 797 798 799 800 801 802 803 804 805 806 807 808 809 810 811 812 813 814 815 816 817 818 819 820 821 822 823 824 825 826 827 828 829 830 831 832 833 834 835 836 837 838 839 840 841 842 843 844 845 846 847 848 849 850 851 852 853 854 855 856 857 858 859 860 861 862 863 864 865 866 867 868 869 870 871 872 873 874 875 876 877 878 879 880 881 882 883 884 885 886 887 888 889 890 891 892 893 894 895 896 897 898 899 900 901 902 903 904 905 906 907 908 909 910 911 912 913 914 915 916 917 918 919 920 921 922 923 924 925 926 927 928 929 930 931 932 933 934 935 936 937 938 939 940 941 942 943 944 945 946 947 948 949 950 951 952 953 954 955 956 957 958 959 960 961 962 963 964 965 966 967 968 969 970 971 972 973 974 975 976 977 978 979 980 981 982 983 984 985 986 987 988 989 990 991 992 993 994 995 996 997 998 999 1000 1001 1002 1003 1004 1005 1006 1007 1008 1009 1010 1011 1012 1013 1014 1015 1016 1017 1018 1019 1020 1021 1022 1023 1024 1025 1026 1027 1028 1029 1030 1031 1032 1033 1034 1035 1036 1037 1038 1039 104

Execution proceedings—The provisions of this order do not directly apply to execution proceedings. The non representation of a minor by a guardian ad litem in execution proceedings is not in itself sufficient to set aside an execution sale (s)

O 3  
rr 3,

4 [Ss 445, 457, ss 440 443 s 456, and R S C, O 65 r 13]

Who may act as next  
friend or be appointed  
guardian for the suit

(1) Any person who is of sound mind and has attained majority may act as next friend of a minor or as his guardian for the suit

Provided that the interest of such person is not adverse to that of the minor and that he is not, in the case of a next friend, a defendant, or, in the case of a guardian for the suit, a plaintiff

(2) Where a minor has a guardian appointed or declared by competent authority, no person other than such guardian shall act as the next friend of the minor or be appointed his guardian for the suit unless the Court considers, for reasons to be recorded, that it is for the minor's welfare that another person be permitted to act or be appointed, as the case may be

(3) No person shall without his consent be appointed guardian for the suit

(4) Where there is no other person fit and willing to act as guardian for the suit the Court may appoint any of its officers to be such guardian, and may direct that the costs to be incurred by such officer in the performance of his duties as such guardian shall be borne either by the parties or by any one or more of the parties to the suit, or out of any fund in Court in which the minor is interested, and may give directions for the repayment or allowance of such costs as justice and the circumstances of the case may require

Code of 1882—Sub r (1) corresponds to ss 445 and 457 of the Code of 1882 sub r (2) to ss 440 and 443 2nd paragraph and sub r (4) to s 456 2nd paragraph and P S C O 65 r 13 Sub r (3) is new It is in accordance with a Bombay ruling in the undermentioned case (t)

Married woman as guardian ad litem—Under the Code of 1882 though a married woman could be appointed next friend of a minor plaintiff she could not be appointed guardian ad litem of a minor defendant Under this Code she may also be appointed guardian ad litem

Sub rule (1) adverse interest.—This rule provides that a person whose interest is adverse to that of a minor should not be appointed guardian ad litem This has given rise to the question whether if a minor is represented by a guardian ad litem whose

(s) *F v Suleman* (19 6) 31 Cal L J 91  
64 IC 25 *Maharaj v Suleman*  
(19 6) 30 Cal W N 86 89 IC 65 (27)  
A C 103 *Ba v Dhar v Mahomed*

*Suleman* (19 6) 8 L h L J 464 97  
IC 181 ( 6) 4 L 490  
(t) *Jadon v Chaf gan* (1891) 5 Bom 306



3 being filed (e) or without notice to the minor under r 3 (3) (f) appointment of a Court guardian without notice to the person in whose care the minor is (g) But such irregularities will vitiate the decree if there is prejudice to the minor as in *Sadashir v Trimbut* (4) and *Shah Abdul Karim v Thakurdas* (5) where no formal appointment was made and the minor's interest were not protected or in *Bhagwan v Param* (j) where a Nazir was appointed guardian without notice to the mother with whom the minor lived and he for want of funds took no steps to defend the suit. The rule is well stated by Wallace J in *Tirumalacharyulu v Ammisetti* (1) as follows. No irregularity by way of omission to send notice as required by O 32 r 3 shall operate to render void the presumed representation of the minor in a suit unless such omission has in fact prejudiced their defence and such prejudice is not a matter of assumption or presumption but of proof.

**Notice**—Notice should be served both on the proposed guardian and on the minor and the wishes of the minor should be considered (4). But if there is no fraud or collusion failure to give notice to the minor is an irregularity which does not justify the Court in setting aside the decree (m).

**Service of summons**—There is no express provision in the Code for service on minors. Hence where the defendant is a minor he should be served with the summons in the way provided for service upon adults (n). But where a guardian ad litem has been appointed by the Court service of summons or of notice of hearing in the case of an appeal on such guardian is sufficient (o). As to service in suits brought against wards of Courts of Wards see Bengal Court of Wards Act 1879 s 51 and Bombay Court of Wards Act 1900 s 34.

**Fraud of next friend or guardian ad litem**—A decree passed against a minor properly represented is binding upon him as much as a decree passed against an adult but it is open to the minor to impeach the decree by a suit in cases where the next friend or guardian for the suit has been guilty of fraud or collusion in allowing the decree to be passed against him (p) or of culpable negligence which has brought prejudice to the minor (q).

**Probate proceedings**—Until a contest arises section 141 of the Code is not applicable to a probate proceeding so as to attract the applicability of this Order. But where a will of which probate is sought affects the interests of a minor it may be expedient as a rule of practice to appoint a guardian ad litem (r).

- (e) *M n Lal v h l* 106a (1910) 3 I A 341 v *P d* (1909) 1 Lah 5 IC 833
- (f) *I H D v Jansal* (1911) 5 Lah 38 IC 443 (3) A I 5
- (g) *M n Lal v P la* (1918) 3 Mai 16 IC 18 *I m m m v D o* (1913) 46 M 1 L J 33 3 IC 402 (1913) A M 46 *Lak h m k n v J g* (1914) 46 M 1 L J 1 *I C* 461 (4) A M 41 *T r u m a l h a r v* (1914) 46 M 1 L J 363 80 IC 461 (3) A M 63
- (h) (1906) 41 B m 87 6 IC 309
- (i) (1909) 55 Cal 111 (29) A C 84
- (j) (1911) 35 All 19 1 IC 63
- (k) (1911) 46 M 1 L J 363 80 IC 461 (4) A M 63 See also *id v H r d y* (1911) 46 M 1 L J 363 (2) A A 545
- (l) *Rajendra v Pralodh* (1911) 6 Pat L J 2 59 IC 936 (21) A P 25
- (m) *S Ma v Luckmi* (1923) 6 All L J 634 (1) A A 61

- (n) *Jat l a v v r alh* (1904) 81 Cal 1 161 *I v f y r* (1908) 3 Cal 1 281 *A m h g u o d f i r t a L a l* (1911) 7 Cal 350 *a n i f i l l v l u b e l l a* (1911) C W 100 (1) *l u r a m v a r v i c e n t i n* (1) S also *T r e c l a n o n* 311 *o n e d e d p r e*
- (o) *R a k v K m a r f y d h* (1906) 30 C W 949 *d l o w t i n g o n v r h e a n d e r* *J g u t e h* (1914) 14 Cal 15. See also *t o h l i m v M h m m a d d i* (1911) 11 M 1 C n 35 p. 115 111 1 31
- (p) *C u r l a v L a k c a l u* (1911) 191 m 1 *L a l l a v l a m* (1911) 118 *L a k h v h l a* (1906) 1 Cal 11 *R e v r a d L a j l a m* (1916) 35 Cal 6 35 IC 63
- (q) *B r i j P a v l a m S a r p* (1925) 44 All 41 80 IC 1018 (1926) A A 35 *A m m a d u d h r a o* (1911) 3 B m 11 135 105 IC 45 (1) A A 613
- (r) *P a d h h y a m l a v f g v a n d e l* (1900) 8 Cal 241 9 IC 664 *a k h a y d v H r o m o y* (1900) 4 C W 534 52 IC 43

**Execution proceedings**—The provisions of this order do not directly apply to execution proceedings. The non representation of a minor by a guardian ad litem in execution proceedings is not in itself sufficient to set aside an execution sale (s)

4 [Ss 445, 437, ss 440 443, s 456, and R S C, O 65, r 13]

Who may act as next friend or be appointed guardian for the suit

(1) Any person who is of sound mind and has attained majority may act as next friend of a minor or as his guardian for the suit

Provided that the interest of such person is not adverse to that of the minor and that he is not, in the case of a next friend, a defendant, or, in the case of a guardian for the suit, a plaintiff

(2) Where a minor has a guardian appointed or declared by competent authority, no person other than such guardian shall act as the next friend of the minor or be appointed his guardian for the suit unless the Court considers, for reasons to be recorded that it is for the minor's welfare that another person be permitted to act or be appointed, as the case may be

(3) No person shall without his consent be appointed guardian for the suit

(4) Where there is no other person fit and willing to act as guardian for the suit, the Court may appoint any of its officers to be such guardian, and may direct that the costs to be incurred by such officer in the performance of his duties as such guardian shall be borne either by the parties or by any one or more of the parties to the suit, or out of any fund in Court in which the minor is interested, and may give directions for the repayment or allowance of such costs as justice and the circumstances of the case may require

Code of 1882—Sub r (1) corresponds to ss 445 and 457 of the Code of 1857 sub r (2) to ss 440 and 443 2nd paragraph and sub r (4) to s 456 2nd paragraph and P S C O 65 r 13 Sub r (3) is new It is in accordance with a Bombay ruling in the undermentioned case (s)

**Married woman as guardian ad litem**—Under the Code of 1882 though a married woman could be appointed next friend of a minor plaintiff she could not be appointed guardian ad litem of a minor defendant Under this Code she may also be appointed guardian ad litem

**Sub rule (1) adverse interest**—This rule provides that a person whose interest is adverse to that of a minor should not be appointed guardian ad litem This has given rise to the question whether if a minor is represented by a guardian ad litem whose

(s) *F v S vend a* (19 ) 31 Cal L.J 91  
64 I C 25 *Mat Ra t v Abd I Saad*  
(19 6) 30 Cal W N 86 89 I C 765 (—7)  
A C 109 *La s Dhar v Maimamad* } *S lem* (19 6) 8 Lah L.J 464 97  
I C 181 (—6) 4 L 490  
(t) *Jadon v Chhagan* (1881) 5 Bom 306



which vitiates the decree (c) The permission to appoint another person as next friend or as guardian ad litem need not be express (d) Failure to record reasons as required by sub r (2) is an irregularity which does not of itself vitiate the appointment (e)

**Sub rule (3) consent of guardian ad litem**—This sub rule controls both sub rule (1) and sub rule (2) and places a material restriction on the power of the Court. No person competent under either of these sub rules can be appointed guardian ad litem without his consent (f) A guardian who has not consented to act as such is no guardian at all and the decree is invalid irrespective of any question of prejudice because the minor has not been represented in the suit (g) Das J seems to take a different view in *Pande Saldeo v Ramayan* (h) but that is erroneous as pointed out by Venkatasubba Rao J in *Sriramulu v Lakshminarayana* (i) and by Rankin CJ in *Satis Chandra v Hashem Ali* (j) The Allahabad High Court has said that in certain circumstances consent may be presumed when the proposed guardian remains silent and absent (l) But it is submitted that this is incorrect and the proper procedure in such case is in default of any other person fit and willing to act to appoint an officer of the Court (l) But under the Code of 1859 which did not contain any proviso similar to r 4 (3) when a guardian under the Guardian and Ward Act made no response consent was presumed (m) In an Allahabad case where a father and his minor son were sued the Court appointed the mother guardian ad litem in spite of her refusal. The father filed a written statement for the son and defended the suit on his behalf. It is clear that the minor was not represented by his mother but the High Court held that there was substantial representation by the father and there was no prejudice to the minor (n) The consent need not be expressed in writing. Some cases use the phrase express consent but the word express is not in the rule. Consent is a question of fact and the evidence of it may be indirect and circumstantial (o) or it may be proved by conduct (p)

**Sub rule (4) Officer of Court as guardian ad litem**—In cases under the previous Codes it was held that if an officer of Court was appointed guardian ad litem he should not be paid for his trouble (q) also that if he had no funds to conduct adequately the defence of the minor the Court could relieve him of his position as guardian (r) But under the present code the Court may provide for the costs to be incurred by him in order that he may obtain legal assistance and this is so even when the guardian ad litem is himself a pleader (s) The appointment of an officer of the Court as guardian ad litem on a false affidavit that there is no other person fit and willing is vitiated by fraud and is of no legal effect. A decree so obtained is not binding on the minor (t) But the mere fact that no inquiry has been made

(c) *Bh major v Hus* in *Sahab* (19 0) 43 Mad 808 59 I C 84

(d) *Sridhar Rao v Ram Lal* (1909) 31 All 7 I C 53

(e) *Rar han v Manallal* (1923) 44 Mad L J 515 41 C 309 (3) A M 53

(f) *A dha Up d a* (19 1) 26 C W N 81 6 I C 18 (1) A C 600

(g) *V s gh v S h k J A* (191 ) 1 C I L J 3 13 I C 414 *As nd a v Jogendra* (1914) 19 C W N 537 7 I C 139

*Su d a v Asf ra* (19 1) C W N 5 6 I C 484 (1) A C 534 *Annada v Upe dra* (1921) 26 C W N 81 65 I C 18 (21) A C 600 *Umapati v Sh kh Afandulla* (1923) 37 Cal L J 496

7 I C 472 (3) A C 63 *Shaukh Syy d v Sakat Ro* (1923) 21st 7 I C 637 ( ) A P 448 *Jagadisa v Harsh* (19 4) 40 Cal L J 39 78 I C 19 (24) A C 104

(h) (19 3) 1st 335 1 I C 05 (3) A P 24

(i) (19 4) 4 Mad 783 83 I C 312 (2) A M 30

(j) (1927) 54 Cal 4 0 103 I C 1 4 (27) A C

488  
(k) *Chatter Singh v Tej Singh* (1920) 43 All 101 59 I C 671 dissent from in *Shauk Sayad v S I i Jia* (19 3) A P 7, 72 I C 637 ( ) A P 448 but followed in *Malayaj v Pu na* (19 4) 47 Mad 4 6 77 I C 6 8 (24) A M 608

(l) *D aba dhu v Ma h d* (1912) 16 Cal L J 318 17 I C 283

(m) *Taje Iwar Dutk v Lakhna P ashad* (19 3) 2 1st 36 83 I C 90 (3) A 1 31

*Ja a Chand a v B hakt* (19 1) 34 Cal L J 30 68 I C 433 (1) A C 84

(n) *Kuber v Ramakar* (19 ) 47 All 3 7 86 I C 86 (25) A A 3 1

(o) *S i murtu v Lak h n ray na* (1924) 4 Mad 83 83 I C 31 (2) A M 30 P 2

(p) *J wahar Singh Saw Si gh* (1923) 1st 1 I J 497 91 I C 5 (24) A L 9

(q) *Ke Kosee v Sette* (1844) 3 M L A 32

( ) *G pulat v Aga si g* (1904) 28 Bom C 71 I C 9 5 (23) A L 08

(r) *M i i v G ga Pra ad* (1923) 45 Mad 72

(s) *Pa ul a v M allal* (19 3) 44 Mad L J 515 74 I C 309 (3) A M 30

by the Court into the question whether there was any other person fit and willing to act as guardian ad litem does not make the decree a nullity. The case is merely one of irregularity (u). The Deputy Registrar who has been appointed guardian of minor respondents in a High Court appeal may also be appointed to represent them in proceedings for obtaining leave to appeal to Privy Council but upon the final admission of the appeal he ceases to represent them (v). The High Court cannot provide for the costs of a guardian ad litem in an appeal to Privy Council (r). As to irregularities in the appointment of a Court guardian see notes under rule 3 above.

5 [Ss 441, 441] (1) Every application to the Court on behalf of a minor, other than an application under rule 10, sub rule (2), shall be made by his next friend or by his guardian for the suit.

Representation of minor  
by next friend or guardian  
for the suit

(2) Every order made in a suit or on any application, before the Court in or by which a minor is in any way concerned or affected, without such minor being represented by a next friend or guardian for the suit, as the case may be may be discharged, and, where the pleader of the party at whose instance such order was obtained knew, or might reasonably have known, the fact of such minority, with costs to be paid by such pleader.

6 [S 461] (1) A next friend or guardian for the suit shall not, without the leave of the Court, receive any money or other movable property on behalf of a minor either—

Receipt by next friend  
or guardian for the suit of  
property under decree for  
minor

- (a) by way of compromise before decree or order, or
- (b) under a decree or order in favour of the minor

(2) Where the next friend or guardian for the suit has not been appointed or declared by competent authority to be guardian of the property of the minor, or, having been so appointed or declared, is under any disability known to the Court to receive the money or other movable property, the Court shall, if it grants him leave to receive the property, require such security and give such directions as will in its opinion, sufficiently protect the property from waste and ensure its proper application.

**Joint Mitakshara family**—The Calcutta High Court had held that this rule did not apply when the next friend was the manager of a Mitakshara joint family of which the minor was a member and that qua manager he could receive money.

(u) *Hind v. Hind* (1909) 8 F.T.R. 281. (v) *Maharaja B. R. Kishor v. Al. Shum* (1907) 115 I.C. 240. (r) *115 I.C. 240*.

due on a decree in favour of himself and the minor (w) But this conflicts with the Privy Council ruling in *Ganesh Rao v Tuljaram* (x) that a manager of a joint family if he is a next friend or guardian is subject to the control of the Court and that he cannot do in his capacity of manager acts that he is debarred from doing as next friend or guardian without the leave of the Court Accordingly when payment under a decree in favour of a minor and of the manager of a joint Hindu family was certified to the Court by the manager alone who was the next friend of the minor the Court refused to record it as the leave of the Court had not been obtained and for the same reason the Court refused to recognize the payment as a valid discharge and granted an execution application for the recovery of the whole amount (y)

**Security for protection of minor's property**—A bond passed by a surety under sub r (2) cannot be enforced by summary process under s 145 ( )

**7 [S 462]** (1) No next friend or guardian for the suit shall, without the leave of the Court, expressly recorded in the proceedings, enter into any agreement or compromise on behalf of a minor with reference to the suit in which he acts as next friend or guardian

(2) Any such agreement or compromise entered into without the leave of the Court so recorded shall be voidable against all parties other than the minor

**Alterations in the rule**—The words expressly recorded in the proceedings in sub r (1) and the words so recorded in sub r (2) are new They give effect to the practice established under the old section. See notes below Compromise decrees when binding on a minor

**Scope of the rule**—This rule contemplates the following steps to be taken in order before a compromise decree is passed in a suit to which a minor is a party namely (1) an application by the next friend or guardian ad litem for leave to compromise the suit (2) the granting of leave by the Court if the Court thinks the case is a fit one for leave and (3) the consent of the next friend or guardian ad litem to the proposed compromise after the Court has granted the leave (a) If the leave is granted and the next friend or guardian ad litem assents to the compromise the parties may apply to the Court under O 23 r 3 for a consent decree in terms of the compromise and if the compromise is lawful it is the duty of the Court under that rule to pass the decree applied for If the next friend of a minor plaintiff agrees to compromise a suit on behalf of the minor subject to the leave of the Court and then withdraws from the compromise before the leave of the Court is applied for the Court will not enforce the compromise at the instance of the defendant even though the terms of the compromise might appear beneficial to the minor The reason is that such compromise is not binding unless it is sanctioned by the Court (b) The Court cannot force a compromise upon a minor against the opinion of the guardian ad litem or next friend (c) But if the guardian or next friend is acting improperly in refusing to consent to a beneficial arrangement the Court may take steps to remove him and substitute some other person (c)

- (w) *Harjari Pershad v Mathur Lal* (1908) 35 C 1 61  
(x) (1913) 40 I A 13 38 Mad 295 19 I C 51  
(y) *Pit Jakkut Jay Doran avaru* (19 5) 47 Mad L J 498 8 I C 88 ( 5) A M 30  
(z) *K rugod ppa v Soogamma* (1918) 41 Mad 40 39 I C 9 8

- (a) *Aman Singh v Varan* (1899) 20 All 98  
(b) *R nga v R jagopala* (1899) 2 Mad 3 9  
*G Job Des v S A Jit Co* (19 5) 47 All 8 88 I C 2 9 ( 2 ) A 4 370  
(c) *Hem g ni v Bhagut* (19 3) 7 C W 79 7 I C 68 ( 3 ) A C 685

**Compromise decree when binding on minor**—The provision contained in this rule making it necessary to obtain the leave of the Court is of great importance for the protection of minor's interests (d) and it has been extended to a compromise by a natural guardian who has put herself in the place of a guardian ad litem by applying to the Court to sanction a compromise (e). To render a decree passed in pursuance of a compromise binding on a minor the following conditions must be complied with—

- (a) The next friend or guardian ad litem must apply to the Court for leave to enter into the proposed compromise (f) stating specifically that the compromise is sought to be made on behalf of the minor (g) and also setting forth the terms of the proposed compromise (h)
- (b) On such an application being made to the Court the Court must exercise a judicial discretion as to the propriety in the interests of the minor of the proposed compromise (i) It is not possible to lay down any hard and fast rule as to what materials a Judge may call for before he is satisfied with the compromise and that is a matter which must be left to his discretion (j) And if the Court sees reason to grant leave it should record an order showing that an application has been made to it that the terms of the proposed agreement or compromise have been considered by it and that having regard to the interests of the minor it has granted leave to make the agreement or compromise (k) It is not sufficient that the terms of a compromise are before the Court There ought to be evidence that the attention of the Court was directly called to the fact that a minor was a party to the compromise and it ought to be shown by an order on petition or in some way not open to doubt that the leave of the Court was obtained (l) A compromise will be deemed to be beneficial to the interests of a minor if it secures to the minor some demonstrable advantage or averts some obvious mischief (m) A certificate of counsel for the minor that the compromise is for his benefit is according to ordinary practice sufficient (n)

In Bombay it has been held that in sanctioning a compromise as for the benefit of a minor the Court should have before it an affidavit by the next friend or guardian of the minor to that effect and in heavy cases there should be an opinion of counsel or else a statement by counsel at the bar that in his opinion the compromise is for the benefit of the minor. It has also been held that the Court is not bound to pass a decree in the exact form of the terms of the compromise agreed to by the parties and that it may make such alterations as it deems expedient (c)

- (c) The leave must be *express* not implied. It must in the language of this rule be *expressly recorded* in the proceedings. From the mere fact that the Court has passed a decree in accordance with a compromise it cannot be inferred that any of the steps preliminary and necessary to the making of the decree have been taken by the Court. The Court by passing a decree in

- (d) Subram n n v Pay I Jeau va (1916) 39  
M d 115 1 7 3 1 C 2 8 [1 C]
- (e) G mallaoppa v Mallaoppa (19 0) 44 Bom  
574 5 1 C 41
- (f) Kala i v Cheddal (180 ) 17 AH 531
- (g) Ma oh r Lal v Jad aih Singh (1906) 3  
All 585 33 I A 1 2
- (A) I rup kallaoppa v Sh dappa (190\*) -6 Bom  
109
- (i) Kalavati v Cheddal (189 ) 17 AH 31
- (j) Dha ryas gh v Au i (19 3) 9 Bom  
I 11 35\* 94 I C 104 (-6) A.B 291
- (K) Ma ohar I v Jad rā S gh (1906) 3  
All 585 33 I A 1 3 Au i v Cheddal
- (189 ) 17 AH 531 G r das m v  
Al giruama (1906) 9 Mad 104 Bhura  
v Deetā a d (1911) 35 Bom 3 10 I C  
909 Sāh ram v Iasa t (1911) 34  
Mad 314 12 I C 409 Hadri Prasad v  
Copai (1919) 41 All 3 10 I C 75
- (i) 28 All 10 589 33 I A 1 3 131 ruppa  
Jahan Chandra v Idrat n (19-3) 1st  
638 7\* I C 1019 (-3) A.I 184
- (m) Dharm ju v G rras (1873) 10 B 11 C 311
- (n) Satyabai v Shur nabi (19 0) 47 I A 84  
\*\* Bom L R 5 53 I C 943
- (o) Cha dadi v Jagandas (19-9) 31 Bom  
L I 6 1 (-9) A B 3-0

pursuance of a compromise does not *ipso facto* sanction the compromise (p) The provisions of this rule are complied with if the leave of the Court is expressly recorded it is not necessary that the order granting leave should state that the Court had considered the terms of the compromise and regarded them to be beneficial to the minor (q)

But the non observance of the above conditions does not render the compromise decree void or affect the jurisdiction of the Court to record it (r) The decree is only voidable and that too at the option of the minor No other party to the suit can call the decree in question the minor alone is entitled to call it in question and this he may do either on attaining majority or before then through a next friend (s)

Procedure to set aside compromise decree—A compromise decree may be set aside either in a regular suit or upon an application for review to the Court that passed the decree (t) But it cannot be called in question by way of objection to any proceeding taken in execution of it (u)

It was doubtful whether under the Code of 1859 a compromise decree can be set aside by an appeal from the decree Where an appeal was preferred from a compromise decree on the ground that the lower Court did not consider the question as to whether the compromise was a proper one in the interests of the minor the High Court of Allahabad entertained the appeal (v) in a similar case the High Court of Calcutta refused to entertain the appeal (w) Under the present Code no appeal lies from a consent decree [s 96 sub-s (3)]

Compromise under misapprehension of a material fact—Where a compromise is entered into under a misapprehension of a material fact it will be set aside even though it may have been sanctioned by the Court under this rule (x) See Indian Contract Act 1872 s 20 Something in the nature of fraud must be shown before a compromise sanctioned by the Court is set aside (y)

Minor attaining majority pending suit—If the minor attains majority while the suit is still pending a compromise entered into by his guardian is not binding on him even though it has been sanctioned by the Court (z)

Compromise of execution proceedings—Execution proceedings are a continuation of the suit and a next friend or guardian cannot after decree enter into a compromise or an adjustment of the decree without the sanction of the Court (a) See O 21 r 2 And this is so even though the guardian ad litem had power as natural guardian to sell the minor's property (b) But the rule is confined to an agreement or compromise in the course of the suit A transfer by a guardian ad litem of a decree

- (p) *M. of ar Lal v. Jadun th Singh* (1906) 3 All 395 I A 18 *Parish S. n. l. v. Bhaduta Singh* (1913) 35 All 49 40 I A 18 1 I C 89 *rup l. appa v. Shidappa* (190) 6 Bom 103 *I. al. atav Ch. d. ulat* (1895) 17 All 531 *Arunachalam v. Mejj pp.* (1899) 21 M d 91 *Sha. t. Ch. d. r. v. K. r. i. Ch. i. der* (1883) 9 Cal 810 *Pam. G. l. m. v. D. rya P. h. d.* (191) 6 Pat L J 190 60 I C 950 (1) A P 14
- (q) *Janki v. N. i. shal* (191) Punj Rec no 36 p 146 39 I C 3
- (r) *P. m. Gulam v. S. m. S. h. az* (190) 5 P t L J 379 6 I C 34
- (s) *I. i. pak. i. pp. v. Sh. d. app* (190) 6 Bom 103 *J. u. l. v. gh. v. Mans. gh.* (191) 2 Lah 164 6 I C 94 ( ) A L 166 *Ishan Ch. n. d. v. N. i. ar* (193) 2 P t 539 I C 1043 ( ) A P 194 *Ph. l. ca. t. i. Kunu. v. Ja. e. h. w. ara* (1904) 48 All 57 83 I C 8 ( ) A A 6 *Tarubal v. Sou. e. dra* (19 ) 9 C W 597 88 I C 369 (25) A C 866
- (t) *Murali v. Rehmoobhoy* (1891) 15 Bom 594

- Su. e. dra. v. Hema. g. n. i.* (190) 34 Cal 63
- (u) *J. r. unachall. m. v. Sh. i. r. unagappa* (1889) 10 Mad 503 *Perupakshappa v. Shidappa* (1899) 3 Bom 60
- (v) *K. i. arat. v. Ch. d. ulat* (189 ) 17 All 531
- (w) *Pakhal v. Ad. rya* (1903) 30 Cal 613
- (x) *B. i. e. Solomon v. Ab. d. ool. A. r. r.* (1881) 6 Cal 68 *Shanda S. gh. v. Lachn* (190) 1 Lah 344 56 I C 88
- (y) *Bha. n. das v. Krishna. ba* (1906) 50 Bom 716 99 I C 307 ( ) A B 11
- (z) *Sa. v. i. v. K. e. r. r. v. N. andu* (1908) 51 Mad 63 ( ) 8 A. M. 294
- (a) *Perupakshappa v. Shidappa* (190) 26 Bom 103 *A. ru. achalam v. R. manan. dan. an* (1906) 29 M d 309 *D. r. u. d. v. Paramasami* (1916) 31 Mad L J 97 3 I C 70 followed in *Kanaka. rya v. M. ulp. ru.* (1921) 41 Mad L J 5 64 I C 85 (21) A M 587 and *Kanaka. rya v. Venkata. amayya* (19 ) 49 Mad L J 443 90 I C 1049 (2 ) A M 187
- (b) *G. mailappa v. Malappa* (190) 44 Bom 4 5 I C 417



in favour of a minor made not with reference to the suit or execution proceeding does not require the sanction of the Court (c)

Agreement to be bound by oath under Indian Oaths Act 1873 s 9 not within this rule—An agreement by the next friend (d) or guardian (e) of a minor that an issue in the suit should be determined by the oath of the defendant does not come within the purview of this rule and the sanction of the Court is not necessary. In such a case the minor is bound by the agreement provided there is no fraud or gross negligence on the part of the next friend.

Abandonment of issue does not amount to a compromise—A next friend or guardian ad litem may abandon an issue in the course of the trial of the suit and the sanction of the Court is not requisite for that purpose for the abandonment of an issue does not amount to a compromise within the meaning of this rule. The abandonment is binding on the minor provided there is no fraud or gross negligence on the part of the next friend or guardian ad litem (f).

Agreement to refer to arbitration—It has been held by the High Courts of Madras (g) and Bombay (h) and by the Chief Court of the Punjab (i) that an agreement by a next friend or guardian ad litem to refer any matter in controversy in a suit to arbitration is an agreement within the meaning of this rule and that the sanction of the Court is therefore necessary. According to the Allahabad High Court such an agreement is not within this rule and the sanction of the Court is not necessary (j). See schedule II r 1.

The decisions cited above relate to cases where the agreement to refer was made during the pendency of a suit. But cases also occur in which no suit is pending and an agreement to refer is made to which a minor is a party by his guardian. In such cases the application of the rule depends upon whether—

(1) that there should be a pending suit as indicated by the words *no next friend or guardian for the suit* and

(2) that there should be an agreement to refer.

If either of these conditions is wanting the present rule does not apply and no leave of the Court is necessary. *A* and *B* carry on business in partnership. *A* dies leaving a minor son and a widow. Disputes arise between the parties as to accounts and an agreement is made between the minor through his mother and *B* to refer the disputes to arbitration. The arbitrators make their award and the minor by his mother applies to file the award under para 20 of Sch II. The application is registered as a suit between the minor applicant as plaintiff and *B* as defendant [see the 2nd clause of para 20]. Notice is then given as required by the 3rd clause of para 20 to *B* and no objection to the award having been made by *B* the award is filed and a decree passed in terms of the award as provided by para 21 of Sch II. Does the agreement to refer require the sanction of the Court under this rule? No because it was not made during the pendency of a suit and the first of the two conditions mentioned above is wanting (k). Does the decree on the award require the sanction of the Court? No because the application to file the award being made by the minor as plaintiff it cannot be said

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| (c) <i>G da jul v Ra ga Rao</i> (1911) 40 M d L J 124 6 I C 2 (11) A M 113                                       | Mad 36 I J 54 v <i>Isakatarubba</i> (1916) 29 Ma 1 8 3 3 I C 881                                    |
| (d) <i>Cheng i v Isak to</i> (1889) 1 M d 443  | (A) <i>Am a v Bh la</i> (1913) 15 Pom L R 403   |
| <i>Shro Nath v S RA Lai</i> (1900) 1 M 9   | 19 I C 44   |
| (e) <i>Deor j v Adh iraj</i> (1917) 44 All 84  | ( ) <i>G ne fa v Jf leha d</i> (1911) Punj R C 109 p 330 15 I C 161 12 B J 11                       |
| (f) <i>Fe 2 i v Bha h 2 i</i> (1899) 3 Ma 1 535 See also <i>W m ao v Coll et r f</i>                             | <i>h m d Ibrahim v Allah Bakh A</i> (1919) 1 n J Rec no 145 p 31 5 I C 3                            |
| <i>Dh rca</i> (1893) 12 Bom 222 and <i>L A m ac v Darh gha M ucpul</i> (1891) 18 Cal 99 17 I A 90 [as to w i et] | (j) <i>Ha d v C i SA A</i> (1916) 4 All 3 <i>L i wan v Lachya</i> (1914) 36 All 69 1 I C 949 IF B I |
| (g) <i>Lak hm sa v Ch th mb</i> (1901) 1   | (k) <i>I sholt Dart et m</i> (1907) 6 Bom 12  |

that there was an *agreement* on behalf of the minor not to object to the award and to allow a decree to be passed on the award in this case the second of the two conditions mentioned above is wanting (l) Again if the application to file the award was made by B in which case the application would be registered as a suit between B as plaintiff and the minor as *defendant* would the decree on the award require the sanction of the Court? Ye if the minor's guardian *agreed* not to object to the award and to allow a decree to be passed on the award in this case both the conditions mentioned above are present namely that there is an *agreement* on behalf of the minor and the agreement is made in the course of a *suit* started by the application to file the award (m)

**Withdrawal of suit by next friend**—If the next friend of a minor plaintiff withdraws from the suit and such withdrawal is in pursuance of an *agreement* or *compromise* entered into with the defendant the withdrawal must be with the sanction of the Court under this rule if the sanction of the Court is not obtained the order of withdrawal may be set aside at the instance of the minor (n) If an appeal is withdrawn on terms and there are parties concerned who are not *suus juris* the leave of the Court must be obtained (o) But if the withdrawal is not in pursuance of an *agreement* or *compromise* entered into with the defendant the sanction of the Court is not necessary and the withdrawal is binding on the minor plaintiff provided there is no fraud or gross negligence on the part of the next friend (p)

**Where the minor is a member of a joint Hindu family**—In a suit brought by some of the members of a joint Hindu family one of whom was a minor a compromise decree was passed after the compromise had been sanctioned by the Court The minor had no separate interest the adult members of the family had taken part in the compromise and assented to it and the Court declared that it was for the benefit of the minor In a suit brought on behalf of the minor to set aside the compromise decree on the ground that the proper materials which were essential to make the compromise and decree binding upon him were not placed before the Court previous to obtaining its sanction it was held that the decree was under the circumstances binding on the minor (q)

**When the father of a minor a member of a joint Hindu family of which the father is the managing member is appointed his guardian ad litem** his powers as managing member so far as they relate to the minor's interest are controlled by the provisions of the present rule and he cannot without the leave of the Court enter into any agreement or compromise on behalf of the minor with reference to the suit Such an agreement is not binding on the minor even if it was a *bona fide* settlement of a disputed claim (r)

**Minor in charge of Court of Wards**—The sanction of the Civil Court required by this rule is not necessary having regard to the provisions of ss 18 and 21 of the Court of Ward Act (Beng Act 9 of 1879) to validate a compromise entered into under the authority and by the direction of the Court of Wards on behalf of a minor under its charge (s)

**Joint bond by a minor and an adult**—In a compromise of a suit two defendants of whom one is a minor enter into a bond by which they jointly agree to pay a certain sum of money to the plaintiff at a future date The leave of the Court is not obtained on behalf of the minor as required by this rule The bond is not enforceable against the minor but it is enforceable to the full amount against the adult promisor (t)

(l) *H. B. n. m. v. S. P. J.* (1919) 43 B. m. 48 49 I. C. 233 [F. R.]

(m) *Mal. v. v. f. n. b. i.* (190) 1 Int. l. Judg. me t (Bomb. y) 609

(n) *K. r. i. v. R. h. i. y.* (1899) 13 B. m. 13 D. r. a. n. a. v. T. i. g. s. u. (1904) 7 M. d. 377

(o) *S. a. l. a. b. v. D. h. i.* (190) 4 I. A. 88 R. o. n. L. R. I. C. 943

(p) *R. a. m. S. r. i. p. v. S. i. h. L. t. a. f. a. t.* (190) 9 Cal

30 *R. a. j. a. d. v. G. h. u. l. l. a.* (1919) Punj. E. c. no. 9 p. 143 47 I. C. 503

(q) *I. a. n. s. u. a. v. I. r. a. d. v. P. a. m. B. a. h. a. d. u. S. n. g. h.* (1907) 34 Cal. 70

(r) *G. h. i. v. v. T. u. l. y. r. m. F. o. w.* (1913) 35 M. d. 29 49 I. A. 13 19 I. C. 515

(s) *V. a. l. i. v. v. I. e. n. b. a.* (1917) 44 Cal. 8 9 37 I. C. 91

(t) *J. a. m. a. B. a. v. F. a. n. t. R. a. o.* (1916) 43 I. A. 92 39 M. d. 409 34 I. C. 13

8 [ S 447 ] (1) Unless otherwise ordered by the Court, Retirement of next friend a next friend shall not retire without first procuring a fit person to be put in his place and giving security for the costs already incurred

(2) The application for the appointment of a new next friend shall be supported by an affidavit showing the fitness of the person proposed, and also that he has no interest adverse to that of the minor

Retirement of next friend—A suit is brought by A and B both minors by their mother as their next friend. The mother is also appointed guardian of the person and property of the minors under the Guardian and Wards Act 1890. Subsequently on the application of the mother A who has then attained majority is appointed guardian of the person and property of B in her place. This is not tantamount to A being appointed next friend of B for the suit. The mother therefore cannot retire without first procuring a fit person to be put in her place and giving security for the costs already incurred (u)

9 [ S 446 ] (1) Where the interest of the next friend of a minor is adverse to that of the minor or where he is so connected with a defendant whose interest is adverse to that of the minor as to make it unlikely that the minor's interest will be properly protected by him, or where he does not do his duty, or, during the pendency of the suit, ceases to reside within British India, or for any other sufficient cause, application may be made on behalf of the minor or by a defendant for his removal, and the Court if satisfied of the sufficiency of the cause assigned, may order the next friend to be removed accordingly, and make such other order as to costs as it thinks fit

(2) Where the next friend is not a guardian appointed or declared by an authority competent in this behalf, and an application is made by a guardian so appointed or declared, who desires to be himself appointed in the place of the next friend, the Court shall remove the next friend unless it considers, for reasons to be recorded by it, that the guardian ought not to be appointed the next friend of the minor, and shall thereupon appoint the applicant to be next friend in his place upon such terms as to the costs already incurred in the suit as it thinks fit

Alterations in the rule—The words and make such other order as to costs as it thinks fit in sub-r (1) are new The words and shall thereupon appoint etc at the end of sub-r (2) are also new

Where the next friend does not do his duty—Where a Court finds that a next friend does not do his duty in relation to a suit it is its duty not to permit him to prejudice the interests of the minor but to adjourn the suit in order that some one interested in the minor may apply on behalf of the minor for the removal of the next friend and for the appointment of a new next friend or that the minor plaintiff himself may on coming of age elect to proceed with the suit or withdraw from it (1) So also if he is acting improperly in refusing to consent to a beneficial compromise (1c)

Appeal after expiry of limitation period—In a suit brought against a minor by his guardian a decree is passed against the minor The interest of the minor requires an appeal but certain events happen after the passing of the decree which render it to the interest of the guardian ad litem that the decree against the minor should stand and hence no appeal is preferred by him from the decree In such a case leave will be granted to the minor on his attaining majority to appeal from the decree though the period of limitation for the appeal may have expired (r)

Non appearance of next friend—When the next friend does not appear the suit should not be dismissed for default even though a reservation is made that such dismissal is without prejudice to the minor The proper course is to stay further proceedings pending the appointment of another next friend (y)

**10 [Ss 448 449]** (1) On the retirement removal or death of the next friend of a minor, further proceedings shall be stayed until the appointment of a next friend in his place

Stay of proceeding on removal etc of next friend

(2) Where the pleader of such minor omits, within a reasonable time, to take steps to get a new next friend appointed, any person interested in the minor or in the matter in issue may apply to the Court for the appointment of one, and the Court may appoint such person as it thinks fit

**11 [Ss 458 459]** (1) Where the guardian for the suit desires to retire or does not do his duty, or where other sufficient ground is made to appear, the Court may permit such guardian to retire or may remove him, and may make such order as to costs as it thinks fit

Retirement removal or death of guardian for the suit

(2) Where the guardian for the suit retires, dies or is removed by the Court during the pendency of the suit, the Court shall appoint a new guardian in his place

The words may permit such guardian to retire in sub-r (1) are new The guardian does not cease to be a guardian merely because he expresses a desire to retire.

(s) *Do ane m. v. Thu garum* (1904) 27 Mad 377 (x) *C. Pandas v. Ladi vahoo* (1896) 6 Bom 104  
(w) *Hem s. v. Bhagne ts* (1923) C W (y) *Kur i v. Cha hal* (1911) 6 Pat L J 317  
N 79 1 C 68 (3) A C 685 63 I C 716 (1) A P 103

Until he is removed by the Court he represents the minor (2) The High Court of Patna has held that it is not necessary to give notice under rule 3 (4) before appointing a new guardian under this rule (a)

12 [Ss 450, 453] (1) A minor plaintiff or a minor not a party to a suit on whose behalf, an application is pending shall, on attaining majority, elect whether he will proceed with the suit or application

Course to be followed by minor plaintiff or applicant on attaining majority

(2) Where he elects to proceed with the suit or application, he shall apply for an order discharging the next friend and for leave to proceed in his own name

(3) The title of the suit or application shall in such case be corrected so as to read thenceforth thus —

“ *A B*, late a minor, by *C D*, his next friend, but now having attained majority ”

(4) Where he elects to abandon the suit or application, he shall, if a sole plaintiff or sole applicant, apply for an order to dismiss the suit or application on repayment of the costs incurred by the defendant or opposite party or which may have been paid by his next friend

(5) Any application under this rule may be made ex parte but no order discharging a next friend and permitting a minor plaintiff to proceed in his own name shall be made without notice to the next friend

When title to be corrected—The provisions of this rule which require the title of a suit to be corrected apply to a pending suit and not to a suit in which a final decree has been passed and in which it only remains to proceed in execution (b)

13 [S 454] (1) Where a minor co plaintiff on attaining majority desires to repudiate the suit, he shall apply to have his name struck out as co plaintiff, and the Court, if it finds that he is not a necessary party, shall dismiss him from the suit on such terms as to costs or otherwise as it thinks fit

Where minor co plaintiff attaining majority desires to repudiate a suit

(2) Notice of the application shall be served on the next friend, on any co plaintiff and on the defendant

(a) *K. Purnanandam v. Narayana* (1906) 6 Mad 3 101 I C 339 (27) A M 534  
(b) *Padma Krishna v. Lakshmi* (1932) 11 C 341 (3) A 1

33  
(b) *Doory Mohun Das v. Talwar Ali* (1912) 2 Cal 20

(3) The costs of all parties of such application, and of all or any proceedings theretofore had in the suit shall be paid by such persons as the Court directs

(4) Where the applicant is a necessary party to the suit the Court may direct him to be made a defendant

Sub r (4) is new

**14 [S 455]** (1) A minor on attaining majority may, if a sole plaintiff, apply that a suit instituted in his name by a next friend be dismissed on the ground that it was unreasonable or improper

Unreasonable or improper suit

(2) Notice of the application shall be served on all the parties concerned, and the Court, upon being satisfied of such unreasonableness or impropriety, may grant the application and order the next friend to pay the cost of all parties in respect of the application and of anything done in the suit, or make such other order as it thinks fit

**15 [S 456]** The provisions contained in rules 1 to 14, so far as they are applicable, shall extend to persons adjudged to be of unsound mind and to persons who though not so adjudged are found by the Court on inquiry by reason of unsoundness of mind or mental infirmity to be incapable of protecting their interests when suing or being sued

Application of rules to persons of unsound mind

**Persons of unsound mind**—The present rule makes the provisions of rule 1 to 14 applicable to persons of unsound mind. The result is that where a person of unsound mind is a plaintiff a suit on his behalf must be brought by a next friend and where he is a defendant the suit must be defended by a guardian ad litem. Where a manager has been appointed of the property of a lunatic under the Lunacy Act no person other than such manager should act as the next friend of the lunatic in a suit in respect of the lunatic's property (c) See r 4 sub r (2) above

**Persons adjudged to be of unsound mind**—A person may be adjudged to be of unsound mind under the Lunacy Act 4 of 1912

**Persons of unsound mind not adjudged to be so**—The old section did not contain any provision as to persons of unsound mind not adjudged to be so. But it was held that the same procedure applied where a party to a suit was of unsound mind though not adjudged to be so. For the title of suits see App A pleadings, Title of Suits.

**Decree against a lunatic**—A decree passed against a lunatic not properly represented in the suit cannot be challenged in execution proceedings. The reason is that a lunatic not properly represented is not a party to the suit within the meaning of s 47 above (d)

**Revision.**—When an application for an inquiry as to whether a party is of unsound mind was dismissed without an inquiry the order was set aside in revision (e). Where during the pendency of a suit in the Court of a Subordinate Judge the defendant's pleader informed the Court that lunacy proceedings were pending in the Court of the District Judge with reference to the mental condition of the defendant and he applied for a stay of the suit until the determination of the question by the District Judge and the application was refused it was held that although no revision lay the case was a fit one for the exercise of the inherent powers of the Court and a stay was granted (f)

**16 [S 464]** Nothing in this Order shall apply to a Sovereign Prince or Ruling Chief suing or being sued in the name of his State or being sued by direction of the Governor

*Saving for Princes and Chiefs*

General in Council or a Local Government in the name of an agent or in any other name, or shall be construed to affect or in any way derogate from the provisions of any local law for the time being in force relating to suits by or against minors or by or against lunatics or other persons of unsound mind

A ruling chief sued in his personal capacity if not domiciled in British India is not subject to the Majority Act. If he has attained majority according to his personal law no guardian ad litem need be appointed (g)

## ORDER XXXIII

### *Suits by Paupers*

**1 [S 401]** Subject to the following provisions, any suit may be instituted by a pauper

*Suit may be instituted in forma pauperis*

**Explanation**—A person is a "pauper" when he is not possessed of sufficient means to enable him to pay the fee prescribed by law for the plaint in such suit, or, where no such fee is prescribed, when he is not entitled to property worth one hundred rupees other than his necessary wearing apparel and the subject matter of the suit

**Scope and object of the order**—A plaintiff suing in a civil Court must pay the Court fee prescribed by law for the plaint and subsequent proceedings in the suit. These fees are prescribed by the Court Fees Act VII of 1870. But a person may be too poor to pay the Court fee and the object of this Order is to enable such person to bring and prosecute suits without payment of Court fees (h). There are however certain fees from which even a pauper is not exempted namely fees for service of process, and such fees must be paid by him (r 8). If the pauper succeeds in the suit the Government have a first charge on the subject matter of the suit for the amount of the Court fee which would have been paid by him if he had not been permitted to sue as a pauper

(e) *Chaturbh v Harma d* (1909) 6 All 335  
104 J ( 141 (1908) A A 104

(f) *Hemad Lal v Chaturbh f* (1906) 48 All  
3,693 I C 8 ( 6) A B 21

(g) *Rameshchand v Maharaja Barendra* (1903)  
9 C W N 247 80 I C 100 ( ) A C 513

(h) *Jot dro v Dwarka* (1923) 20 Cal 111 115

(r 10) If the pauper fails in the suit the Court should order him to pay the Court fees due by him (r 11) An order directing a pauper plaintiff to pay the defendant in cash the costs occasioned by an amendment of the plaint and dismissing the suit in default of such payment was held to be wholly improper (v) But the Pangoon High Court has held that a pauper may be ordered to pay costs as a condition of an adjournment (j)

Is not possessed of —These words refer to property over which the petitioner has actual control They do not apply to a dowry debt due by the petitioner's husband (k)

Subject matter of the suit. —In determining whether a person claiming to sue as a pauper is worth Rs 100 neither the value of his necessary wearing apparel nor the value of the property claimed by him in the suit should be taken into consideration The ground for excluding the subject matter of the suit under this rule is that such property is presumably out of the pauper's reach and cannot be made use of by him to carry on his litigation (l)

A applies for leave to sue as a pauper for the recovery of certain ornaments worth Rs. 2000 from B Pending the investigation into pauperism B deposits in Court a portion of the ornaments claimed by A of the value of Rs. 100 as ornaments belonging to A The ornaments deposited in Court being entirely at A's disposal are no longer part of the subject-matter of the suit From the moment of the deposit A becomes entitled to property worth Rs. 100 and hence he is not entitled to sue as a pauper for the rest of the ornaments (m) Macleod J however expressed the opinion that A could not be said in such a case to be entitled to property worth Rs. 100 for otherwise every application for leave to sue as a pauper may be defeated by the respondent paying into Court Rs. 100 out of the amount claimed (n) and has recently given effect to this view in *Bai Dalagarr v Motilal* (o) the reason given being that the property does not cease to be the subject matter of the suit because of defendant's admission or payment

In a Madras case the petitioner had obtained a decree for maintenance and sought to appeal in forma pauperis for higher maintenance but the defendant paid Rs. 571 arrears of maintenance into Court to her credit and the petition was dismissed on the ground that she had sufficient means to pay the Court fee on the memorandum of appeal (p)

A who has mortgaged his property to B sues B for redemption A's equity of redemption is no part of the subject-matter of the suit Its value therefore should be taken into consideration in determining whether A is a pauper (q)

Sons sued as paupers to set aside an alienation of joint family property by the father but when it was found that there was a share of the property that had not been alienated they were not allowed to continue the suit as paupers (r)

Other than his necessary wearing apparel and the subject matter of the suit —These words do not qualify that part of the Explanation which requires that the person should not be possessed of sufficient means to enable him to pay the fee prescribed by law but only the conditions that the applicant is not entitled to property worth Rs. 100 (s) Ornaments which a woman ordinarily wears are of the same class as her wearing apparel (t)

- (i) *Ambay v Hanmantrai* (1911) 47 Bom 104
- (j) 69 I C 207 ( ) A B 385
- (k) *Lim F n Sun v E p Wan Ho E* (1918) 6 Rang 61 (23) A B 306
- (l) *Mab v Shikha S (karr)* (1917) 45 C 1 L J 68 100 I C 261 (27) A C 309
- (m) *M Hamad v A Shikha* (1885) 10 All 46
- (n) *Dwa Kanath v Madhavras* (1886) 10 Bom 07
- (o) *Fatmabay v Dossabai* (1910) 34 Bom 638
- (p) 5 I C 688

- (q) (1913) 47 Bom 537 I C 24 ( ) A B 47
- (r) *Maj Bahin v re* (1915) 50 Mad L J 114
- (s) 94 I C 33 ( ) A B 56
- (t) *Kapil Deo v Fam Rikha* (1911) 33 All 23
- (u) 8 I C 494
- (v) *Fa n Pr sad v Jagtama* (1911) 47 All 872
- (w) 83 I C 40 ( ) A B 54
- (x) *Krishnaiah v Manohar* (1906) 30 Bo 1 593
- (y) *Mahabai v Shikha Satta* (1911) 45 Cal L J 68 100 I C 61 ( ) A C 309





thereof, shall be annexed thereto, and it shall be signed and verified in the manner prescribed for the signing and verification of pleadings

**Procedure**—Rules 2 to 8 prescribe the procedure to be followed when a suit is proposed to be instituted in forma pauperis

**Death of applicant**—Where an application for leave to sue in forma pauperis has been made but the applicant dies pending the hearing of the application the application cannot be continued by the legal representative of the deceased applicant. The reason is that the right to apply for leave to sue as a pauper is a personal right and it does not survive to the representative of the deceased applicant. But the legal representative may present a fresh application for leave to sue in forma pauperis if he himself is a pauper (h)

**3 [S 404]** Notwithstanding anything contained in these rules, the application shall be presented to the Court by the applicant in person, unless he is exempted from appearing in Court, in which case the application may be presented by an authorized agent who can answer all material questions relating to the application, and who may be examined in the same manner as the party represented by him might have been examined had such party attended in person

**Presented to the Court**—Presentation need not be to the Court itself. Presentation to the proper officer of the Court is sufficient (i)

**Purda nashin woman**—A purda nashin woman exempted from appearing in Court under s 13, above may present the application for leave to sue as a pauper by a duly authorized agent (j)

**Pauper appeals**—The provisions of this rule apply also to applications for leave to appeal as a pauper. See O 44 r 1

**4 [S 406]** (1) Where the application is in proper form and duly presented, the Court may, if it thinks fit, examine the applicant, or his agent, when the applicant is allowed to appear by agent, regarding the merits of the claim and the property of the applicant

(2) Where the application is presented by an agent, the Court may, if it thinks fit order that the applicant be examined by a commission in the manner in which the examination of an absent witness may be taken

**Examination**—This Order contemplates examination of two kinds namely (1) the examination of the applicant which may as indicated in this rule be regarding (a)

(a) *Lal t Moh n v Satish Ch d a* (1906) 33 Cal 1163 *Ka eri v Jasur'a* (1908) 51 Mad 697 110 I C 318 (28) A M 28

(i) *Ch damba a v Fadar M h d en* (1911) 43 Mad 8 84 I L 963 (4) A M 901

(j) *Wazir un issa v Il l a Bulsh* (190 ) 4 All 17

the merits of the claim and (b) pauperism and (2) the examination of persons other than the applicant which should be confined to pauperism only as indicated by the provisions of rr 6 and 7 below. Persons other than the applicant cannot be examined on the merits of the applicant's claim (1)

5 [Ss 405, 407] The Court shall

Rejection of application reject an application for permission to sue as a pauper—

- (a) where it is not framed and presented in the manner prescribed by rules 2 and 3, or
- (b) where the applicant is not a pauper, or
- (c) where he has, within two months next before the presentation of the application, disposed of any property fraudulently or in order to be able to apply for permission to sue as a pauper, or
- (d) where his allegations do not show a cause of action, or
- (e) where he has entered into any agreement with reference to the subject-matter of the proposed suit under which any other person has obtained an interest in such subject-matter

Alteration in the rule—The expression cause of action in cl. (d) has been substituted for the words right to sue in such Court. See notes below under the head Clause (d) cause of action

Clause (a) application not framed as required by rule 2.—Failure to calculate the Court fee value in accordance with the provisions of the Court Fees Act and O 7 r 1 of the Code is a non-compliance with the provisions of Clause (a) of this rule and the application must be rejected (1)

Clause (c) fraudulent disposal of property—Thus if a person has property worth Rs 1000 and he disposes of it in August 1915 to enable himself to sue as a pauper and applies for leave to sue as a pauper in September 1915 the application should be rejected under this rule

Clause (d) cause of action—The corresponding clause of the old section ran thus That his allegations do not show a right to sue in such Court. It was contended that the words sue in such Court referred to the jurisdiction of the Court and not to the cause of action disclosed in the application. But this contention was rejected and it was held that the clause did not limit the Court to an inquiry whether the right to sue arose within the jurisdiction but that it had a more extended meaning and that the Court was to ascertain if the application showed a good subsisting cause of action capable of enforcement in Court and calling for an answer and not barred by the law of limitation or any other law (m). It was accordingly held that the application to sue as a pauper must be rejected if the right to sue was barred by the law of limitation (n).

(2) *Jendra v D rya* (1919) 46 C 1 61 & 1 C 610

(D) *M v P v Ma Shure* (1922) Rang 350 118 C 1 (2) A II 124

(m) *Chatterjee v Rajaraj* (1908) All 661 A m r k A v d r v a (1899) 20

All 99 1 *Jendra v Sudh dra* (1906)

19 Mad 19 *Amritham v Alwa* (1904)

\* M d 37 *D lara v Vallab s* (18 2)

13 Bom 1 &

(n) *Chatterjee v I ja Pam* (1908) All 661

*Ma Shure v M i Lai* (1919) Tuss

R c no 134 p 314 53 I C 411

or as *res judicata* (o) or if it did not disclose a good cause of action as where the application was for leave to sue on a contract which was void as being immoral and opposed to public policy (p). The expression cause of action has been substituted for the words right to sue in such Court to give effect to these decisions. The Court must as stated above consider the question of limitation to see if the applicant has a subsisting cause of action (q). But this does not mean that the Court should at this preliminary stage decide a question of limitation as to which there has been a considerable difference of judicial opinion (r).

Rule 4 provides that where the application is in proper form and duly presented the Court may examine the applicant regarding the merits of the claim and the property of the applicant. The expression the merits of the claim has reference to r 5 (d) which says that the Court shall reject the application if the allegations of the applicant do not show a cause of action. It has accordingly been held that it is the duty of the Court to consider not only the statements made in the plaint but also the statements made by the applicant in his examination in order to determine whether his allegations do or do not show a cause of action (s) and further to determine at the preliminary stage whether the plaintiff is or is not entitled to succeed on the basis of the alleged cause of action. In some cases it was contended that in order to determine whether there was a cause of action the allegations in the plaint were the sole matters to be looked to. As to this the Allahabad High Court (t) said. If the allegations in the plaint were the sole matters to be looked to and the applicant were admittedly a pauper the granting of this application to sue as a pauper would depend not on whether he had any merits to go upon but on the skill of the gentleman who drafted his petition and his plaint, and the examination as to the merits under sec 406 (r) would be superfluous.

In an Allahabad case it was held that the Court had no power under cl (d) of this rule to reject an application on the ground that the matter in dispute was *res judicata* (u). This decision it is submitted is erroneous for a cause of action means a valid and subsisting cause of action not barred by limitation or *res judicata*.

Insolvency is not one of the grounds on which an application can be rejected under this rule (v).

Clause (e) transfer of interest in subject matter of proposed suit.—The interest transferred may be either vested or contingent. Thus an agreement authorising a pleader to recover his fees out of the revenues of a village forming the subject matter of the proposed suit in the event of the applicant failing to pay the fees to the pleader is an agreement under which the pleader obtains a contingent interest in the subject matter of the suit. If such an agreement is proved the application for leave to sue in forma pauperis must be rejected (w).

Revision.—An order rejecting an application under this rule is not appealable (x) but it is open to revision in a proper case (y) though the Allahabad High Court has in a later case held that no revision lies (z).

- (o) *117 d a v S d h d r a* (1896) 19 Mad 19  
 (p) *Dul i v I a l l b d* (1883) 13 B m 1 6  
 (q) *Gow ndasam v The Municipal Council*  
 (1918) 41 M 6 0 0 4 I C 45  
 (r) *Gowindasam Pillay v Muncipal Council*  
*Kumbakonam* (1918) 41 M 6 0 0  
 (s) *Cl t t a r p a l v R i j a H m* (198 ) 7 All 661  
*Kam akh Nath v S n d a Nath* (1898)  
 0 All 293 *D l a i v I a l l a b a d* (1889)  
 13 Bom 1 6 *Nawab Bahad v H r i d*  
*C l a d r* (1911) 13 C 1 L J 593 11 I C  
 52 *Jog d a v D r y a* (1918) 46 Cal  
 6 1 6 I C 610 *commenting on Debo*  
*Das v Ram C a r n* (1888) 2 C W N  
 4 4 *Gopal v B g o o* (1903) 8 C W N 0  
 (t) *Kam akh Nath v S n d a Nath* (1898) 0  
 All 299

- (u) *L ch m v R B h a d r* (19 5) 23 All  
 I J 200 88 I C 81 ( 5) A A 5  
 (v) *C l d m b r a m v A H e r* (19 5) 48 Ind. L  
 J 491 87 I C 0 (25) A M. J L  
 (w) *Manol ar v L l e l m a n* (1845) 9 E m. 271  
 (x) *Secret ry of State v Julia* (1899) 71 All 122  
 (y) *M u h a m m d v A j u d i a* (185-) 10 All 67  
*D b o D a s v I n C h a r a* (1 8-) C W N  
 4 4 *Gopal v B g o o* (1903) 8 C W N  
 0 *P a A s d a v I a l l a b a d* (1887)  
 M d L J 330 101 I C I ( 2) A M.  
 441  
 (z) *Shanker B n v Ram D o* ( 25 4 All  
 493 94 I C 64 ( 1) A A 441 *Kuldeep*  
*v Secretary of State* ( 25 44 All 21  
 65 I C 2 5 ( 2) A A L

**Letters Patent appeal**—No appeal is allowed by the Code from an order made under this rule. But the Madras High Court has held that an appeal lies under cl. 15 of the Letters Patent from an order allowing or refusing to allow a plaintiff to sue as a pauper on the ground that such an order is a judgment and that it is neither interlocutory nor made in the exercise of discretion (a).

6 [ S 408 ] Where the Court sees no reason to reject the application on any of the grounds stated in rule 5, it shall fix a day (of which at least ten days' clear notice shall be given to the opposite party and the Government under) for receiving such evidence as the applicant may produce in proof of his pauperism, and for hearing any evidence which may be adduced in disproof thereof.

Notice of day for receiving evidence of applicants for permit

**Evidence**—See notes to r 4 above under the head Examination

Notice —As to form of notice see App H form no 12

7 [ S 409 ] (1) On the day so fixed or as soon there  
after as may be convenient, the Court shall  
examine the witnesses (if any) produced  
by either party, and may examine the applicant or his  
agent, and shall make a memorandum of the substance of  
the evidence.

### Procedure at hearing

(2) The Court shall also hear any argument which the parties may desire to offer on the question whether, on the face of the application and of the evidence (if any) taken by the Court as herein provided, the applicant is or is not subject to any of the prohibitions specified in rule 5

(3) The Court shall then either allow or refuse to allow the applicant to sue as a pauper

Sub rule (2) —The Court when issuing notice under r 6 for receiving evidence in proof of pauperism has presumably decided *ex parte* that none of the prohibitions in r 4 exists. But this does not preclude the Court from deciding whether the allegations of the applicant do or do not show a cause of action on the evidence of the applicant though it may be taken after the issue of the notice. This question however cannot be decided on the evidence of witnesses called to give evidence on the issue of pauperism, not even the evidence of the applicant's own witnesses. It has accordingly been held that the Court has no power to determine on the evidence of witnesses as distinguished from the evidence of the applicant himself that the applicant has no cause of action (b) or that his claim is barred by limitation (c). This rule enables the parties to argue the question if they so desire whether the application is or is not subject to any of the prohibitions

- (a) *Il ba v f ru hothama* (19 5) 44 31a 1 00  
85 I ( 01 ( 5) A 31 16 d 111 g  
4 p p m s ' m u d a (1903) 6 31 d  
43
- (b) *sa ru il li v 11 d ' s m d* (19 3) 45  
All 44 3 I C 534 ( "3) A 4
- ( ) *Jog ndra aray a v il ya kara* (1919)
- 46 (al 6 1 5 I C 610) *Shakti M Nam*  
*m I ' s aril v sa da 31 Nammed*  
*sa il rulla* (19 4) 5 'at 2 5 87  
8 1 (25) A 1 30 *M'a Shoppamb v*  
*M barak* (19"v) 7 Kang 361 ( ) A 3  
2 3

specified in r 5 above. It does not preclude the Court if no argument is offered from considering that question (d) O

**Review**—An order under this rule refusing leave to sue as a pauper is subject to review (e). The application for review is not liable to any Court fee (f).

**Propriety of order allowing applicant to sue in forma pauperis**—Where after due consideration of an application for leave to sue as a pauper the Court of first instance has allowed the suit to be instituted *in forma pauperis* and has passed a decree in favour of the plaintiff it is not open to the defendant in appeal from the decree to question the propriety of the order permitting the plaintiff to sue as a pauper. S 10 does not apply to such an order (g).

**Legal representative**—If the applicant dies before the application is granted and registered as a suit there is no suit pending and his legal representative cannot be brought on the record to continue the application (h).

**Limitation where application granted**—Where an application for leave to sue as a pauper is granted the date on which the application is filed will be deemed to be the date on which the pauper suit is instituted for all purposes of limitation and not the date on which the application is numbered and registered as a suit [Limitation Act 1908 s 4]. Therefore when the rate of Court fee was enhanced between the date of filing and the date of granting the application the Court fees were in the calculation of costs assessed at the former rate (i).

**Limitation where application refused**—Where an application for leave to sue as a pauper is refused and the applicant subsequently institutes a suit in respect of the same subject matter in the ordinary way (r 15) the suit will be deemed for the purposes of limitation to have been instituted on the date on which the plaint is presented and not the date on which the rejected application was filed. The reason is that upon an order of refusal under this rule the proceedings instituted under r 2 come to an end (j).

**Limitation where application is converted into a plaint on payment of court fees**—A person who has applied for leave to sue as a pauper may at any time before an order is made under this rule convert his application into a plaint by paying into Court the necessary Court fees. In such a case if the application was made *bona fide* the suit would be deemed to have been instituted for the purposes of limitation on the day on which the application was filed and not the day on which the Court fees were paid. But if it is found that the application was made in bad faith the suit would be deemed to have been instituted on the day on which the Court fees were paid and not on the day on which the application was filed (k).

### Illustrations

1. A applies for leave to sue as a pauper. On the day fixed for the hearing of the application A alleges that he has succeeded in negotiating a loan for the payment of the Court fees, pays the necessary Court fees into Court. The application is thereupon numbered and registered as a plaint. The application for leave to sue as a pauper having been made in good faith the suit will be deemed to have been instituted on the

- (d) *Amirth n v Alur* (1904) 27 Mad 3  
 (e) *Adarj v Maikj* (1880) 4 Bom 414  
 (f) *Uda v Naima* (1898) 20 All 410  
 (g) *Mumtaz v Rasula* (1901) 13 All 364  
 (h) *Sabbah v Hla* (1908) 51 Mad 69 110  
     *J C 318 (28) A M 8 Lall Mol n*  
     *v Sush Chadda D s* (1906) 33 Cal  
     1163  
 (i) *Kma v Mli* (1904) 49 Mad L J 38  
     91 I C 307 (6) A M 153

- (j) *N v Mla Li* (1891) 1 All 6  
     *Keesh v Frsh* (1896) 10 Bom  
     503 *Ashl ya v Butevuri* (1897) 14  
     Cal 883  
 (k) *Sturrt Sker v Ode* (1880) 2 All 41  
     *N n M k n Li* (1881) 17 All  
     56 *Ja Idary J Li* (1901) 9 Cal  
     47 *Sookind v D l Ch d* (1903) 1 Rang  
     194 *Li C 83 (3) A R 6 Contra*  
     *Abbas v Na Li* (1896) 13 All 66

day on which the application was filed and not on the day on which the Court fees were paid

2 On the last day of the period of limitation prescribed for the institution of a suit A applies for leave to sue as a pauper. The application is heard a fortnight later. It transpires at the hearing of the application that A was possessed of sufficient means to enable him to pay the Court fees. Before an order is made under this rule rejecting the application A pays the necessary Court fees into Court and the application is thereupon converted into a plaint. The application not having been made in good faith the suit will be deemed to have been instituted on the day on which the Court fees were paid and not on the day on which the application was filed. The Court fees having been paid after the expiration of the period of limitation the suit is time barred.

Limitation where plaintiff dispaupered—Where a plaintiff is dispaupered under r 9 and he pays the Court fees as provided by r 11 he is entitled to continue the suit and no question of limitation arises (i)

8 [S 410] Where the application is granted, it shall be numbered and registered, and shall be deemed the plaint in the suit, and the suit shall proceed in all other respects as a suit

Procedure if application admitted

instituted in the ordinary manner, except that the plaintiff shall not be liable to pay any Court fee (other than fees payable for service of process) in respect of any petition, appointment of a pleader or other proceeding connected with the suit

Limitation where application granted See notes to r 7 above

9 [S 414] The Court may, on the application of the defendant, or of the Government pleader, of which seven days' clear notice in writing has been given to the plaintiff, order the plaintiff to be dispaupered—

Dispaupering

- (a) if he is guilty of vexatious or improper conduct in the course of the suit,
- (b) if it appears that his means are such that he ought not to continue to sue as a pauper, or
- (c) if he has entered into any agreement with reference to the subject-matter of the suit under which any other person has obtained an interest in such subject-matter

Clause (a).—Non disclosure by the plaintiff of a life policy worth Rs. 225 in a suit where the Court fees were over Rs 500 was held not to justify his being dispaupered (m)

(i) *A v. M. K. L. (199) 17 All* | (m) *Shri K. S. v. Nallakumari* (1900) 22 Bom 201 O I C 964 (22) A B 1

**Clause (b)**—Receipt of interim maintenance during the suit is not a ground for dispaupering the plaintiff if it is not enough to enable her to save the amount required for Court fees (n) Nor can she be dispaupered because she is living with a rich relation and appearing by *amice* counsel (o)

**Limitation where plaintiff dispaupered**—See notes to r 7 under the same heading

**10 [S 411]** Where the plaintiff succeeds in the suit, the Court shall calculate the amount of Court fees which would have been paid by the plaintiff if he had not been permitted to sue as a pauper such amount shall be recoverable by the Government from any party ordered by the decree to pay the same, and shall be a first charge on the subject matter of the suit

Cost where pauper succeeds:

See rr 12 and 13

**Amount of Court fees shall be a first charge**—The charge is to be enforced by an application for the attachment and sale of the subject matter of the suit A separate suit for the sale of the subject matter to realise the Court fees is now barred see r 13 below and s 47 (p) The application for execution by the Government must be made within three years from the date of the decree in the pauper suit (q)

**Recovery of Court fees by Government from party ordered to pay the same**—If the plaintiff is directed to pay the Court fees the Government may realize the same by an application for execution against the person or property of the plaintiff and if the defendant is directed to pay the Court fees the Government may realise the same by an application for execution against the person or property of the defendant

**Mode of realization of Court fees by Government**—The plaintiff in a suit *in forma pauperis* obtains a decree against the defendant for possession of certain property It is declared by the decree that the amount of Court fees shall be a first charge on the property and that the same shall also be recoverable by the Government from the defendant In such a case if the defendant fails to pay the Court fees the Government may at its option realize the Court fees either by attachment and sale of the property which was the subject matter of the suit or it may realize the same by an application for execution against the person or property of the defendant (r) The former right is not lost merely because the property for the recovery of which the pauper suit was brought has passed from the hands of the judgment debtor into the hands of the pauper decree holder (s) The Government however have no *lien upon the decree* for the amount of the Court fees (t) hence if the amount of Court fees is not paid the Government are not entitled to sell the decree obtained by the plaintiff for the purpose of recovering such amount (u) In a case where a successful plaintiff's property was confined to a right to future maintenance a receiver was appointed to collect it and to pay the Government by instalments (v)

( ) *Srinol v Secretary of St te* (1933) 2 Pat 879 77 I C 611 ( 4 ) A 1 27

(o) (1 3) 2 Pat 89 77 I C 611 ( 4 ) A P 7 at pra

(p) *Pa D v Secretary of St te* (1836) 18 All 410 *Ba w v S et y of St te* (1919) 4 1st L J 166 61 I C 315

(q) *Appaya v collector of Vizag pat m* (188 ) 4 Ma 1 155

(r) *Pam Das v Secretary of St te* (1896) 18 All

**III**  
(s) *Babu v Secretary of St te* (1910) 4 Pat L J 188 50 I C 315

(t) *Pran Krato v Collector of Moodshedabad* (1871) 15 W R 20

(u) *Joti dro Nath v Dwarka Nath* (1893) 20 Cal 111

(v) *Secretary of St te v Be ka* (1906) 49 Mad 557 94 I C 4 ( 6 ) A M 56



r 10 **Effect of first charge.**—Since the amount of Court fees recoverable by Government is a first charge on the subject matter of the suit (w) it follows that a sale held in execution of such charge must prevail against a subsequent sale (x). For the same reason the defendant against whom the decree is passed cannot set off against the subject matter of the suit any sum that may be due to him under a cross-decree held by him against the plaintiff. A obtains a decree against B for Rs 1,000 in a suit brought by him against the plaintiff. A obtains a decree against B for Rs 1,000 in a suit brought by him against the plaintiff. A is directed by the decree to pay the Court fees but he fails to pay the same. Thereupon the Government apply to attach and sell the judgment debt of Rs 1,500 due to A from B. B claims to set off Rs 1,400 due to him under a decree held by him against A. B is not entitled to the set-off claimed by him for the Government has a first charge on Rs 1,500 that being the subject matter of the suit (y).

**Crown's prerogative of precedence in respect of Court fees.**—If the plaintiff succeeds in the suit and the amount payable under the decree by the defendant is paid into Court the Government is entitled to payment of the Court fees out of the fund in the Court on a mere application for payment without attaching the fund in the first instance. This is because the Crown is entitled to precedence in respect of a Crown debt over all other creditors of the pauper decree holder. A obtains a decree against B for specific performance and costs in a suit brought in *forma pauperis*. It is directed by the decree that B should pay the Court fees to Government and the Court fees are also declared to be a first charge on the property directed to be conveyed by B to A. B fails to pay A's costs. A thereupon applies for attachment and sale of certain property belonging to B for payment of his costs. The property is sold and the sale proceeds amounting to Rs 1,000 are paid into Court. Thereafter A's solicitor C applies to the Court for payment to him out of the Rs 1,000 of the costs incurred by him on behalf of A. At the same time a claim is made by the Government Solicitor for payment of the Court fees out of the Rs 1,000 in priority to C's claim. The Government are entitled to precedence in respect of the Court fees and C is entitled only to the balance left after payment of the Court fees (z).

It is to be observed that in the Calcutta case cited above C was a creditor of A inasmuch as he was entitled to be paid his costs by A. But he was merely an ordinary creditor as distinguished from a secured creditor. It is also to be observed that Court fees form a Crown debt and the Crown was to that extent a creditor of A. It has to be borne in mind that it is only when claims of the Crown and claims of ordinary creditors or common persons (to use an old expression) concur or come into competition that the Crown is preferred. The Crown has no more right than a common person to seize A's property and apply it in or towards discharge of a debt due from A. It was so observed by Lord Macnaghten in a case in which the Privy Council held that where a money decree is obtained by a pauper in a suit by him against B and B is directed by the decree to pay the Court fees the Government are not entitled to realize the Court fees by a sale of B's property previously mortgaged by him to C so as to defeat the right of C (a). All that could be sold by the Government in such a case is the equity of redemption of B in the property (b).

**Appeal.**—Questions arising between the Government and any party to the suit under this rule would be questions relating to the execution discharge and satisfaction of a decree within the meaning of s. 47. And it is provided by r. 13 below that they should be deemed to be questions arising between the parties to the suit.

- (w) See *C. P. D. Coll. ror of Ka ra* (18 8)  
 (x) *1 B m 7*  
 (y) *1 B m 7*  
 (z) *1 B m 7*  
 (a) *1 B m 7*  
 (b) *1 B m 7*

- 1 B m 7 Secretary of Stat v Bombay  
 1 B m 7 d Sh pp g Co (18 8) 5 B H  
 (a) *1 B m 7*  
 (b) *1 B m 7*

within the meaning of s 47. It follows that an order deciding any such question is appealable as a decree [see s 2 cl (-) and s 96] (c). Under the Code of 1882 it was held by the High Courts of Bombay and Madras that the Government not being a party to the suit such questions could not be said to be questions arising between the party to the suit within the meaning of s 244 [now s 47] and that orders determining such questions were not appealable as decrees (d). On the other hand the High Court of Allahabad held that such orders were appealable (e). Rule 13 (which is new) sets this conflict at rest by providing that though the Government is not a party to the suit the Government shall be deemed to be a party to the suit for the purposes of s 47.

Costs where pauper partly succeeds and partly fails—Rule 10 deals with the case of a pauper plaintiff who succeeds in the suit. Rule 11 deals with the case of a pauper plaintiff who fails in the suit. There is no separate provision for the case in which a pauper plaintiff has partly succeeded and partly failed. Presumably the Court is intended to deal with such a case by combining the provisions of the two rules. In such a case therefore the Court fees payable on the plaint should be apportioned between the plaintiff and the defendant. The Madras and Allahabad High Courts have held that it is illegal to lay upon the defendant in such a case a larger proportion of the Court fee leviable from the plaintiff than would have been payable by the plaintiff if the claim had been limited originally to that portion which was successful (f). But the Calcutta High Court considers that the Court has a discretion and is not bound by any hard and fast rule of apportionment (g). In a suit for Rs 3,000 the plaintiff got a decree for Rs 88 15-0 and was ordered to pay the defendant's costs amounting to Rs 151. The Court held that as plaintiff was precluded by O 21 r 19 from executing his decree the case fell under rule 11 (h). Again when a pauper appeal was allowed on a point that did not touch merits of the case the Court ordered the Court fees to be paid by the appellant and respondent in equal moieties (i).

**11** [S 412] Where the plaintiff fails in the suit or is dispaupered, or where the suit is withdrawn or dismissed.—

(a) because the summons for the defendant to appear and answer has not been served upon him in consequence of the failure of the plaintiff to pay the Court fees or postal charges (if any) chargeable for such service, or

(b) because the plaintiff does not appear when the suit is called on for hearing.

the Court shall order the plaintiff or any person added as a co plaintiff to the suit, to pay the Court-fees which would

(c) Secretary of State & Va Jan (190) 9  
B m 10

(d) C H et of P t g i v J r dan (188 )  
 8 Bom 590 coll t of Ka ruv m h d t  
 (1894) 18 Bom 454 C H eto f T u h  
 nopol f v d i t a m a k r i h a (1900) -3

(e) *Secretary of State v. Knight* 11 (1891) 13

(f) Ch. drar la v. Secretary of State (1890) 14  
Mad 163 Ga. v. Ga. (1916) 38 All  
469 3 1 C. 48 Secretary of State v.

Tr p u d (19 6) 20 Mad L J 40 96

I C 112 (-6) A M 4 4 Sr n u a v  
 J I h i (19 8) 54 M d L J 530 108  
 I C 1 (-78) A M 10

(g)  $Pol \vdash K \text{ mod } \vdash KMS \text{ n } K \text{ m } n$  (10 3) 55  
(a) 498 10 I C (s) 4 C 196

(K) *Clark p n v Government of India* (1911)

4 Md L J 191 691 C 43 ( ) A  
M 15  
(t) Bolam & v Pam (195) 48 Md L J  
273 871 C 57 ( ) A N 86

11 have been paid by the plaintiff if he had not been permitted to sue as a pauper

See rules 12 and 13

### Alterations in the rule

- 1 The word *withdrawn* has been newly added See notes below under the head *Withdrawn*.
- 2 Besides the liability to pay the Court fees the plaintiff was under the old section subject to a further penalty of fine or imprisonment if the Court found that the suit was frivolous or vexatious This provision has been omitted in the present rule

Scope of the rule —An order under this rule directing the pauper plaintiff to pay the Court fees can only be made in the following four cases —

- (1) where the plaintiff *fails* in the suit
- (2) where the plaintiff is *dispaupered* under r 9
- (3) where the suit is *withdrawn* or
- (4) where the suit is *dismissed under the circumstances specified* in cl (a) or cl (b)

If follows from what has been stated above that where an application to leave to sue *in forma pauperis* is returned under O 7 r 10 for want of jurisdiction to be presented to the proper Court no order can be made under this rule directing the applicant to pay the Court fees It cannot be said in such a case that the plaintiff has *failed* in the suit (j) The decision may also be put on the ground that the present rule does not apply until the application is granted and is numbered and registered under r 8 above But a dismissal of the suit at the request of the plaintiff and the defendant on the suit being settled out of Court amounts to a *failure* within the meaning of this rule (i)

*Withdrawn*. —This word has been newly added Under the old section there was a conflict of decisions as to whether the Court could order the plaintiff to pay the Court fees if the suit was *withdrawn* (i) The insertion of the word *withdrawn* makes it clear that the Court has the power under this rule to order the plaintiff to pay the Court fees if the suit is *withdrawn* whether the withdrawal is without the leave of the Court or with leave to bring a fresh suit under O 23 r 1

*Costs* —This rule does not preclude the Court from awarding a successful defendant his costs in a pauper suit The Court has full power under s. 35 to give and apportion costs in any manner it thinks fit Nothing in this rule limits or otherwise affects the power conferred upon the Court by s. 35 to give and apportion costs (m)

Omission to make an order for payment of Court fees —The Government has the right at any time to apply to the Court to make an order for the payment of the Court fees (r 12) If the order is refused the Government may by virtue of the provisions of r 13 (which is new) prefer an appeal from the order of refusal Under the Code of 1882 it was held that the Government not being a party to the suit had no right of appeal and it could therefore proceed only by an application for revision (n).

- Collector of Lat ager v Janard n (1884) 8 Bom 590
- Secretary of Stat v Na ya (1911) 3 Bom 414 1-1 & 29
- Collector of Stagesatam v Abd l Kharim (1904) 11 Mad 113 Secret ry of Stat v Naraya (1904) 9 Bom 10 Secret ry of Stat v Ali Garathadas (1904) 31 Bom 10 [Court fees ordered] Collector of

- A arav Krich ppa (1891) 15 Bom 464 (Chandaba v Kuvir (194) 15 Bom 464 [to it fees not ord red])
- Jatha v C lva (1886) 8 Bom 464
- Collector of Lat ager v J nard (1884) 8 Bom 590 (Chandaba v Kuvir (194) 15 Bom 464)

- 12 [New]** The Government shall have the right at any time to apply to the Court to make an order for the payment of Court fees under rule 10 or rule 11

Government may apply for payment of Court fees

This rule is new It enables the Government, in cases of error and omission with regard to Court-fees to have the error or omission rectified by a mere application to the Court. See r (13) below

- 13 [New]** All matters arising between the Government and any party to the suit under rule 10, rule 11 or rule 12 shall be deemed to be questions arising between the parties to the suit within the meaning of section 47

Government to be deemed a party

This rule is new See notes to r 10 under the head Appeal and notes to r 11 under the head Omission to make an order for payment of Court fees

- 14 [New]** Where an order is made under rule 10, rule 11 or rule 12, the Court shall forthwith cause a copy of the decree to be forwarded to the Collector

Copy of decree to be sent to Collector

- 15 [S 413]** An order refusing to allow the applicant to sue as a pauper shall be a bar to any subsequent application of the like nature by him in respect of the same right to sue, but the applicant shall be at liberty to institute a suit in the ordinary manner in respect of such right, provided that he first pays the costs (if any) incurred by the Government and by the opposite party in opposing his application for leave to sue as a pauper

Refusl to allow applicant to sue as pauper to bar subsequent application of like nature

Order refusing to allow applicant to sue as pauper—This rule provides that an order refusing to allow the applicant to sue as a pauper shall be a bar to any subsequent application of the like nature by him in respect of the same right to sue. The words "order refusing to allow the applicant to sue" have given rise to the question whether an order rejecting an application under r 5 above is an order refusing to allow the applicant to sue within the meaning of this rule or whether those words refer to an order made under r 7 where the words used are also "refuse to allow the applicant to sue as a pauper". It has been held in some cases that there is no distinction between an order of rejection made under r 5 and an order of refusal made under r 7. Rejection of an application under r 5 is a bar to a subsequent application for leave to sue (o). On the other hand it has been held that there is a distinction between orders made under r 5 and those made under r 7 and that the refusal of an application under r 5 is no bar to a subsequent application (p).

(o) *Ramlal v. Brijani* (1896) 20 Bom 85  
*Atul Chand v. R. J. Peary* (1913) 20  
 C W N 669 *Atul v. P. Rana* (1914)  
 40 Cal L H 188 84 L C 703 (4) A C  
 1032

(p) *Musammal Bai Kaur v. Shih Das* (1904)  
 1 Lah 151 54 I C 97 *Ma Sein v.*

*Ma Kya* (1926) 5 K L J 21  
 (26) A R 210 *Shamshad v.*  
*R. Nagve* (1907) 5 K L J 21  
 I C 96 (26) A R 210 *Shamshad v.*  
*Ma Shwe* (1907) 5 K L J 21  
 15 (29) A R 210

Dismissal of application for default or for want of prosecution.—It has been held in some cases that the dismissal of a pauper application for default (g) or dismissal owing to the applicant's failure to prosecute the application is a bar to a subsequent application (r) while in some that it is not (s)

Bar to subsequent application.—The bar to a subsequent application being a bar to the jurisdiction of the Court the Court is competent and bound to take notice of it at any stage of the suit (t)

Right to sue.—There is no substantial distinction between the words right to sue in this rule and the words cause of action in rule 5. It has accordingly been held that the dismissal of an application to sue in forma pauperis for maintenance for a particular period is no bar to a subsequent application for maintenance for a different period (u).

16 [S 415] The costs of an application for permission to sue as a pauper and of an inquiry into pauperism shall be costs in the suit

Costs

## ORDER XXXIV

### *Suits relating to Mortgages of Immovable Property*

1 [New Act 4 of 1882 s 85] Subject to the provisions of this Code, all persons having an interest either in the mortgage security or in the right of redemption shall be joined as parties to any suit relating to the mortgage

*Explanation*—A puisne mortgagee may sue for foreclosure or for sale without making the prior mortgagee a party to the suit, and a prior mortgagee need not be joined in a suit to redeem a subsequent mortgage

Suits relating to mortgages.—This Order is new. It is a re enactment with some alteration of sections 8, 90, 92, 94, 96, 97 and 100 of the Transfer of Property Act, 1882 relating to suits on mortgage. The Transfer of Property Act did not contain any provision for the passing of a final decree in cases where payment was made in accordance with the terms of the preliminary decree. This omission has now been remedied and provision has been made in rules 3, 5 and 8 for the passing of a final decree in such cases. The object of transferring the provisions relating to mortgage suits from the Transfer of Property Act to the Code is explained in the notes to r 3 below. Limitation for application for final decree

Transfer of Property Act, 1882 s 85.—This rule is a reproduction with some alterations of s 85 of the Transfer of Property Act which ran as follows

Subject to the provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure s 437 [now O 31 r 1] all persons having an interest in the property comprised in a mortgage must be joined as parties to any suit under this chapter relating to such mortgage provided that the plaintiff has notice of such interest.

(g) *Ranchod v Benza* J (1896) 20 Bom 86.  
(r) *Atul Chandra v Raja Jary* (1915) 20 C.W.N. 662  
(s) *Ma Gyan v Ma Kya* (1906) 4 Rang 415  
94 L.C. 6 (20) A.H. 00

(t) *Janchoo v Bha Ji* (1896) 20 Bom 88  
41s Afrid v Bha Ji (1901) 40 Cal L.J. 1  
24 L.C. 25 (24) A.C. 1037  
(u) *Pot v Maia Das v K. Mah. Aye* (1900) 21 Cal L.J. 241 27 L.C. 9

A comparison of the present rule with s 85 of the Transfer of Property Act will shew that the words in the mortgage security or in the right of redemption have been substituted for in the property comprised in the mortgage. An Explanation has been added and the proviso relating to notice is omitted. The explanation was added as it was generally thought that s 85 made it imperative on a puisne mortgagee to make a prior mortgagee a party to his action for foreclosure. The substitution of the words in the mortgage security or in the right of redemption have made it clear that an adverse claimant who is a stranger to the security or the equity of redemption need not be joined (1) see notes below. Persons having an interest either in the mortgage security or in the right of redemption

**Scope and object of the rule**—The object of this rule requiring all persons having an interest either in the mortgage security or in the right of redemption to be joined as parties is to avoid multiplicity of suits (w). The rule applies only to suits relating to a mortgage that is to say to suits for foreclosure sale and redemption as indicated by the marginal note to the rule. The rule therefore does not apply to suits by a mortgagee for a personal decree against the mortgagor (as to which see r 6 below).

**Persons having an interest either in the mortgage security or in the right of redemption**—The corresponding words in the Transfer of Property Act s 80 were persons having an interest in the property comprised in a mortgage. The words gave rise to a conflict of views. According to one view which coincides with the English law and the law as enunciated in the present rule those persons only should be joined as parties to a suit relating to a mortgage who were either interested in the mortgage security or in the right of redemption. A person who sets up a title paramount to that of the mortgagor and mortgagee should not be joined as a party to such suit for he is neither interested in the mortgage security nor in the right of redemption (x). Thus if A lets his property on a lease to B and B mortgages the leasehold to C A holding the property by title paramount should not be joined as a party defendant to a suit by C to enforce the mortgage (y). Similarly if A and B are co owners of certain property and B mortgages his undivided share to C A should not be joined as a party to a suit for sale by C as A has no interest in the right of redemption (z). According to the other view which prevailed in Allahabad all persons must be joined as parties if they had an interest in the property though they might have no interest either in the mortgage security or in the equity of redemption. The word property according to the Allahabad High Court means the actual immovable property mortgaged and not merely particular rights and interests in such property such as a bare right to redeem (a). The view held by the Allahabad High Court is no longer tenable. The present rule gives effect to the former view which as already stated is in accord ance with the English law.

But though the Allahabad High Court held that all persons interested in the mortgage property must be joined as parties to a suit on mortgage that Court agreed with the other High Courts in holding that a person who claimed adversely to the mortgagor and the mortgagee is not a necessary party to such suit. Thus if A mortgages certain property to B and B sues A for sale of the mortgaged property and C claims the property as his

- (r) Ghose on mortgage 4th ed p 97  
 (w) *Lala Su aj P or d v G lab Chand* (1901) 28 Cal 517 69 530 *Shaha aheb v Sad Ali* (1919) 43 Bom 575 578 511 C 3  
 (x) *Mukant Ba vya v Su ch Chandra* (1886) 1 Cal 414 414 121 A 171 *Jagg war Dutt v H ban M huen* (1906) 33 Cal 4 *Radha Anwar v Reol Singh* (1916) 43 J A 187 188 33 All 494 491 35 I C 939 *Jf ng S n v U Pon G jaw* (1914) 2 Rang 106 80 I C 753 (4)

- A R 210 *Yusufnathan v Ma Aye* (1906) 4 Rang 214 93 I C 11 (4) 4 R 208  
 (y) *J gyeear Dutt v Bhuban Mohan* (1906) 33 Cal 45 See also *Krishna Ayy v Muthukuma aricamiya* (1906) 29 Mad 217 4  
 (z) *Mou Moh a Ghose v Parvati Nath Ghose* (1905) 3 Cal 745 *Joyo Mohan Deb v Daudoo* (1905) 12 C W N 94  
 (a) *Mata Din v Kazim Husain* (1891) 13 All 44 [Mahmood J dissenting]



Official Assignee or Receiver of the assets of the mortgagor in insolvency (l) or by voluntary alienation as the transferee of the equity of redemption (m) should be made parties to a suit relating to a mortgage (n). In other words persons mentioned in s 91 of the Transfer of Property Act as persons entitled to redeem the mortgaged property should be joined as parties (o). If not joined as plaintiffs they should be joined as defendants (p). But a person not having any interest in the mortgage at the date of the suit need not be joined as a party (q).

If a mortgagee suing on his mortgage either for sale or foreclosure thinks fit to exempt from his suit some portion of the mortgaged property and to sell or to foreclose the mortgage in respect of the remainder there is nothing in law to prevent his doing so. If he exempts a portion of the mortgaged property from his suit he is not obliged to make parties to the suit persons interested in the portion so exempted (r). The same rule applies where a part of the property originally mortgaged has been absolutely released from the mortgage and has become excluded from the operation of the security (s). If the mortgagee by his laches loses his remedy against the owner of part of the equity of redemption and does not make him a party to the suit that part of the property is treated as released from the mortgage and the mortgagee must submit to a deduction from his claim (t).

Where there are two or more mortgagors that is two or more persons interested in the equity of redemption any one of them may sue for redemption but then the other mortgagors must be made party defendants (u). Where there are two or more encumbrances created on the same property the mortgagor seeking to redeem the first mortgage must join the subsequent mortgagees as parties. Similarly a second mortgagee seeking to redeem a prior mortgage must join the mortgagor as a party (s). But the prior mortgagee is not a necessary party to a suit by the mortgagor to redeem a subsequent mortgage see Explanation to the rule.

All persons interested in the mortgage security either (1) primarily as the mortgagee or (2) derivatively (i) by operation of law as the Official Assignee or Receiver of the assets of the mortgagee in insolvency or (ii) by voluntary alienation as the transferee of the security or debt should be made parties to a suit relating to the mortgage (w). If not joined as plaintiffs they should be joined as defendants.

A mortgagor mortgages his property to B. B sues A on the mortgage. During the pendency of the suit A executes a second mortgage of his property to C. C is not a necessary party to A's suit the mortgage to him having been executed subsequently to the institution of the suit (x).

**Trustees executors and administrators.**—The rule begins with the words subject to the provisions of this Code. The reference is to O 31 r 1 which provides

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>(l) <i>Punth elu Bhashyam</i> (1902) 25 Mad 406 4. But see <i>Jaganath v Asaichan</i> (19 5) 41 C 1 L J 290 861 C 1042 (25) A C 785</p> <p>(m) <i>H. alai v Kuthan Lal</i> (1897) 19 All 513. <i>Sivatha v Jamarubdoyar</i> (1898) 21 Mad 84. <i>Broj Nath v Kh. Lal (Aundar)</i> (1871) 14 M I A 144</p> <p>(n) <i>R. gh. Vinay k v Sherik Daud</i> (1889) 13 Bom 51 53</p> <p>(o) <i>Chulam Hus v Dina Asa</i> (1901) 43 All 467 [attaching decree holder] <i>Dadoba v Damodar</i> (1892) 16 Bom 466 [auction purchaser] <i>Ahmad Hus ain v Afuhammed Q. m</i> (19 6) 48 All 171 90 I C 80 (26) A A 46 (co-mortg. gor)</p> <p>(p) <i>Ragho Sales v Ballurhna</i> (1885) 9 Bom 123</p> <p>(q) <i>Ragho v D. ad</i> (1888) 13 Bom 51. <i>Trumbak v S. kharam</i> (189 ) 16 Bom 599</p> <p>(r) <i>Sho. Tahal v Sh. odan Pat</i> (1906) 38 All</p> | <p>174 <i>Sh. a Prasad v Behari Tal</i> (1903) 25 All 79. See also <i>Ganesh v Ch. a</i> (1913) 35 All 47 19 I C 614</p> <p>(s) <i>Nari Hu ain v Nhat Chand</i> (1905) All W N 158. <i>Hari Kisen v Jehat Hossein</i> (1903) 39 Cal 755. <i>Ponnusami v Srinivasan</i> (1908) 31 Mad 333</p> <p>(t) <i>Imam Al v Baijnath</i> (1906) 33 Cal 613 (P C). <i>Buddhal v Rama</i> (1920) 44 Bom 23 65 I C 3 7. <i>Harchandra v Mahomed</i> (19 1) 25 C W N 594 66 I C 312</p> <p>(u) <i>B. ri Singh v Nawal Singh</i> (1902) 24 All 2 6. <i>Mariyul Raman v Narayan</i> (1903) 26 Mad 461</p> <p>(v) <i>Thompson v Easteralls</i> (1839) 3 Ch Rep 215</p> <p>(w) See <i>Seton on Decrees</i> 6th ed vol. II 193. <i>Daniels's Chancery Practice</i> 8th ed vol. I, pp 184 189</p> <p>(x) <i>Ishaq Ali Khan v Chunni</i> (1899) 21 All 149</p> |
|---|--|



for suits concerning property vested in a trustee executor or administrator Having regard to the provisions of that rule a suit for redemption (y) or foreclosure ( ) or sale may be brought by trustees without making the beneficiaries parties.

**Benamidar** —A benamidar can maintain a suit on a mortgage. Thus if a mortgage is executed ostensibly in favour of A but the real mortgagee is B, A may sue the mortgagor on the mortgage. It is not open to the mortgagor to contend that A being merely the benamidar he cannot maintain the suit (a).

**Sub mortgagee**—A mortgagee may create such estates as he pleases. He may convey by way of sub mortgage to whom and in as many parcels as he pleases (b) It has been held by a Full Bench of the Allahabad High Court that when a mortgagor has sub mortgaged his interest in the property mortgaged to him the sub mortgagee is entitled to sell the interest in the property of his sub mortgagor without impeaching the mortgagor and foreclosing his equity of redemption in other words he is entitled to sell the sub mortgagor's interest leaving the equity of redemption outstanding in the mortgagor (c) In an earlier case (d) the Allahabad High Court took the view that a sub mortgagee is entitled only to a decree for money against the sub mortgagor but this was doubted in later cases (e) and it is not good law See notes to r 2 below **Sub mortgagee**

A person cannot be both plaintiff and defendant.—In a foreclosure action by a first mortgagee where the plaintiff also joined himself as a defendant as one of the junior mortgagees his name was struck out as a co defendant (1)

Consequences of non joinder—Under the corresponding section 85 of the Transfer of Property Act it was held by the Allahabad High Court that the non joinder of a person who ought to have been made a party to a suit on a mortgage was a defect fatal to the suit and that the suit should therefore be dismissed but that the Court if it sees fit to do so may add him as a party under s. 32 of the Code of 1882 [O 1 r 10 (2)]. Those decisions proceeded on what the Court said was the imperative character of the word must in section 85 of that Act (7). In a recent case under the present rule the same Court held that the result of non joinder of a subsequent mortgagee in a suit on a prior mortgage though intentional would not be the dismissal of the whole suit but only as much of it as relate to the property affected by the subsequent mortgage (8). The High Courts of Bombay (1) and Calcutta (3) took the same view as the Allahabad High Court.

The word must which occurred in a 8. of the Transfer of Property Act having been dropped and the section having been transferred into the Code the question as to the effect on non joinder is it is submitted governed by the provisions of the Code. O 1 r 0

- (y) *Mills v Jones* (1840) 13 C. D. 639 and 6 App. Ca. 639  
(z) *Mori v Morley* (1848) 25 L. v. 3  
1 *Succession of the first wife of Francis v Harrison* (1890) 43 C. D. 193  
(a) *Gu v aayan v Shro Lal S gh* (1919) 46 I A 19 46 Cal. 68 574 491 C 1 *Bhola Jee had v Lam Lal* (1897) 4 Cal. 31 I v *Mah d* (1899) Bom 67-  
1 *Lal m v Lamrao s gh* (1902) 21 All 341  
(b) *Tyler v Fur II* [182] A C 221 per Lord H. Russell  
(c) *P. M. Shank Ga th Prasad* (1907) 29 All 3 {F.B.} appro. 1 C. 104 v *Varadun* (1912) 14 L. R. 911 64 I C. 741 (1) A B 4 s *Mafuram v Bhairav* (1911) 3 Lah. L. J. 373.  
(d) *Ca ya Prasad v A s Lal* (1896) 18 All 113 *Lam Jata P v Lamul S ngh* (1903) 27 All 511  
(e) *Kam S gh v A s gh* (1905) All 472 477 C 8 *Muth I* (1905) v *Vinayachandam* (1897) 20 M 1 35  
(f) *Warrell v M d A H* (1899) 81 L. T. 800  
(g) *Mata Doo v Karmu H an v* (1921) 13 All 43 885 *Bhawa v Prasad v Karmu* (1925) 17 All 537, 555 556 Cal. 1 m 4 s *Karmu v M lakshmi Karmu* (1926) 14 All 102 112 *Ku s Lal v For Chand* (1903) 27 All 5 [Particulars of] *Tham v gh v Thak Aishwa* (1924) 23 All 394 [particulars of]
- (A) *Alam s gh v C Lal S ngh* (1913) 25 All 481 21 I C - 71  
(7) *Sorah v Lakshmi* (1924) 24 Bom 701 707  
(J) *Jam naja had v Langa Prasad* (1897) 19 Cal. 401 411

provides that no suit shall be defeated by reason of non joinder of parties and O 34 r 1 is subject to O 1 r 9 (1) Under O 1 r 10 (2) the Court has the power to add parties at any stage of the suit By s 99 of the Code it is enacted that no decree shall be reversed or substantially varied in appeal on account of any misjoinder of parties [which include non joinder (1)] unless it affects the merits of the case or the jurisdiction of the Court The result is that no suit on a mortgage should be dismissed by reason of non joinder of parties unless the parties are *necessary* parties and the plaintiff refuses to add them as parties If the parties are merely *proper* parties as distinguished from necessary parties (m) the Court may though the plaintiff refuses to add them as parties proceed under O 1 r 9 to deal with the matter in controversy so far as regards the rights and interest of the parties actually before it This was in effect held by the High Court of Bombay in *Shahasheb v Sadashiv* (n) a case under the present rule In that case a suit was brought by a mortgagee against the widow and daughters of the deceased mortgagor for sale of the mortgaged properties The deceased was a Mahomedan and besides the widow and daughters he left a brother as one of his heirs It was contended on behalf of the defendants that the brother having an interest in the right of redemption he ought to have been joined as a defendant and that the plaintiff having omitted to join him as a defendant the suit should be dismissed in its entirety At the date when the objection as to non joinder was taken by the defendants the period of limitation as against the brother had expired It was held overruling the contention that the brother was not a *necessary* party and that a decree could be passed against the widow and the daughters to the extent of their interest in the properties So in a mortgage suit a second mortgagee is a proper party but not a necessary party and the suit should not be dismissed because he has not been joined (o)

Where a person who ought to have been joined as a party under this rule is not joined as a party and a decree is passed in the suit the decree cannot affect his rights (p) [see notes below Mahomedan co heirs] To take a case which frequently occurs if a second or subsequent mortgagee who ought to be but is not joined as a party to a suit by the prior mortgagee the proceedings in the suit are not binding on him so as to affect his rights under the second mortgage (q) As second mortgagee he could have sued the mortgagor for a sale of the property subject to the first mortgage or he could have redeemed the first mortgage and then sued the mortgagor for sale on both the mortgages The point to be noted is that the second mortgagee does not lose either of these rights merely because a decree has been passed in the prior mortgagee's suit and the mortgaged property has been sold in execution of the decree The sale has not the effect of displacing the second mortgagee and leaving him with nothing but a claim against the balance (if any) of the sale proceeds of the property after satisfying the first mortgagee (r) The omission to implead the second mortgagee does not in any way

(k) *Sulal Prasad v Asho Singh* (19 3) 2 Pat 175 69 I C 677 (2) A P 61

(l) See notes to s 99 Misjoinder of parties or causes of action

(m) As to the distinction between necessary parties and proper parties see notes to O 1 r 10 ( ) Who ought to have been joined

(n) (1919) 43 Bom 575 51 I C 223 followed in *Kherodamoyi Das v Habib Shaha* (19 5) 9 C W N 51 6 I C 638 (5) A C 152

(o) *Sulal Prasad v Asho Singh* (19 2) Pat 175 69 I C 677 (2) A P 651 *Parshad Lal v Lajpat Singh* (1923) 21 All L J 701 74 I C 913 (24) A A 107

(p) *Broj Nath v Kheal Chunder* (1871) 14 N I A 114 *Pagho Saloo v Baikrishna* (1885) 9 Bom 128 *Hassanbhai v Umayy* (1904) 28 Bom 153 *Ram Va sin v Bandi Parshad* (1904) 31 Cal 737 *Judgeo Singh v Habibulla* (1908) 1 C W N 107 *Hassan Lal v Kulan Lal* (1897) 19 All 543 *Brj*

*Kushore v Madho Singh* (1906) 23 All 279 *Sathi v Pamarubhaya* (1898) 1

Mad 61 *Purnitharelu v Bhaskyam* (190 ) 25 Mad 406 4 *R ngasamy v Jell*

*Bod* (1903) 26 Mad 484 *Malikarjunadu v Li ga Murti* (1903) 26 Mad 33

*Kail v Gurja* (1912) 39 Cal 9 14 I C 299 *Shrinath Singh v Saado*

*Pat* 4 (19 4) 32 Pat 114 75 I C 942 (24) A P 452 *Paras m v Pandoh*

(19 ) 44 All 46 67 I C 533 (2-) A A 135

(q) *Umesh Chunder v Zahur Fatima* (1891) 18 Cal 164 17 I A 201 *Hat Ram v Shadi Lal* (1918) 45 I A 130 133 40 All

407 410 45 I C 793 *Mairu Mal v Kunwar* (19 0) 47 I A 71 4 All 364

55 I C 949 *Maung Shwe v Karambu* (19 8) 6 Rang 1 110 I C 701 (3) A E 1

(r) *Gobind Lal v Ramjanam* (1894) 21 Cal 70 20 I A 165

1 of the Privy Council (*p*) that where a suit is brought on a mortgage by or against the manager of a joint Hindu family in his representative capacity the other members of the family are not necessary parties to the suit and that the suit will not fail by reason of the non joinder of those members. It makes no difference whether the manager is a father or collateral relation such as an uncle or a brother

According to the Bombay decisions it would seem that the other co parceners are necessary parties to a suit brought on a mortgage by or against the manager (*q*) But if they are not joined as parties and a decree is passed for the sale of the joint family property against the manager in his representative character and the property is sold in execution of the decree the sale it has been held passes the interest of the other co parceners also in the property the mere fact that they were not parties to the mortgage suit is no ground for setting aside the sale unless it be shown by them that the debt contracted by the manager was one for which they are not liable (*r*)

According to the Calcutta High Court the other co parceners are necessary parties to a suit on a mortgage of joint family property and if a decree is passed in such a suit without their being joined as parties the decree is not binding on them and they may by suit obtain a declaration that not being parties to the suit their interests are not bound by the decree in the suit (*s*)

In another case before the Privy Council governed by the Transfer of Property Act 1882 where a foreclosure decree was passed against the manager of a joint Hindu family and the other members brought a suit to set aside the decree on the ground of their non joinder as persons interested in the equity of redemption under s. 85 of the Transfer of Property Act their Lordships held that the decree was in the circumstances of the case binding upon them though they were not parties to the suit. Their Lordships said There seems to be no doubt upon the Indian decisions (from which their Lordships see no reason to dissent) that there are occasions including foreclosure suits when the managers of a joint Hindu family so effectively represent all other members of the family that the family as a whole is bound. It is quite clear from the facts of the case and the findings of the Courts upon them that this is a case where this principle ought to be applied *There is not the slightest ground for suggesting that the manager of the joint family did not act in every way in the interests of the family its lf* and no question arises under s. 85 of the Transfer of Property Act [O 34 r 1] because the mortgagee had no notice of the plaintiff's interests (*t*) Note that the words provided that the plaintiff has notice of such interest which occurred in s. 85 of the Transfer of Property Act do not occur in the present rule

The recent Privy Council case of *Ganpat Lal v Bindabans Prasad* (*u*) is an authority for the proposition that in a suit on a mortgage against the manager of a joint Hindu family all the other members of the family are represented by the manager The mortgage was by the manager and the mortgagee obtained a decree for sale joining as parties the manager and the other members of the family The mortgagee purchased the property himself But one of the members of the family who was a minor was wrongly described in the suit as an adult. He sued to redeem on the ground that not having been represented in the suit by a guardian *ad litem* he was not a party to the mortgagee's suit. This claim would have been unanswerable if he had not been

(p) *Kishan Prasad v Har v Ram C* 95 (1911) 33 All 7 35 I A 45 91 C 39

(q) *Gemeland v Akripatra* (1916) 40 Bom 14 33 I C 771

(r) *P. Mirilal v Sanyal* 2 (1910) 34 Bom 2 51 C 961 (Amra v ada (1910) 12 Bom 1 3 811 73 C 920

(s) *Lala v ref. I vead v Golab Chand* (1901) 25 Cal 17 *Lala v ref. Prasad v Golab*

*Chand* (1900) 7 Cal 101 *Debi Prasad v Dhanraj* 1 (1911) 41 Cal 7 11 C 517

(t) *Shoo Chand v Jadoo K. v* (1911) 36 All 2 3 41 J A 216 11 C 501

*affirm g* (1911) 33 All 71 71 C 91

(u) (1910) 47 I A 91 47 Cal 9 1 30 J C 274  
See also *Eliza v v* 8 1000  
(1907) 54 I A 1 1 5 81 1000 40  
4 3 101 I C 44 (77) A 11. 38

represented by the manager in the suit. But the Privy Council held that as he had not sued to set aside the sale and did not impeach the mortgage or the decree the suit was not maintainable. In other words he was represented by the manager and it did not matter whether he was a party or not. The only ground which he could take was that he was not liable for the mortgage debt contracted by the manager and that he had not done. The same rule was applied by the High Court of Bombay in a suit for sale on a mortgage against the grandfather who was the manager (1).

Where parties are not governed by the Hindu law and the only interest which a son has under the customary law is a reversionary interest in the property and a right to protect that interest by interfering to prevent unnecessary alienations the son has no such interest in the property as is contemplated by the present rule and he is not therefore a necessary party to a suit on a mortgage against his father (2).

2 [New Act IV of 1882, sec 86] (1) In a suit for  
 Preliminary decree in foreclosure suit foreclosure, if the plaintiff succeeds, the Court shall pass a preliminary decree—

(a) ordering that an account be taken of what was due to the plaintiff at the date of such decree for—

- (i) principal and interest on the mortgage,
- (ii) the costs of suit, if any, awarded to him, and
- (iii) other costs, charges and expenses properly incurred by him up to that date in respect of his mortgage security, together with interest thereon, or

(b) declaring the amount so due at that date, and

(c) directing—

- (i) that, if the defendant pays into Court the amount so found or declared due on or before such date as the Court may fix within six months from the date on which the Court confirms and countersigns the account taken under clause (a), or from the date on which such amount is declared in Court under clause (b), as the case may be, and thereafter pays such amount as may be adjudged due in respect of subsequent costs, charges and expenses as provided in rule 10, together with subsequent interest on such sums respectively as provided in rule 11, the plaintiff shall deliver up to the defendant, or to such person as the defendant appoints,

(1) *Madhusudan v Bhagwan* (1909) 53 Bom 444 118 I C 88 (-9) A B 213 | (2) *Sh v Dev Singh v Jai Ram* (1910) Panj Rec no 1-3 p 327 53 I C 411

2

all documents in his possession or power relating to the mortgaged property, and shall, if so required, re-transfer the property to the defendant at his cost free from the mortgage and from all incumbrances created by the plaintiff or any person claiming under him, or, where the plaintiff claims by derived title, by those under whom he claims, and shall also, if necessary, put the defendant in possession of the property, and

- (1) that, if payment of the amount found or declared due under or by the preliminary decree is not made on or before the date so fixed, or the defendant fails to pay, within such time as the Court may fix, the amount adjudged due in respect of subsequent costs, charges, expenses and interest, the plaintiff shall be entitled to apply for a final decree debarring the defendant from all right to redeem the property

(2) The Court may, on good cause shown and upon terms to be fixed by the Court, from time to time extend the time fixed for the payment of the amount found or declared to be due under sub rule (1) or of the amount adjudged to be due in respect of subsequent costs and interest

(3) Where, in a suit for foreclosure, subsequent mortgagees or persons deriving title from, or subrogated to the rights of any such mortgagees are joined as defendants the preliminary decree shall provide for the adjudication of the respective rights and liabilities of the parties to the suit in the manner and form set forth in Form No 9 or Form No 10, as the case may be, of Appendix D with such variations as the circumstances of the case may require

The old rule —The above rule has been substituted for old r 2 by the Transfer of Property (Amendment) Supplementary Act 1929 which comes into operation on the 1st April 1930. The old rule will be in operation till the above date. It is as follows —

- 2 In a suit for foreclosure if the plaintiff succeeds the Court shall pass a decree—
  - (a) ordering that an account be taken of what will be due to the plaintiff for principal and interest on the mortgage and for his costs of the suit (if any) awarded to him on the day next hereinafter referred to or
  - (b) declaring the amount so due at the date of such decree and directing—

- (c) that if the defendant pays into Court the amount so due on a day within six months from the date of declaring in Court the amount so due to be fixed by the Court the plaintiff shall deliver up to the defendant or to such person as he appoints all documents in his possession or power relating to the mortgaged property and shall if so required re transfer the property to the defendant free from the mortgage and from all incumbrances created by the plaintiff or any person claiming under him or where the plaintiff claims by derived title by those under whom he claims and shall also if necessary put the defendant in possession of the property but
- (d) that if such payment is not made on or before the day to be fixed by the Court the defendant shall be debarred from all rights to redeem the property

**Transfer of Property Act 1882 s 85**—This rule corresponds to s 86 of the Transfer of Property Act except in the following particulars —

- 1 The words to the plaintiff or which occurred in s 86 after the word pays in cl (c) have been omitted the object being that in every case the defendant should pay the money into Court
- 2 In cl (c) the words if so required have been added before the words re transfer the property as according to mofussil practice a re transfer is not ordinarily required

**The old rule and the new rule —**

- 1 The new rule expressly states that the decree to be passed under it is a preliminary decree
- 2 The old rule was not clear as to the date up to which accounts were to be taken The new rule makes it clear that the Court should direct accounts to be taken up to the date of the preliminary decree
- 3 The new rule expressly provides that in taking accounts the amount to be spent by a mortgagee for necessary costs charges and expenses incurred by the mortgagee in respect of the mortgage security together with interest thereon should be taken into account
- 4 The old rule was not clear as to the day on which payment was to be made by the mortgagor in cases where accounts were directed to be taken This is now made clear in sub rule (1) (c) (i)
- 5 The provision in new sub rule (1) (c) (i) as to subsequent interest is new See rule 11 (b)
- 6 New sub rule (1) (c) makes it clear that the costs of re transfer are to be borne by the mortgagor
- 7 New sub rule (1) (c) (u) makes it clear that if default is made by the mortgagor in payment of the amount due under the preliminary decree the mortgagee has to apply to the Court for a final decree
- 8 New sub rule (2) relates to the power of the Court to extend the time for payment It is in substance a reproduction of old rule 3 (2) See note below Power to extend time in foreclosure suits
- 9 New sub rule (3) draws specific attention to the forms of decrees to be passed where subsequent mortgagees are joined as parties to a suit for foreclosure

**Form of preliminary decree for foreclosure**—See Appendix D Form No 3 when accounts are directed to be taken and Form No 3A when no accounts are taken and the Court declares the amount due

**Foreclosure and sale**—Until 1st April 1930 i.e. until the Transfer of Property (Amendment) Act 1929 comes into operation a suit for foreclosure can only be brought where the mortgage is an English mortgage or a mortgage by conditional sale. After that date it is no longer open to the holder of an English mortgage to sue for foreclosure. In the case of a mortgage by deposit of title-deeds in Bombay where the remedy by way of foreclosure was held to be open to such a mortgagee s. 10 (2) of the Transfer of Property (Amendment) Supplementary Act allows a period of two years i.e. upto 1st April 1931 to such a mortgagee to enforce his remedy by way of foreclosure. Under the Transfer of Property Amending Act 1929 the remedy by way of foreclosure is allowed only (1) in the case of a mortgage by conditional sale and (2) an anomalous mortgage where there is an express stipulation in that behalf. A suit for sale can only be brought where the mortgage is an English mortgage or a simple mortgage.

The holder of a mortgage by conditional sale cannot institute a suit for sale. A simple mortgagee cannot institute a suit for foreclosure. A usufructuary mortgagee cannot institute a suit either for foreclosure or sale [Transfer of Property Act s. 6]. Rules 2 and 3 provide for decrees for foreclosure. Rules 4 and 5 provide for decrees for sale.

The Transfer of Property Amending Act 1929 places a mortgage by deposit of title-deeds on the same footing as a simple mortgage. In the case therefore of a mortgage by deposit of title deeds the only remedy open to the mortgagee is by way of sale except in Bombay where the mortgagee is allowed a further period of two years as stated above. See secs. 67, 96 and 100 of the Transfer of Property Act 1882 and r. 15 below.

**Right of redemption**—The mortgagor has at any time after the mortgage money has become payable by him a right on payment of deposit in Court or tender of the mortgage money to require the mortgagee to deliver up to him all documents in the mortgagee's possession relating to the mortgaged property and to re-transfer the property to him. This right is called the right of redemption. The right to redeem subsists so long as a mortgage subsists (r. 1) [Transfer of Property Act s. 60]. Rules 7 and 8 provide for decrees for redemption.

**Account against mortgagor**—Whether the suit be one for foreclosure, sale or redemption, the preliminary decree in each case must either declare the amount due or direct an account to be taken of what is due to the mortgagee for principal, interest and costs, and for other costs, charges and expenses in respect of the mortgage security. Where the same property is mortgaged to several persons in succession and the subsequent mortgagees are joined as parties to the suit, they are entitled, if they appear and prove their mortgages, to ask for a decree for an account on each of their mortgages and a declaration of their right in a suit for sale to participate in the surplus sale-proceeds in order of priority. An account is then taken of what is due on each mortgage, the sums so found due to each mortgagee are included in one report, and the sale proceeds are subsequently divided between the plaintiff and the puisne mortgagees in accordance with their claims as found by the report (9). See Appendix D Forms of Decrees Nos 9 to 11. Where the mortgagee is in possession an account is to be taken of what is due to the mortgagee for principal and interest and also of the income derived by him from the property. Whatever may be the nature of the suit, it lies upon the mortgagor to prove what is due to him for principal and interest. If the mortgage-deed is not put in evidence, as where it is not stamped and the mortgagee refuses to pay the penalty, he can only be credited in the account with the sum which the mortgagor admits was the amount of the principal ( ).

(1) *Ramji v. P. Narayan* (1919) 43 Bom 331; 49 IC 898. *Ramchandram v. Hanumanth* (1911) 44 Bom 939; 34 IC 45.  
(9) *Borhande Pershad v. Tar Chaud* (1906)

33 Cal 9\* 111.  
(1) *Ganga Mulik v. Bapat* (1882) 6 Bom 653.  
670

**Principal.**—The amount of principal and the rate of interest payable thereon are almost invariably stated in the instrument of mortgage. Such statement amounts to an admission on the part of the mortgagor that he has received the amount mentioned in the instrument. But an admission is not conclusive proof of the matter admitted (a) and it is open to the mortgagor to show that a smaller consideration or no consideration at all passed under the instrument of mortgage (b). But the burden of proof in that case lies on the mortgagor (c). But though an admission is not conclusive proof of the matter admitted it may operate as an estoppel so as to preclude the mortgagor from asserting that a smaller consideration or no consideration passed under the instrument of mortgage (d). This is so in cases where the mortgagee transfers his interest in the mortgage to a third party who has no notice that the full amount acknowledged to have been received on the face of the mortgage deed has not been received. In such a case the mortgagor is not entitled to redeem except on payment to the transferee of the amount stated in the mortgage deed to have been received by the mortgagor (e).

**Interest.**—See r 11 below and notes. See also notes to sec 34. The rule of *dampnat*.

**Costs of suit.**—Whether the suit is one for foreclosure sale or redemption the mortgagee is entitled to all costs properly incurred (f) by him including costs subsequent to decree (r 10). This right resting substantially upon contract can only be lost or curtailed by such inequitable conduct on the part of the mortgagee as may amount to a violation or culpable neglect of his duty under the contract (g). Thus costs incurred by the mortgagee after a proper tender has been made have been disallowed (h). And where in a suit for redemption the mortgagee though he had been fully paid contended that a large amount was still due to him he was directed to pay costs of the suit (i).

**Other costs charges and expenses.**—Sec 72 of the Transfer of Property Act 1882 enables the mortgagee to spend such money as is necessary for the preservation of the mortgaged property from destruction, forfeiture or sale for supporting the mortgagor's title to the property for making his own title thereto good against the mortgagor etc. and, in the absence of a contract to the contrary to add such money to the principal money at the rate of interest payable on the principal. Sec 63A enables the mortgagee in possession to make such improvements as are necessary to preserve the property from destruction or deterioration and to add such money to the principal money at the rate of interest payable on the principal. These are the costs charges and expenses referred to in r 2 (1) (a) (iii) and they are to be taken into account in determining the amount payable by the mortgagor to the mortgagee (j). Rule 10 below provides for payment by the mortgagor to the mortgagee of similar costs charges and expenses incurred by the mortgagee after the date of the preliminary decree up to the time of actual payment.

**Subsequent interest.**—There was no provision either in old r 2 or in old r 3 for payment of interest by the mortgagor subsequent to the day fixed under the decree for payment of the amount due. Provision has now been made for it in r 11 (b) below.

- (a) Evidence Act 187 s 31
- (b) Evidence Act 187 s 9 proviso (1)
- (c) *M. hab. F. ad v. Buhari Dajal* (190) 7 All 71. *M. Khan Bahad v. Indar Parshad* (1896) 23 Cal 90. 3 IA 9. See also *Br. Jashua v. Budhanuddi* (1891) 6 Cal 263. 77 278.
- (d) Evidence Act ss 31 115
- (e) *Buckerton v. Waller* (1886) 51 CD 151. *Bateman v. H. nt* (1901) 2 h. B 539.

- (f) *Dryd n v. Fro t* (1833) 3 I J Ch 235. *M. Karaj Bahad r S ngh v. Banrudd n* (1905) 41 Cal L J 607 93 I C 361 (—) A C 1135.
- (g) *Bank of New South Wales v. Connor* (1889) 11 App Case 73 28.
- (h) *Dhondo v. Ballir shna* (1884) 8 Bom 190.
- (i) *Ashworth v. Lord* (1887) 30 Ch D 545. See also *Cla. ba v. Jones* (1887) 35 Ch D 545.
- (j) See *Da dha v. Daudhai* (1890) 14 Bom 113.



**2** Plaintiff to apply for final decree for sale—Sub rule (1) (c) (ii) makes it clear that if default is made by the mortgagor in payment of the amount due the mortgagee has to *apply* for a final decree for sale. In one case the application was made by the transferee from the mortgagee and it was contended that the decree made on his application was a nullity but it was held that the decree having been passed in the presence of the mortgagor he was bound by it (*k*)

**Account against mortgagee in possession**—Where under the terms of a usufructary mortgage the mortgagee is to enjoy the rents and profits in lieu of interest, or the rents and profits are to be taken as an equivalent of the interest and of specific portions of the principal there is no obligation on the mortgagee to render any accounts (l). In other cases a mortgagee in possession is bound to render an account of the rents and profits of the mortgaged property (m). As to annual rents against a mortgagee in possession see the undermentioned cases (n).

Power to extend time in foreclosure suits.—The proviso to old r 3 (\*) empowered the Court upon good cause shown and upon such terms as it thought fit from time to time to postpone the day fixed for payment by the mortgagor of the mortgage money. This proviso has now been transferred to sub rule (2) of the present rule with some alterations. Sub rule (2) empowers the Court upon good cause shown and upon terms to be fixed by the Court from time to time at any time before a final decree is passed to extend the time fixed for payment. The power to extend the time is discretionary and the mortgagor is not entitled to an extension as of right (o). It is not a good ground for extending the time that the mortgagee was under a misconception or payment in time was unnecessary (p). It was held under the old rule that the application for extension of time need not be made before the expiry of the time originally fixed for payment and that it could be made even after the expiry of that time provided it was made before a final decree for foreclosure was passed (q). This is now made clear by substituting the words extend the time for the words postpone the day.

It was held under the old rule that even if there was no order postponing the day fixed for the payment of the mortgage-money a payment into Court by the mortgagor of the mortgage money before the passing of a final decree for foreclosure was an effectual payment (r). Effect has been given to these decisions by substituting in r 3 (1) the words before a final decree debarring the defendant from all right to redeem the mortgaged property has been passed for the words on or before the day fixed which occurred in old r 3 (1).

**Appeal from order refusing to extend time**—An appeal lies from an order refusing to extend the time for payment under O 43 (1) (c)

Sub mortgage.—A sub mortgagee may sue for foreclosure or sale to the same extent as the mortgagee himself (s). Where the sub mortgagee is a party to the suit the preliminary decree must direct an account to be taken of what is due to the mortgagee and of what is due to the sub mortgagee. As to the form of decree in a suit by a sub mortgagee against the mortgagee and mortgagor see Appendix D form No. 11. As to the form of decree in a suit for redemption by the mortgagor against the

- (2) *Jalil v Chandra* (1919) 4 Pat L.J 317  
303 511 (881)
- (J) Transfer of Property Act ss 6 and 77
- (m) Transfer of Property Act s 78 (g)
- ( ) *Jalil v Gudi* 4 (1894) 6 All 203  
*Aikworth v Lord* (1857) 26 Ch.D 545 549  
See also *Fletcher on Marriage* pp 8-87A  
and *Taure Lectures*, 1875 c p 2A
- (e) *Mugos v Jomazumi* (1916) 39 Mad  
p., 311 C 203 *Ratnad v Chandra*  
(1919) 4 Pat L.J 317 321 C, 841 B 1  
*one leaf of v Karna* 416 (1922) 28  
C 33 23 702 A 3m

- (p) *Statul v Th b r f j r (190A)* 83 I A  
U 63 Cal B 1 100 I 40 (Z) A  
14 13
- (q) % *ayana v Kapaya (1890)* 20 Mad 133  
31 I 80 ayana v L pen r (190A) 133  
Mad 48 2nd 80 ayana v 3 amala  
(190A) 3 Mad 300 1 from v B ha  
(190A) 3 km 771 1 ayana v Cepal  
(190A) 24 km 10 31 ayana v Kama  
oma (1910) 29 Mad 8 31 C ~
- (r) B 1 Aery 31ad nla Lal (19 2) 24  
Lal 100 1 C 70
- (s) 30a Mathu 1 (aya v Fekistacka-om (189A)  
22 Mad 35

mortgagee and sub mortgagee see the undermentioned case (t) See notes to r 1 above Sub mortgagees

Subsequent incumbrancers —For forms of decrees in cases where there are subsequent incumbrances see Appendix D forms Nos 9 10 and also the undermentioned case (u)

Mortgage of chattels and of intangible property —A mortgage of chattels is entitled to sue for foreclosure So also a mortgagee of intangible property such as palas or turns of worship in a temple (v)

Res judicata —See notes to s 11 Application of the above rules to suits on mortgage on p 51 above

3 [Nou Act 4 of 1882, s 87] (1) Where, before a final decree debarring the defendant from all right to redeem the mortgaged property has been passed, the defendant makes payment into Court of all amounts due from him under sub rule (1) of rule 2, the Court shall, on application made by the defendant in this behalf, pass a final decree—

- (a) ordering the plaintiff to deliver up the documents referred to in the preliminary decree,
- and, if necessary,—
- (b) ordering him to re transfer at the cost of the defendant the mortgaged property as directed in the said decree,

and, also, if necessary,—

- (c) ordering him to put the defendant in possession of the property

(2) Where payment in accordance with sub rule (1) has not been made, the Court shall, on application made by the plaintiff in this behalf, pass a final decree declaring that the defendant and all persons claiming through or under him are debarred from all right to redeem the mortgaged property and also, if necessary, ordering the defendant to put the plaintiff in possession of the property

(3) On the passing of a final decree under sub rule (2), all liabilities to which the defendant is subject in respect of the mortgage or on account of the suit shall be deemed to have been discharged

(t) *Na yan v G nof* (1891) 15 Bom 69

(u) *Gopi Varan v Banendhar* (1905) 7 All 35

(v) *Mahamaya v Haridas* (1915) 4 Cal 455  
477 478 27 I C 400

3

The old rule—The above rule has been substituted for old r 3 by the Transfer of Property (Amendment) Supplementary Act 1929 which comes into operation on 1st April 1930. The old rule will be in operation till the above date. It is as follows—

3 (1) Where on or before the day fixed the defendant pays into Court the amount declared due as aforesaid, together with such subsequent costs as are mentioned in rule 10 the Court shall pass a decree—

(a) ordering the plaintiff to deliver up the document which under the terms of the preliminary decree he is bound to deliver up

and if so required—

(b) ordering him to re transfer the mortgaged property as directed in the said decree

and also if necessary—

(c) ordering him to put the defendant in possession of the property

(2) Where such payment is not so made the Court shall on application made in that behalf by the plaintiff pass a decree that the defendant and all persons claiming through or under him be debarred from all right to redeem the mortgaged property and also if necessary ordering the defendant to put the plaintiff in possession of the property

Provided that the Court may upon good cause shown and upon such terms (if any)

Power to enlarge time as it thinks fit from time to time postpone the day fixed for such payments

Discharge of debt. (3) On the passing of a decree under sub-rule (2) the debt secured by the mortgage shall be deemed to be discharged.

Transfer of property Act, 1882 s 87—This rule corresponds to s 87 of the Transfer of Property Act except in two particulars:— (1) sub r (1) provides for the passing of a decree where payment is made s 87 of the Transfer of Property Act contained only the words the defendants shall (if necessary) be put into possession of the mortgaged property (2) Sub r (2) again provides for the passing of a decree where no payment is made Under s 87 the Court had merely to pass an order See as to this distinction notes to r 3 below Final decree for sale Limitation

The old rule and the new rule—

(1) The new rule makes it clear that the decree to be passed under it is a final decree

(2) The words before a final decree debarring the defendant from all right to redeem the mortgaged property has been passed in new sub rule (1) have been substituted for the words on or before the day fixed which occurred in old sub-rule (3).

(3) The defendant mortgagor has to apply to the Court for a decree after paying the amount into Court

(4) The proviso to old sub rule (2) regarding the power of the Court to extend the time for payment has been transferred to new rule 4

(5) In sub rule (3) it is made clear that on the passing of the final decree for foreclosure not only the mortgage debt is extinguished but all liabilities of the defendant in respect of the mortgage and on account of the suit are discharged.

Final decree for foreclosure—For form see Appendix D new form No 4 [old form No 10]. Where the mortgagor fails to pay the amount due by him on the date fixed by the preliminary decree the mortgagee may apply under sub r (2) for a final decree declaring that the mortgagor is debarred from all right to redeem the mortgaged property. No formal notice of such application is necessary to a mortgagor who is sui juris but notice is necessary where the mortgagor is a minor absence of notice however

will not invalidate the final decree unless prejudice is caused to the minor (r) until a final decree is passed the mortgagor may apply under rule (2) for an extension of the time for payment. He may even without an extension at any time before the final decree is passed pay the money into Court and so avert foreclosure (x). See note to r 2 above. Power to extend time in foreclosure suits.

**Only one final decree for foreclosure.**—The law contemplates the passing of only one final decree and that a final decree can be made only after the Appellate Court has decided the appeal from the preliminary decree. Thus if A sues B for foreclosure of a mortgage comprising two properties and a preliminary decree for foreclosure is passed as regards one of the properties but the suit is dismissed as regards the other and A appeals from that part of the decree by which his suit was dismissed and pending the appeal applies for and obtains a final decree for foreclosure in respect of the property ordered to be foreclosed he cannot afterwards if he succeeds in the appeal obtain another final decree for foreclosure of the other property (y). See note to r 5 below. Only one final decree in a suit for sale.

**Payment into Court.**—The payment into Court may be made by the mortgagor at any time before the final decree for foreclosure has been passed. See notes to r 4 above. Power to extend time in foreclosure suits.

**Effect of appeal on time for payment.**—A preliminary decree is passed in a foreclosure suit fixing a period of six months from the date of the decree for payment by the mortgagor of the amount due. The mortgagor prefers an appeal from the decree but the decree is confirmed in appeal. The decree of the appellate Court is *silent as to the time allowed for redemption*. This does not operate as an extension of the time for payment so as to enable the mortgagor to redeem the mortgage within six months from the date of the appellate decree. The mortgagor is entitled to a final decree for foreclosure after the expiration of six months from the date of the original decree though six months may not have expired from the date of the appellate decree. The appellate decree simply confirming the original decree cannot be read as giving the mortgagor six months from the date of the decree on appeal (z). Nor does the summary dismissal of an appeal extend the time for payment (a). This is in accordance with the general principle that where time is prescribed by the decree of the lower Court for the performance of a condition precedent and the appellate Court simply confirms the decree of the lower Court or summarily dismisses the appeal it cannot be regarded as enlarging the time fixed by the original decree for the performance of the condition (b). The result is the same where the appeal is withdrawn and no decree is passed in appeal. The withdrawal does not give the mortgagor a fresh period for redemption (c). To avoid the difficulty arising in such cases the mortgagor should take care to have a fresh date fixed for payment by the appellate Court offering at the same time to pay interest up to that date (d) or he should apply under r 2 (2) for an extension of the time for payment. See note under s 34. Time for payment fixed by decree.

**Sub rule 3 Discharge of debt etc on foreclosure.**—Old sub rule (3) provided that on the passing of a final decree for foreclosure the debt secured by the mortgage shall be deemed to be discharged. The present sub rule (3) provides that

(u) *Mahade v Somath* (1906) 48 All 88  
97 I C 277 (5) A A 757

(z) *Somesh v Ram Krishna* (1900) 27 Cal 70  
*Salig Ram v Muradan* (1903) 25 All 231  
See also *Dris Prasad v Jas Karan* (1905) 24 All 479

(y) *Sham Sendar v Muhammad* (1905) 27 All 501

(z) *Biola Dath v Kant Chandra* (1898) 25 Cal 311  
*B. Santia Kuma v Jadhav Ram* (1905) 26 C W N 440 70 I C 735 (2) A C 39  
See also *Churanji Lal v Dhaam Si ga* (1896) 18 All 455 *M. Ankruman*

*v Unappan* (1895) 15 Mad 170  
*Kanara v Govinda* (1893) 16 Mad 214  
where the same question arose in suits for redemption

(a) *Dattatraya v Harad o* (1903) 47 Bom 956  
76 I L 103 (4) A B 98

(b) *Ram swami v Sendar* (1908) 31 Mad 48  
*Aminadi v Sda* (1893) 17 Bom 547

(c) *Falloy v Genu* (1891) 15 Bom 370 *Chuda samay Ishwary* (1895) 16 Bom 43

(d) *Fakirunna sis Bibi v Tarini Ch m* (1893) 0 Cal 29

3 on the passing of a final decree for foreclosure all liabilities to which the defendant is subject in respect of the mortgage or on account of the suit shall be deemed to have been discharged. The liabilities in respect of the mortgage refer not only to the mortgage debt but also to the other costs charges and expenses referred to in r 2 (1) (a) (iv). The liabilities on account of the suit include costs of the suit awarded against the mortgagee.

**Limitation for application for a final decree**—The period of limitation for an application for a final decree in a suit for foreclosure sale or redemption is three years under art 181 of the Limitation Act 1908. As to limitation for execution of a final decree for foreclosure sale or redemption see note below. Limitation for execution of final decree.

Where no payment is made by the mortgagor of the amount due on or before the day fixed the mortgagee may apply for a final decree. The procedure prescribed by the Transfer of Property Act in suits for foreclosure redemption and sale was in the first place to pass a decree and then an order absolute. This phraseology gave rise to conflicting decisions. In some cases it was held that an application for an order absolute for sale under s 59 of the Transfer of Property Act was an application to execute the decree and that the period of limitation was three years from the date of the decree as provided by art 179 of the Limitation Act of 1877 [Limitation Act 1908 art 181]. In other cases it was held that such an application was one to obtain a further decree that the only article of the Limitation Act that could possibly apply to it was the general article 138 [now art 181] but that even that article could not apply as it applied only to applications under the Code of Civil Procedure and that there being no other article there was no period of limitation at all for an application for an order absolute under the Transfer of Property Act. [It is interesting to note that the former view was taken by the Privy Council in cases under the Transfer of Property Act decided in 1914 (e)]. To put an end to this conflict of decisions it is now provided that the application which follows a preliminary decree is one to obtain a final decree [see r 3 (2) r 5 (3) r 8 (1)] so as to bring it within the purview of art 181 of the Limitation Act of 1908 [old art 178] and not one to execute the decree (f). Further the provisions relating to mortgage suits have been transferred from the Transfer of Property Act to the Civil Procedure Code so that it is no longer possible to contend that these applications are not under the provisions of the Civil Procedure Code (g). The result is that an application for a final decree for foreclosure sale or redemption is now governed by the residuary article 181 of the Limitation Act 1908 and the period of limitation is three years from the date on which the right to apply accrues (h). Where an appeal is preferred from the preliminary decree the right to make such an application accrues not on the expiry of the time limited by the preliminary decree but on the date of the decree of the Court of appeal (i). This rule applies although the decree of the Appellate Court has been made three years after the time fixed for redemption by the decree of the trial Judge (j). Where a decree was passed before the new Code came into force and the application for a final decree was made after the new Code

came into force it was held that the right to apply never having accrued to the decree holder until the new Code conferred it upon him the period of limitation under art 181 did not begin to run until the new Code came into force that is until 1st January 1909 (l) If the preliminary decree directs the mortgagee to pay off a prior mortgage but fixes no period for such payment the starting point for limitation for an application for a final decree is at the expiry of six months from the preliminary decree (l) In a case where the Court erroneously expressed an opinion that a puisne mortgagee could not sell the property without paying off a prior mortgage it was held that limitation was suspended for the time spent in ascertaining the balance due to him (m) An omission to draw up a final decree has been treated as an irregularity and in a case where the Court erroneously made an order absolute instead of a final decree for sale execution was allowed to proceed (n)

Application for execution of final decree—Limitation for an application for execution of a final decree is under art 182 of the Limitation Act 1908 (o)

4 [New Act 4 of 1882, s 88] (1) In a suit for sale, if the plaintiff succeeds, the Court shall pass a preliminary decree to the effect mentioned in clauses (a), (b) and (c) (1) of sub rule (1) of rule 2, and further directing that, in default of the defendant paying as therein mentioned, the plaintiff shall be entitled to apply for a final decree directing that the mortgaged property or a sufficient part thereof be sold, and the proceeds of the sale (after deduction therefrom of the expenses of the sale) be paid into Court and applied in payment of what has been found or declared under or by the preliminary decree due to the plaintiff, together with such amount as may have been adjudged due in respect of subsequent costs, charges, expenses and interest, and the balance, if any, be paid to the defendant or other persons entitled to receive the same

(2) The Court may, on good cause shown and upon terms to be fixed by the Court, from time to time, at any time before a final decree for sale is passed, extend the time fixed for the payment of the amount found or declared due under sub rule (1) or of the amount adjudged due in respect of subsequent costs, charges, expenses and interest

(3) In a suit for foreclosure in the case of an anomalous mortgage, if the plaintiff succeeds, the Court may, at the instance of any party to the suit or of any other person interested

Power to decree sale in foreclosure-suit

- (r) *As si gao v B nda* (1918) 4 Bom 309  
46 I C 107 See also *Keshavnarind a v Ra i Debend a* (1919) 4 P t I J 213  
48 I C 215  
(l) *Gyan Si gh v Ala Husa n* (1921) 43 All  
30 80 I C 817 (21 A A 56  
(m) *Hemendra v Dha m* (1912) 25 C W N

- 376 6- I C 418 (21) A C 381  
(n) *Chhagan Lal v J yaram* (1915) 51 Bom 125  
100 I C 96 (27) A B 131  
(o) *Samar S gh v Dronand n* (1917) 6 Pat  
80 10 I C 811 (27) A P 215 [suit  
for sale]

3 on the passing of a final decree for foreclosure all liabilities to which the defendant is subject in respect of the mortgage or on account of the suit shall be deemed to have been discharged. The liabilities in respect of the mortgage refer not only to the mortgage debt but also to the other costs charges and expenses referred to in r 2 (1) (a) (iii). The liabilities on account of the suit include costs of the suit awarded against the mortgagee.

**Limitation for application for a final decree**—The period of limitation for an application for a final decree in a suit for foreclosure sale or redemption is three years under art 181 of the Limitation Act 1908. As to limitation for execution of a final decree for foreclosure sale or redemption see note below. Limitation for execution of final decree.

Where no payment is made by the mortgagor of the amount due on or before the day fixed the mortgagee may apply for a final decree. The procedure prescribed by the Transfer of Property Act in suits for foreclosure redemption and sale was in the first place to pass a decree and then an order absolute. This phraseology gave rise to conflicting decisions. In some cases it was held that an application for an order absolute for sale under s 89 of the Transfer of Property Act was an application to execute the decree and that the period of limitation was three years from the date of the decree as provided by art 179 of the Limitation Act of 1877 [Limitation Act 1908 art 18]. In other cases it was held that such an application was one to obtain a further decree that the only article of the Limitation Act that could possibly apply to it was the general article 178 [now art 181] but that even that article could not apply as it applied only to applications under the Code of Civil Procedure and that there being no other article there was no period of limitation at all for an application for an order absolute under the Transfer of Property Act. [It is interesting to note that the former view was taken by the Privy Council in cases under the Transfer of Property Act decided in 1914 (e)]. To put an end to this conflict of decisions it is now provided that the application which follows a preliminary decree is one to obtain a final decree [see r 3 (2) r 5 (3) r 8 (1)] so as to bring it within the purview of art 181 of the Limitation Act of 1908 [old art 178] and not one to execute the decree (f). Further the provisions relating to mortgage suits have been transferred from the Transfer of Property Act to the Civil Procedure Code so that it is no longer possible to contend that these applications are not under the provisions of the Civil Procedure Code (g). The result is that an application for a final decree for foreclosure sale or redemption is now governed by the residuary article 181 of the Limitation Act 1908 and the period of limitation is three years from the date on which the right to apply accrues (h). Where an appeal is preferred from the preliminary decree the right to make such an application accrues not on the expiry of the time limited by the preliminary decree but on the date of the decree of the Court of appeal (i). This rule applies although the decree of the Appellate Court has been made three years after the time fixed for redemption by the decree of the trial Judge (j). Where a decree was passed before the new Code came into force and the application for a final decree was made after the new Code

- (e) 4rd I Majid v Jawah v Lal (1911) 36 All 300 I C 619 [1 C] B Suk Nath v M v I Das (1913) 36 All 31 41 L.A. 104 33 I C 614 foll we in Muhammad v Abi Karim (1916) 39 Mad 514 29 I C 37.
- (f) FA Inath v Tara Chand (1920) 5 Cal W N 9 597 50 I C 177.
- (g) 1st Look Chand v Sarai Chander (1911) 33 Cal 913 9 I C 111 I C 913 affirm sub-judice. 31 na Lal v Sarai Chander (1915) 4 I A 85 4 Cal 776 27 I C 643.
- (h) Dutt v Naraiah (1914) 35 B.M. 3 1 I C 214 B.M. 5 34 v B.M. mado (1915) 19 C.W. N 473, 28 I C 211 M na Lal v Sarai Chander (1915) 4 I A 85 27 I C 643 Subbaiah Am v Rama jam (1919)

- 4 Mad 52 49 I C 93 [acknowledged under s 19 of the Limitation Act.] Bala Ram v Anand (1916) 1 Pat. L. J 361 39 I C 235, Muhammad v Fakhra (1919) 40 Mad L J 61 62 I C 366 (22) A M 65.
- (i) Joward Hussan v Genda Singh (1914) 31 A 19 6 Pat 24 98 I C 472 (1 A P C 93 approving Gajalla v Kulkarni (1917) 32 All 611 42 I C 93 overruled.) Madho v N. J. (1916) 38 All 21 33 L.A. 494 Nannand v Bokre (1919) 40 All 63 43 I C 80 Javeri Fakhra (1921) 44 Mad 14 64 I C 174 (1) A 35 414.
- (j) Fitzholmes v Dutt of Upper India Ltd (1917) 51 I A 5 6 Lah. 3 190 I C 25 (1) A 1 C 25.

came into force it was held that the right to apply never having accrued to the decree holder until the new Code conferred it upon him the period of limitation under art 181 did not begin to run until the new Code came into force that is until 1st January 1909 (l) If the preliminary decree directs the mortgagee to pay off a prior mortgage but fixes no period for such payment the starting point for limitation for an application for a final decree is at the expiry of six months from the preliminary decree (i) In a case where the Court erroneously expressed an opinion that a puisne mortgagee could not sell the property without paying off a prior mortgage it was held that limitation was suspended for the time spent in ascertaining the balance due to him (m) An omission to draw up a final decree has been treated as an irregularity and in a case where the Court erroneously made an order absolute instead of a final decree for sale execution was allowed to proceed (n)

Application for execution of final decree—Limitation for an application for execution of a final decree is under art 182 of the Limitation Act 1908 (o)

#### 4 [New Act 4 of 1882, s 88] (1) In a suit for sale, if

Preliminary decree in suit for sale

the plaintiff succeeds, the Court shall pass a preliminary decree to the effect mentioned in clauses (a), (b) and (c) (i) of sub rule (1)

of rule 2, and further directing that, in default of the defendant paying as therein mentioned, the plaintiff shall be entitled to apply for a final decree directing that the mortgaged property or a sufficient part thereof be sold, and the proceeds of the sale (after deduction therefrom of the expenses of the sale) be paid into Court and applied in payment of what has been found or declared under or by the preliminary decree due to the plaintiff, together with such amount as may have been adjudged due in respect of subsequent costs, charges, expenses and interest, and the balance, if any, be paid to the defendant or other persons entitled to receive the same

(2) The Court may, on good cause shown and upon terms to be fixed by the Court, from time to time, at any time before a final decree for sale is passed, extend the time fixed for the payment of the amount found or declared due under sub rule (1) or of the amount adjudged due in respect of subsequent costs, charges, expenses and interest

(3) In a suit for foreclosure in the case of an anomalous mortgage, if the plaintiff succeeds, the Court may, at the instance of any party to the suit or of any other person interested

Power to decree sale in foreclosure suit

- (k) *Narsay v Bando* (1918) 42 Bom 309  
46 I C 107 See also *Keshawees rindra*  
v *P. n. D.endra* (1919) 4 Pat L J 213  
48 I C 245  
(l) *Gyan Singh v. Ata Hussain* (1921) 43 All  
3 D 60 I C 817 (21 A A 56  
(m) *Hemend v Dha* (1911) 25 C W N

3/6 6 I C 418 (1) A C 381

- (n) *Chhagan Lal v. Jajam* (1915) 51 Bom 125  
100 I C 956 (27) A B 131  
(o) *Samor Singh v. Deo dan* (1917) 6 Pat  
80 10 I C 811 (27) A P 215 (suit  
for sale)



4 in the mortgage-security or the right of redemption, pass a like decree (in lieu of a decree for foreclosure) on such terms as it thinks fit, including the deposit in Court of a reasonable sum fixed by the Court to meet the expenses of the sale and to secure the performance of the terms

(4) Where, in a suit for sale or a suit for foreclosure in which sale is ordered, subsequent mortgagees or persons deriving title from, or subrogated to the rights of, any such mortgagees are joined as parties, the preliminary decree referred to in sub rule (1) shall provide for the adjudication of the respective rights and liabilities of the parties to the suit in the manner and form set forth in Form No 9, Form No 10 or Form No 11, as the case may be, of Appendix D with such variations as the circumstances of the case may require

The old rule—The above rule has been substituted for old r 4 by the Transfer of Property (Amendment) Supplementary Act 1929 which comes into operation on the 1st April 1930. The old rule is as follows—

4 (1) In a suit for sale if the plaintiff succeeds the Court shall pass a decree to the effect mentioned in clauses (a) (b) and (c) of rule 2 and also directing that in default of the defendant paying as therein mentioned the mortgaged property or a sufficient part thereof be sold and that the proceeds of the sale (after defraying thereout the expenses of the sale) be paid into Court and applied in payment of what is declared due to the plaintiff as aforesaid together with subsequent interest and subsequent costs and that the balance (if any) be paid to the defendant or other persons entitled to receive the same

(2) In a suit for foreclosure if the plaintiff succeeds and the mortgage is not a mortgage by conditional sale the Court may at the instance of the plaintiff or of any person interested either in the mortgage money or in the right of redemption pass a like decree (in lieu of a decree for foreclosure) on such terms as it thinks fit including the deposit in Court of a reasonable sum fixed by the Court to meet the expenses of sale and to secure the performance of the terms

Transfer of Property Act s 88—This rule corresponds with sec 88 of the Transfer of Property Act. The reference to subsequent interest and subsequent costs is new

The old rule and the new rule—(1) The new rule expressly says that the decree to be passed under it is to be a *preliminary decree*

(2) The new rule says that on default in payment by the mortgagor the mortgagee has to *apply* for a final decree for sale

(3) The new rule makes it clear that the mortgagee has to pay not only subsequent interest and subsequent costs as under the old rule but also subsequent costs charges and expenses. See r 10 below

(4) Sub rule (2) of the new rule empowers the Court to extend the time for payment. There was no such provision in the old rules

(5) Sub rule (4) of the new rule provides for decrees in suits to which subsequent mortgagees are parties

**Preliminary decree for sale**—A suit for sale of mortgaged property can only be brought where the mortgage is an English mortgage or a simple mortgage or a mortgage by deposit of title deeds or where the property is subject to a charge within the meaning of sec 100 of the Transfer of Property Act (see r 10 below). The preliminary decree to be passed in a suit for sale corresponds to the preliminary decree in a suit for foreclosure in all respects except that instead of a direction providing for foreclosure the decree is to contain a direction providing for sale of the mortgaged property. The notes therefore on r 2 above as to the taking of accounts and the determination of principal interest and costs apply equally to this rule.

**Sub rule (1)** Subsequent costs charges expenses and interest—See rr 10 and 11 below.

**Sub rule (2)** Power to extend time in suit for sale—This sub rule is new. It empowers the Court in a suit for sale to extend the time fixed for payment of the amount due by the mortgagor on good cause shown. There was no such provision in the old rule enabling the Court to extend the time for payment in a suit for sale. It was therefore held that if the mortgagor failed to pay on or before the day fixed the Court had no power to extend the time for payment and that it was bound to pass a final decree for sale (p). At the same time it was held that even if time was not extended the mortgagor was entitled under O 21 r 69 to stop the sale by payment of the amount due and costs (q) and further if the property was sold to have the sale set aside on making the deposit as provided by O 21 r 89 (r). In the cases cited above the Court held that the provisions of the Code relating to execution of decrees applied to sales under mortgage decrees. There were however cases in which it was held that the sections of the Code relating to execution did not apply to sales under mortgage decrees (s). But the latter view is no longer tenable and it was to negative that view that the sections of the Transfer of Property Act relating to decrees in mortgage suits were transferred to the Code. As to O 21 r 83 it is expressly provided that nothing contained therein applies to a sale in execution of a mortgage decree (t). See notes to r 5 below. Mortgagor's rights before confirmation of sale.

**Form of decree**—As to the form of a preliminary decree for sale see App D Form No 5 [old form No 4]. On referring to the form it will be observed that it does not contain any declaration of personal liability of the defendant for principal interest or costs. Such a declaration in fact ought not to be included in the decree for sale. If the sale proceeds are not sufficient to pay the amount due to the mortgagee the mortgagee may apply for a personal decree against the mortgagor under r 8 below (u). See Appendix D Form No 8 [old Form No 11].

**Subsequent incumbrancers**—For the contents of a decree for sale in a suit by the first mortgagee (v) see Appendix D Form No 9 [old Form No 7]. For the contents of a decree for sale in a suit by a second mortgagee see Appendix D Form No 10 [old form No 8].

**Rights of second mortgagee in a suit for sale by first mortgagee**—If mortgages his property first to A and then to B. A sues M for a sale of the mortgaged property making B a party defendant. In such a suit the only right of B the second mortgagee is to redeem A's mortgage or to receive his mortgage money

- (p) *T v Gajanan* (1909) 4 B m 00  
(q) *H R v Nimeshar* (1898) 20 All 254  
*I jai m v Ch n Lal* (1897) 13 All 20  
*Babujan v Sacl* (1904) 31 Cal 863  
*Ad pr am v Gopalasami* (1908) 31 M d 354  
(r) See *Tamal v Syed Dastagha* (1899) M d 86  
*M H Lal v a l i v Laga rti* (1901) M d 14  
*Krish v v Mah d* (1901) Bom 104

- (s) See *Pasutha Ch dra v Khetra* (1901) 2 Cal 61  
(t) *I a a Lal v Junjab v a o al La l* (1913) 5 Lah L J 85  
*I C 816 (1) A L 384*  
(u) See *K mal n i a v Komandur* (1907) 30 Mad 461  
(v) See *Bt hamk v T a Chand* (1906) 33 Cal 9 111

out of the surplus sale proceeds after satisfaction of *A*'s mortgage. He is entitled to treat the suit brought by *A* the first mortgagee as one for his benefit. It follows therefore that *B* cannot ask for a sale of the property if *A*'s claim is satisfied by *M* before sale. Also if a decree for sale is passed in *A*'s suit *B* cannot ask for a decree for sale of another property of *M* included in his mortgage. In either case *B* must bring a separate suit for sale on his mortgage (*w*).

**Award and consent decree**—An arbitrator is not bound by this rule. A decree in terms of an award may order the sale of the property mortgaged although no preliminary decree under this rule or final decree under rule 5 has been passed (*x*). So also if the decree is a consent decree (*y*). In *Kashi Chandra v Priyanath* (*z*) Mookerjee J. directed that before execution an order absolute should be obtained under O 34 r 5 but the consent decree in that case was in the form of a preliminary decree.

**Sub rule (3) Power to decree sale in a foreclosure suit**—Under the Transfer of Property Amending Act 1929 foreclosure is allowed in the case only of anomalous mortgage where there is an express stipulation in that behalf and in the case of a mortgage by conditional sale. The remedy by way of foreclosure is no longer open in the case of an English mortgage. The words in the case of an anomalous mortgage have accordingly been added after the words in a suit for foreclosure in new sub-rule (3) which corresponds to old r 4 (2). In the case of a mortgage by conditional sale the only remedy open to the mortgagee is foreclosure and there is no scope for an alternative decree for sale.

**Appeal from order refusing to extend time**—An appeal lies from an order refusing to extend the time for payment under O 43 r (1) (o). The provision for extension of time contained in sub rule (2) of this rule is now and so is the provision for an appeal from an order refusing to extend the time under sub rule (2). See O 43 r (1) (o) and notes clause (o).

**5 [New Act 4 of 1882, s 89]** (1) Where, on or before the day fixed or at any time before the confirmation of a sale made in pursuance of a final decree passed under sub rule (3) of this rule, the defendant makes payment into Court of all amounts due from him under sub rule (1) of rule 4, the Court shall, on application made by the defendant in this behalf, pass a final decree or, if such decree has been passed, an order—

- (a) ordering the plaintiff to deliver up the documents referred to in the preliminary decree,
- and, if necessary,—
- (b) ordering him to transfer the mortgaged property as directed in the said decree,

(w) *Sri Chandra v Nagesh* (1910) 37 Cal 907 81 C 111 *Fedaryasa v Madura Hindu Sabha Andhi Co* (1919) 4 Mad 90 49 I C 36  
 (z) *Arpenda Nath v Jhankar* (19 4) 3 Pat 1 80 I C 588 ( 4) A P 563  
*Hemad Lal v Fakircha d* (19 3) 50 Cal 650 74 I C 900 (23) A C 66 *Jahan Chandra v A* 2 Pat 533

7 I C 1019 ( 3) A P 181 *Sital S agha v B jnath* (10<sup>th</sup>) 44 All 663, 75 I C 485 ( ) A A 383 *Askari Husar v Jafang ra Mal* (19 7) 49 All 997 100 I C 50 (27) A A 167 F B *Kumar Gangakand v Maharaja Sir Jamshwar S. p. (19 7) 6 Pat 328 10 I C 419 ( 7) A P 271*  
 (x) (1924) 23 C W N 550 83 I C 421 (24) A C 643

and, also, if necessary,—

O 3

- (c) ordering him to put the defendant in possession of the property

(2) Where the mortgaged property or part thereof has been sold in pursuance of a decree passed under sub rule (3) of this rule, the Court shall not pass an order under sub rule (1) of this rule unless the defendant, in addition to the amount mentioned in sub rule (1), deposits in Court for payment to the purchaser a sum equal to five per cent of the amount of the purchase money paid into Court by the purchaser

Where such deposit has been made, the purchaser shall be entitled to an order for repayment of the amount of the purchase money paid into Court by him together with a sum equal to five per cent thereof

(3) Where payment in accordance with sub rule (1) has not been made, the Court shall on application made by the plaintiff in this behalf pass a final decree directing that the mortgaged property or a sufficient part thereof be sold, and that the proceeds of the sale be dealt with in the manner provided in sub rule (1) of rule 4

The old rule—The above rule has been substituted for old r 5 by the Transfer of Property (Amendment) Supplementary Act 1929 which comes into operation on the 1st April 1930. The old rule is as follows—

5 (1) Where on or before the day fixed the defendant pays into Court the amount declared due as aforesaid together with such subsequent costs as are mentioned in rule 10 the Court shall pass a decree—

- (a) ordering the plaintiff to deliver up the documents which under the terms of the preliminary decree he is bound to deliver up

and if so required—

- (b) ordering him to re transfer the mortgaged property as directed in the said decree

and also if necessary—

- (c) ordering him to put the defendant in possession of the property

(2) Where such payment is not so made the Court shall on application made in that behalf by the plaintiff pass a decree that the mortgaged property or a sufficient part thereof be sold and that the proceeds of the sale be dealt with as is mentioned in rule 4

Transfer of Property Act 1882 s 89—This rule corresponds with sec 89 of the Transfer of Property Act except in the following particulars—

- 1 The provision contained in sub r (1) for the passing of a decree in the case where payment is made in accordance with the terms of the preliminary decree is new

5

- 2 By sub rule (2) it is provided that the application which follows a preliminary decree for sale is not for an order for sale as it was in sec 89 of the Transfer of Property Act but for a decree for sale See notes below Final decree for sale Limitation
- 3 The words to the plaintiff or which occurred in sec 89 after the word pays (see 1 2 of this rule) have been omitted See notes below Payment into Court
- 4 The words and thereupon the defendant's right to redeem and the security shall both be extinguished which occurred at the end of sec 89 have been omitted. See notes to r 1 above Consequences of non joinder

#### The old rule and the new rule —

- (1) The words or at any time before the confirmation of a sale made in pursuance of a final decree passed under sub rule (3) of this rule in sub rule (1) are new
- (2) If the mortgagor pays the amount due into Court he has to apply for a final decree for a re transfer of the mortgaged property to him and if a final decree has already been passed and the amount is deposited before confirmation of sale for an order for a re transfer
- (3) Sub rule (2) is new There was no such provision in the old rule
- (4) Sub-rule (3) makes it clear that if the mortgagor fails to pay the amount into Court the mortgagee has to apply for a final decree for sale

**Consent decree providing for payment in instalments**—Where in a suit for sale on a mortgage the consent decree provides for payment of the mortgage money in instalments and does not provide for payment on a fixed date within six months from the date of declaring the amount due as provided by r 4 r 4 has no application and consequently it is not necessary for the mortgagee to apply for a final decree in terms of the present rule (a)

**No power to go behind preliminary decree**—On an application of the mortgagee for a final decree the Court has no power to go behind the preliminary decree Its powers are limited to those mentioned in this rule (b)

**Only one final decree for sale**—In *Gajadhar v Kishen* (c) Banerji J said It seems to me that this rule i.e. the rule regulating applications for final decrees in mortgage actions— contemplates the passing of only one final decree in a suit for sale upon a mortgage The essential condition to the making of a final decree is the existence of a preliminary decree which has become conclusive between the parties Where an appeal has been preferred it is the decree of the Appellate Court which is the final decree in the cause This statement of the law was approved by the Judicial Committee in *Jowad Hussain v Gendun Singh* (d) From this it is concluded by the Allahabad High Court (e) though not without a note of dissent (f) that if the mortgagee obtains a final decree for sale pending an appeal from the preliminary decree the decree is invalid and incapable of execution though the mortgagee may apply for a final decree on foot of the preliminary decree as passed by the Appellate Court In a Patna case (g) however a final decree in exactly similar circumstances prior to the dismissal of the mortgagor's appeal from a preliminary decree was treated as valid though operative only from the date of dismissal of the appeal

- (a) *Iskari Hasm v Jahang & Shaf* (19 7) 40 All. 97 100 I C 59 (7) A A 367
- (b) *Kailash v Kishore Singh* (19 9) 27 All. L. J 45 115 I C 46 (-9) A A 25
- (c) (19 7) 2 All. 611 4 L C 93
- (d) (19 6) 53 I A 197

- (e) *Lalman v Shyam* (19 6) 24 All. L. J 83 9 I C 608 (26) A A 791
- (f) *Khour-mu-mu & Bibi v Oudh Commercial Bank Ltd* (19 9) 27 All. L. J 490 (199) A A 287
- (g) *Suman Singh v Doodan* (19 7) 6 Pat. 789 103 I C 811 (7) A P 315

**Mortgagor's rights before confirmation of sale**—In sub rule (1) the words or at any time before the confirmation of a sale made in pursuance of a final decree passed under sub-rule (3) of this rule are new. They enable the mortgagor to pay the amount due into Court even after sale provided the sale is not confirmed under O 21 r 92. The mortgagor may exercise this right even if no order has been made extending the time for payment. Where the deposit of the amount due is made after the property has been sold the mortgagor must also deposit for payment to the purchaser a sum equivalent to five per cent of the purchase money as provided by sub rule (2). If he does so the sale becomes ineffective and the purchaser is entitled to repayment of the purchase money paid by him into Court together with the deposit of five per cent. On the mortgagor depositing the amount due and the five per cent he is entitled to an order under sub rule (1) ordering the mortgagee to deliver up the title deeds and to re transfer the mortgaged property to him. See notes to r 4 above. Power to extend time in suit for sale.

**Payment into Court**—Under sec 89 of the Transfer of Property Act the defendant was at liberty to pay the amount to the plaintiff or into Court. Under the present rule [sub r (1)] the payment has to be made into Court. If the money is not paid into Court the Court must pass a final decree for sale [sub rule (3)]. It has been held in some cases that if money payable under the preliminary decree is paid out of Court but the payment is not certified as required by O 21 r 2 the Court should not take any notice of the payment and no credit should be given to the mortgagor in respect thereof (h). On the other hand it has been held that an application for a final decree is not an application for execution and O 21 r 2 does not apply (i) and this seems to be the correct view. In a Patna case (j) the High Court held that O 23 r 3 applied to such a case and directed the trial Court to take an account of the money alleged to have been paid by the mortgagor after the date of the preliminary decree. If the decree is a consent decree or one which is not passed under rr 4 and 5 there is no obligation to pay into Court and the Court can inquire into the payment or adjustment whether certified or not (k).

**Dismissal of mortgagee's application for final decree for default**—Where an application is made by the mortgagee for a final decree it should not be dismissed for his subsequent absence. If it is dismissed the order of dismissal must be set aside and a final decree must be passed (l).

**Sufficient part thereof**—It is not necessary to sell all the properties mortgaged at once. Ordinarily the right of selling in a particular order rests with the decree holder but in view of equities arising in favour of various parties the Court may direct the order in which they should be sold (m).

**Effect of sale under mortgage decree**—By a sale of property in execution of a decree for the payment of money the interest of the judgment debtor alone passes to the purchaser (n). By a sale of mortgaged property in execution of a mortgage decree the interest both of the mortgagor and mortgagee passes to the purchaser (o). See notes to r 1 above under the head Consequences of non joinder.

**Injunction restraining mortgagor from receiving income of mortgaged property**—It has been held in Allahabad that it is not competent to the Court after a final decree for sale has been passed to restrain the mortgagor by an injunction from

(h) *Singh Raja v Prithu Raj* (1919) 40 Mad 61 48 IC 196. *P. H. v. Jalen draya* (1917) 5 C 1 LJ 553 40 IC 845.

(i) *Ramys Lal v Singh Karan* (1917) 39 All 53 40 IC 424.

(j) *Jogendra v Gour* (1917) Pat LJ 533 40 IC 345.

(k) *M. Nagar Sahu v Bhaloo Singh* (1900) 6 Pat LJ 672 57 IC 473. *Sital Singh v Banmath* (1904) 46 All 668 75 IC 485. —) A.A. 283.

(l) *Jodha v Gokaran* (1905) 47 All 546 87 IC 25 (25) A.A. 6. *Chandav Amir* (1907) 49 All 59 101 IC 66 (27) A.A. 439.

(m) *P. Jeshur Prasad v Mahommed Rahman* (1924) 3 Pat 5 78 L.C. 798 (1) A.P. 459.

(n) See notes to O 21 r 91.

(o) *Mapanlal v Shakra* (1898) 7 Bom 945. *Desai Lalubha v Mandas* (1896) 70 Bom 390. *Perumal v Karcari* (1893) 16 Mad 11.

r 5

- 2 By sub rule (2) it is provided that the application which follows a preliminary decree for sale is not for an order for sale as it was in sec 89 of the Transfer of Property Act but for a *decree* for sale See notes below  
Final decree for sale Limitation
- 3 The words to the plaintiff or which occurred in sec 89 after the word pays (see l 2 of this rule) have been omitted. See notes below Paym at intk Court
- 4 The words and thereupon the defendant's right to redeem and the security shall both be extinguished which occurred at the end of sec 89 have been omitted. See notes to r 1 above Consequences of non joinder

### The old rule and the new rule —

- (1) The words or at any time before the confirmation of a sale made in pursuance of a final decree passed under sub rule (3) of this rule' in sub-rule (1) are new
- (2) If the mortgagor pays the amount due into Court he has to apply for a final decree for a re transfer of the mortgaged property to him and if a final decree has already been passed and the amount is deposited before confirmation of sale for an order for a re transfer
- (3) Sub rule (2) is new There was no such provision in the old rule
- (4) Sub rule (3) makes it clear that if the mortgagor fails to pay the amount into Court the mortgagee has to apply for a final decree for sale

**Consent decree providing for payment in instalments**—Where in a suit for sale on a mortgage the consent decree provides for payment of the mortgage money in instalments and does not provide for payment on a fixed date within six months from the date of declaring the amount due as provided by r 4 r 4 has no application and consequently it is not necessary for the mortgagee to apply for a final decree in terms of the present rule (a)

**No power to go behind preliminary decree**—On an application of the mortgagee for a final decree the Court has no power to go behind the preliminary decree Its powers are limited to those mentioned in this rule (b)

**Only one final decree for sale**—In *Gajadhar v. Aishan* (c) Banerji J said It seems to me that this rule i.e. the rule regulating applications for final decrees in mortgage actions— contemplates the passing of only one final decree in a suit for sale upon a mortgage The essential condition to the making of a final decree is the existence of a preliminary decree which has become conclusive between the parties Where an appeal has been preferred it is the decree of the Appellate Court which is the final decree in the cause This statement of the law was approved by the Judicial Committee in *Jowad Hussain v. Gendan Singh* (d) From this it is concluded by the Allahabad High Court (e) though not without a note of dissent (f) that if the mortgagee obtains a final decree for sale pending an appeal from the preliminary decree the decree is invalid and incapable of execution though the mortgagee may apply for a final decree on foot of the preliminary decree as passed by the Appellate Court In a Patna case (g) however a final decree in exactly similar circumstances prior to the dismissal of the mortgagee's appeal from a preliminary decree was treated as valid though operative only from the date of dismissal of the appeal

(a) *Askari Hasan v. Jalangra Mal* (19 7) 49 All 37 100 I C 59 (—7) 4 A 167  
(b) *Kallou v. Nader Singh* (19 9) 27 All L J 115 I C 46 ( 9) 4 A 25  
(c) (19 7) 39 All 641 4— I C 23  
(d) (19 6) 63 I A 197

(e) *Lalman v. Sham* (1926) 24 All L J 83  
9 I C 808 (26) A A 91  
(f) *Khar-un-nissa Bib v. O dā Commercial Bank Ltd* (19 9) 27 All L J 430 (—9) A A 8  
(g) *Suman Singh v. Deonandan* (1927) 6 Pat 780 103 I C 811 (27) A P 215

**Mortgagor's rights before confirmation of sale**—In sub rule (1) the words or at any time before the confirmation of a sale made in pursuance of a final decree passed under sub rule (3) of this rule are new. They enable the mortgagor to pay the amount due into Court even after sale provided the sale is not confirmed under O 21 r 2. The mortgagor may exercise this right even if no order has been made extending the time for payment. Where the deposit of the amount due is made after the property has been sold the mortgagor must also deposit for payment to the purchaser a sum equivalent to five per cent of the purchase money as provided by sub rule (2). If he does so the sale becomes ineffective and the purchaser is entitled to repayment of the purchase money paid by him into Court together with the deposit of five per cent. On the mortgagor depositing the amount due and the five per cent he is entitled to an order under sub-rule (1) ordering the mortgagee to deliver up the title deeds and to re-transfer the mortgaged property to him. See notes to r 4 above. Power to extend time in suit for sale.

**Payment into Court.**—Under sec 89 of the Transfer of Property Act the defendant was at liberty to pay the amount to the plaintiff or into Court. Under the present rule [sub r (1)] the payment has to be made into Court. If the money is not paid into Court the Court must pass a final decree for sale [sub rule (3)]. It has been held in some cases that if money payable under the preliminary decree is paid out of Court but the payment is not certified as required by O 21 r 2 the Court should not take any notice of the payment and no credit should be given to the mortgagor in respect thereof (h). On the other hand it has been held that an application for a final decree is not an application for execution and O 21 r 2 does not apply (i) and this seems to be the correct view. In a Patna case (j) the High Court held that O 23 r 3 applied to such a case and directed the trial Court to take an account of the money alleged to have been paid by the mortgagor after the date of the preliminary decree. If the decree is a consent decree or one which is not passed under rr 4 and 5 there is no obligation to pay into Court and the Court can inquire into the payment or adjustment whether certified or not (k).

**Dismissal of mortgagee's application for final decree for default**—Where an application is made by the mortgagee for a final decree it should not be dismissed for his subsequent absence. If it is dismissed the order of dismissal must be set aside and a final decree must be passed (l).

**Sufficient part thereof**—It is not necessary to sell all the properties mortgaged at once. Ordinarily the right of selling in a particular order rests with the decree holder but in view of equities arising in favour of various parties the Court may direct the order in which they should be sold (m).

**Effect of sale under mortgage decree**—By a sale of property in execution of a decree for the payment of money the interest of the judgment debtor alone passes to the purchaser (n). By a sale of mortgaged property in execution of a mortgage decree the interest both of the mortgagor and mortgagee passes to the purchaser (o). See notes to r 1 above under the head Consequences of non joinder.

**Injunction restraining mortgagor from receiving income of mortgaged property**—It has been held in Allahabad that it is not competent to the Court after a final decree for sale has been passed to restrain the mortgagor by an injunction from

(h) *Si ga Ray v Pathu Raja* (1919) 42 Mad 61 48 IC 196. *P n Bibi v Juten darya* (1913) 5 Cal LJ 553 40 IC 845.

(i) *R m J Lal v Si gh Karam* (1917) 39 All 632 40 IC 44.

(j) *Joge dha v Gours* (1917) Pat LJ 533 40 IC 345.

(k) *Mangar Sahu v Bhatoo Si gh* (1920) 5 Pat LJ 872 57 IC 473. *Sital Singh v Baijnath* (1914) 44 All 468 75 IC 485 2 A A 393.

(l) *Jodha v Gok n* (1915) 47 All 546 87 IC 25 (25) A A 6. *Chandav Am r* (1927) 49 All 50 101 IC 66 (1) A A 439.

(m) *Pakshwar Prasad v Mahammad Rahiman* (1924) 5 Pat 5 78 IC 796 (1) A P 459.

(n) See notes to O 21 r 91.

(o) *Meghna v Shakra* (1893) 2 Bom 945. *Deva Lalubhai v Al ndas* (1896) 10 Bom 390. *Perumal v Kareri* (1893) 16 Mad 11.



receiving the income of the mortgaged property even if there be a good ground for it. The reason given is that all that the decree holder is entitled to is to have the property sold and nothing more (p)

**Limitation for application for final decree**—See note to r 3 above under the same head

**Limitation for application for execution of final decree**—See note to r 3 above under the same head

**Appeal**—Under the present Code a party aggrieved by a preliminary decree passed under r 4 of this Order may appeal from it. If he does not appeal from it he is precluded from disputing its correctness in an appeal which may be preferred from the final decree passed under this rule [s 97] (q). Even under the old Code the correctness of the decree under sec 89 of the Transfer of Property Act [now O 34 r 4] could not be questioned in an application for an order absolute under sec 89 [now O 34 r 5] or in an appeal from an order absolute made on such an application (r).

An adjudication dismissing an application under this rule for a final decree for sale is not an order under s 47 but a decree and is appealable as such under s 96 (s) and is therefore not open to revision (t).

**Dekkan Agriculturists Relief Act 17 of 1879**—As to the applicability of this rule to cases under the Dekkan Agriculturists Relief Act see the undermentioned case (u).

**Court fees Act**—An appeal from a final decree for sale under this rule requires an ad valorem court fee and cannot be stamped as an appeal from an order (i).

**Costs not recoverable from mortgagor personally**—In a mortgage decree for sale costs are part of the amount due upon the mortgage and are recoverable from the mortgaged property and not personally from the mortgagor unless the decree itself so directs (w).

**6 [New Act 4 of 1882 s 90]** Where the net proceeds of any sale held under the last preceding rule are found insufficient to pay the amount due to the plaintiff, the Court, on application by him, may, if the balance is legally recoverable from the defendant otherwise than out of the property sold, pass a decree for such balance.

**The old rule**—The above rule has been substituted for old r 6 by Transfer of Property (Amendment) Supplementary Act 1929 which comes into operation on the 1st April 1930. The old rule is as follows—

**6** Where the net proceeds of any such sale are found to be insufficient to pay the amount due to the plaintiff if the balance is legally recoverable from the defendant otherwise than out of the property sold the Court may pass a decree for such amount.

(p) *Muhammad Inamullah v Varma* (1915) 37 All 423 29 I C 601

(q) *Kul da v Ramananda* (1921) 48 Cal 1036 81 I C 9-3 (1) A C 109. *Jogend a v S tynd a* (19 5) 29 C W N 610 90 I C 380 (5) A C 790

(r) *Muridha v Mahendras* (1916) 40 Bom 321 327 33 I C 749

(s) *S Bhalakrishna v Ramanujan* (1919) 82 Mad 57 48 I C 28

(t) *K m r Ga ranand v Pirthichand* (19 0) 5 Pat L J 312

(u) *Kashinath v Rama* (1916) 40 Bom 49 37 I C 255. *Sukhya v Suklat* (1904) 48

Bom 172 81 I C 634 (24) A B 189  
(v) *Baigra i Lal v Alahabir* (1913) 85 All 476 21 I C 498 (F B). *Jank bai v Chamma* (19-0) 2 Bom L R 811 57 I C 579

(w) *Mstakhdari v Ramdas* (1917) 2 Pat L J 51 38 I C 214. *Damba Si gh v Kaya S gh* (1918) 40 All 109 43 I C 557. *Maqbul v Lalla* (1898) 20 All 8-3. *Muhammad v Bant Lal* (19 1) 45 All- 630 73 I C 950 (24) A A 104. But see *Amina v Ram* (1919) 41 All 473, 50 I C 730. *Shro Da hen v Bant Chaudhri* (19 6) 48 All 4-5 94 I C 8 2 (28) A A 424

The old rule and the new rule—The words any sale held under the last preceding section in the new rule have been substituted for the words any such sale. It is thus made clear that this rule applies to a sale held in execution of a decree passed under rule 5 which rule 8 A applies to a sale held in execution of a decree passed under rule 8.

Personal Decree for balance against mortgagor—Where after the sale of the mortgaged property there is still a balance due to the mortgagee and that amount is legally recoverable from the mortgagor the mortgagee may apply for and obtain a decree under this rule against the mortgagor personally which he may execute against the person of the mortgagor or by attachment and sale of his other properties (x). A decree under this rule is a decree to be passed in the original suit and not in a fresh suit (y). The object of the rule is to obviate the necessity of a fresh suit to recover the balance (z). Such a suit in fact could not be brought except where the mortgagee had reserved his right to do so with the leave of the Court under O 2 r 2 (a). A personal decree under this rule for the balance should not be passed until after the mortgaged property had been sold and the proceeds found insufficient to pay the mortgage money in other words the Court should not while passing a decree for sale under r 5 pass a personal decree for the balance and a personal decree can only be passed when the sale proceeds are found to be insufficient to satisfy the mortgagee's claim (b). In a recent case the Judicial Committee held that a decree for sale under sec 88 of the Transfer of Property Act 1882 can validly provide that if the proceeds of sale are not sufficient to pay the mortgage debt the mortgagor should pay the balance personally though the personal decree could not be executed until after the property was sold and the nett sale proceeds were found to be insufficient to satisfy the debt (c). But the form of the decree to be passed under this rule Appendix D Form No 11 makes it clear that a personal decree cannot be passed until after the sale is held and the balance ascertained. If it is passed before sale and the mortgagor does not object he is estopped from doing so at a later stage (d). When the decree only gives the mortgagee a remedy against the mortgaged property the personal remedy having become time barred the mortgagee can only recover against the mortgaged property (e). See App A Form No 45 and App D Form No 4.

A personal decree cannot be passed under this rule unless all the properties directed to be sold under rr 4 and 5 have been sold. This is because the remedy of the mortgagee in the first instance is against the properties mortgaged and such properties should in the first instance be exhausted before a personal liability can be imposed upon the mortgagor. But this does not mean that if a portion of the properties is destroyed or has ceased to be available for sale through no fault of the mortgagee there can be no decree for personal liability against the mortgagor (f). It has similarly been held that the omission to include in the plaint a portion of the mortgaged property does not debar the mortgagee from obtaining a personal decree under this rule provided the omission was not intended to prejudice and has not prejudiced the mortgagor (g). In a case of a mortgage by the father of a joint Hindu family not being

- (x) *Sonatun Shah v Ali Hussain* (1889) 16 Cal 323.  
 (y) *Raj Singh v Purmanand* (1889) 11 All 486. *Musahed v Inayat ul lah* (1890) 14 All 513.  
 (z) *Madika Junadu v Lingamurti* (1900) 25 Mad 244 236.  
 (a) *Ibid* p 287.  
 (b) *Lal Behary Singh v Habibullah Khan* (1899) 26 Cal 166. *Pam Ranjan v Inda Naan* (1906) 33 Cal 890. *Damodar v Vyanku* (1907) 31 Bom 244. *Badr Das v Inayat Khan* (1900) All 404. *Ayyasamier v Venkata Kela* (1917) 40 Mad 989 996.  
 (c) 37 I C 741. *Janardhan v Erishji* (1911) 4 Bom L R 953 88 I C 377.  
 (d) *Jeena Bahu v Parmashur* (1919) 46 I A 994 47 Cal 370 49 I C 820.

- (d) *Taya v Teka Ram* (1914) 46 All 32 77 I C 32 (24) A A 5.  
 (e) *Hamm v Fagharendrarao* (1914) 4 Bom L R 410 67 I C 847 (2) A B 237.  
 (f) *Chand Mull v Ban Behari* (1913) 50 Cal 718 71 I C 101 (24) A C 209. *Satish Panjan v Mercantile Bank of India Ltd* (1918) 45 Cal 70 48 I C 3. *Ram Ranjan v Inda Naan* (1906) 33 Cal 890. *Badr Das v Inayat Khan* (1900) 2 All 404 explained in (1917) 45 Cal 70 716 48 I C 3. *Samanta v Loke Nath* (1911) 6 Pat L J 106 61 I C 635. (1914) 4 P 49. *Sahu Bhubhar v Chandu Lal* (1919) 50 All 31 108 I C 459 (28) A A 71.  
 (g) *Copal v Bhanu* (1917) 4 Pat L J 539 41 I C 56.

one for necessity the High Court of Madras held that the mortgagee was entitled to a conditional decree under this rule against the father personally and against the joint family property of himself and his undivided sons for the recovery of the balance in case the sale proceeds of the father's share of the mortgaged property was insufficient (h). Where a sale in execution of a decree on a mortgage by a Hindu lady was set aside at the instance of her grandson who was the real owner the Allahabad High Court passed a personal decree against her under this rule saying that the mortgagee having been compelled to refund the purchase money to the purchaser the net proceeds of the sale were nil and therefore insufficient to pay the amount due (i). The absence of any reservation in the preliminary decree of liberty to the decree holder to apply for a personal decree does not disable him from doing so later (j).

Where net proceeds of any such sale held under r 5 are found insufficient.—A personal decree under this rule can only follow *the mortgage decree under which the sale is held*. Therefore if a sale has taken place under a decree on a prior mortgage that would not entitle a subsequent mortgagee who has also obtained a decree for sale to apply for and obtain a decree under this rule. The reason is that the sale was not held under his decree (k). Similarly where a person holding two mortgages over the same property brings two suits on those mortgages and obtains two decrees and the mortgaged property is sold under one of those decrees the fact that the sale proceeds after discharging that decree are not sufficient to pay the amount due under the other decree would not entitle him to apply for and obtain a personal decree under this rule for the balance due under the other decree. The reason is that the property was sold not under that decree but under the first decree (l).

Amount due.—A personal decree under this rule can only be passed where the net proceeds of the sale are insufficient to pay the amount due to the mortgagee. The expression amount due includes costs (m) [see r 4 (1)]. It also includes when a puisne mortgagee is plaintiff the amount paid by him in satisfaction of prior mortgages (n).

Personal obligation to pay a question of construction.—In India a mortgage does not necessarily import a personal obligation to repay. *Prima facie* this obligation is present in simple mortgages and of course in English mortgages. *Prima facie* it is not present in mortgages by conditional sale and in usufructuary mortgages. In each case the question is one of construction of the mortgage instrument and the personal liability to repay may become barred before the right of recourse to the mortgaged property is barred (o).

Legally recoverable.—No decree can be passed for the balance under this rule unless the balance is *legally recoverable*. The balance is not legally recoverable if the right to recover the mortgage debt from the mortgagor personally is barred by limitation at the date of the suit for sale. It would be barred in the case of an unregistered instrument after the expiration of three years from the date on which it is repayable and in the case of a registered instrument after the expiration of six years from that date (p) unless the right is kept alive by acknowledgment as provided by s 19 of the

- (h) *Kanda m v Kuppu Mooppan* (19 0) 43 Mad 421 55 I C 370  
 (i) *Badal S gh v Debi Kandan* (19 7) 49 All 506 100 I C 775 (7) A A 395  
 (j) *Go ndawami v A Iarwan* (19 7) 53 M J L J 480 103 I C 58 (7) A M 79 Pat Sahib v J hu (19 8) 33 C W N 300 (29) A C 387  
 (k) *Badri D s v Inayat Khan* (1906) All 104 Durbari Mal v Moolu Singh (19 0) 4 All 519 56 I C 152  
 (l) *Bulaki Das v Secretary of State* (1909) 31 All 371 1 I C 896  
 (m) *Kamalamma v Kom nd* (1907) 30 Mad 461, *I J Kuma v Shew y* (1906) 35 Cal 431 *Al ghul v Lalla* (1899) 20

- All 53  
 ( ) *Al Jan v Marum Bt* (1901) 6 All 93  
 (o) *I H v Grg y* (19 5) 5 Cal 82 863 44 89 I C 1 (5) A C 834 J 91 S 94 v Ch da Mal (1904) 30 All 383 [simple mortg g]  
 (p) *Munsherb E man v Inayat ul-lah* (1907) 14 All 613, 514 *Pam D a v Kula* (1893) 7 All 507 12 I A 1 *Miller v R nra Bala* (1896) 1 Cal 349 *Qulam Hus n v Mahomedali* (1910) 31 I C M 540 7 I C 455 *Al tra v Kulu* (1910) 41 All 581 60 I C 610 *Caneel Lal Iand t v Khet amohan Mahapat a* (1906) 53 I A 134 5 I C 585 95 I C 853 (26) A I C 6

Limitation Act 1908 or by payment of interest or part payment of principal as provided by s 20 of that Act. If the right to recover the mortgage debt from the mortgagor personally is not barred at the date of the suit for sale the mortgagee is entitled if there is a deficiency to a personal decree for the balance though the application under this rule may be made after the expiry of the period of limitation for a suit for a personal decree (2). The mortgagee however is not entitled to wait indefinitely for a personal decree after the deficiency has been ascertained. He must apply for a personal decree within three years from the date when the deficiency is ascertained as provided by Art 181 of the Limitation Act otherwise the application will be time barred (r).

Legally recoverable from the defendant otherwise than out of the property sold.—These words mean by way of illustration that the balance must be a balance which the mortgagee is not precluded by the terms of the mortgage from realizing otherwise than out of the property sold (s).

Personal liability of purchaser from mortgagor.—The transferee of the equity of redemption in mortgaged property who has agreed with the mortgagor to pay to the mortgagee the amount due to him is not a person from whom the balance is legally recoverable within the meaning of this rule there being no contract between him and the mortgagee. Hence no personal decree can be passed against the transferee under this rule at the instance of the mortgagee (f).

Costs against puisne mortgagee.—A prior mortgagee is not entitled to a decree under this rule against a puisne mortgagee for the amount of his costs. The present rule does not apply to such a case (u).

Limitation.—See notes above. Legally recoverable.

Consent decree.—A consent decree may provide for personal recovery from the mortgagor by execution of the decree if the sale proceeds are insufficient and in that case no further decree under this rule is necessary (t).

Appeal.—An appeal from a decree under this rule lies to the District Judge and not to the High Court notwithstanding that the decree be for a sum exceeding Rs 5 000 if the original mortgage suit was valued at less than Rs 5 000 (w). See notes to sec 98 Forum of appeal.

**7** [New Act IV of 1882, s 92] (1) In a suit for redemption, if the plaintiff succeeds, the Court shall pass a preliminary decree—

Preliminary decree in redemption suit

(a) ordering that an account be taken of what was due to the defendant at the date of such decree for—

(i) principal and interest on the mortgage,

(ii) the costs of suit, if any, awarded to him, and

- (g) *Hamid ud-din v. Kadir & Baith* (1898) 20 All 385; *Chattar Mal v. Thakur* (1898) 20 All 512; *Jagjit Singh v. Chandar Mal* (1908) 30 All 389; *Rahmat Karim v. Abd. Karim* (1907) 34 C 1 67; *F. M. Heli v. Ram Patan* (1929) 4 Luck 237; 114 I C 769 (29) A O 59.
- (r) *M. Hamid v. Alim-un-nissa* (1918) 40 All 551; 47 I C 56; *Fell v. Gorry* (1915) 5 Cal 828; 89 I C 1 (25) A C 834 (F B).
- (s) *Murshid Zaman v. Inayat-ul-Jah* (1891) 14 All 513; 518.

- (t) *Jamna Das v. Ram Autar* (1911) 34 All 63; 39 I A 7; 13 I C 304 [P C] affirmed; 19 (1909) 31 All 3; 21 C 460; *Banku Prasad v. K. L. Prasad* (1912) 26 C W 771; 93 I C 970 (13) A C 54 [P C].
- (u) *F. M. Lal v. S. L. Chand* (1901) 23 All 489; *Mata Amber v. Sri Dha* (1904) 6 All 507.
- (v) *Adity Prasad v. H. Gorind Singh* (1910) 3 Luck 411; 103 I C 723 (118) A O 490.
- (w) *B. D. Das v. Shankar* (1919) 41 All 384; 49 I C 687.



Limitation Act 1908 or by payment of interest or part payment of principal as provided by s 20 of that Act. If the right to recover the mortgage debt from the mortgagor personally is not barred at the date of the suit for sale the mortgagee is entitled if there is a deficiency to a personal decree for the balance though the application under this rule may be made after the expiry of the period of limitation for a suit for a personal decree (q). The mortgagee however is not entitled to wait indefinitely for a personal decree after the deficiency has been ascertained. He must apply for a personal decree within three years from the date when the deficiency is ascertained as provided by Art 181 of the Limitation Act otherwise the application will be time barred (r).

Legally recoverable from the defendant otherwise than out of the property sold.—These words mean by way of illustration that the balance must be a balance which the mortgagee is not precluded by the terms of the mortgage from realizing otherwise than out of the property sold (s).

Personal liability of purchaser from mortgagor.—The transferee of the equity of redemption in mortgaged property who has agreed with the mortgagor to pay to the mortgagee the amount due to him is not a person from whom the balance is legally recoverable within the meaning of this rule there being no contract between him and the mortgagee. Hence no personal decree can be passed against the transferee under this rule at the instance of the mortgagee (t).

Costs against puisne mortgagee.—A prior mortgagee is not entitled to a decree under this rule against a puisne mortgagee for the amount of his costs. The present rule does not apply to such a case (u).

Limitation.—See notes above. Legally recoverable.

Consent decree.—A consent decree may provide for personal recovery from the mortgagor by execution of the decree if the sale proceeds are insufficient and in that case no further decree under this rule is necessary (v).

Appeal.—An appeal from a decree under this rule lies to the District Judge and not to the High Court notwithstanding that the decree be for a sum exceeding Rs 5 000 if the original mortgage suit was valued at less than Rs 5 000 (w). See notes to sec 98 Forum of appeal.

7 [N<sup>ew</sup> Act IV of 1882, s 92] (1) In a suit for redemption, if the plaintiff succeeds, the Court shall pass a preliminary decree—

Preliminary decrees in redemption suit

(a) ordering that an account be taken of what was due to the defendant at the date of such decree for—

(i) principal and interest on the mortgage,

(ii) the costs of suit, if any awarded to him, and

(g) *Hamid ud-din v Kedar Nath* (1898) 20 All 388. *Chatter Mal v Thakurs* (1898) 20 All 512. *Ja gir Singh v Chanda Mal* (1908) 0 All 388. *R Amal K run v Abd i K run* (1907) 34 Cal 8. *R m H t v Ram Rat n* (19 9) 4 Lu k. 37. 114 I C 769 (29) A O 59.

(r) *Muhamm d v Al m-un-nisa* (1918) 40 All 551. 47 I C 56. *P H v Gregory* (19 5) 52 Cal 8-8. 89 I C 1 ( 5) A C 834 (F B).

(s) *Mur h b Zaman v Inayat-ul-Jah* (189 ) 14 All 513 518.

(t) *Jamna Das v Pam Aulor* (191 ) 31 All 83. 39 I A 7. 13 I C 304 (F C) affirm. *ing* (1909) 31 All 3. 2 I C 460. *Antu P a ad v Anila Prasad* (19 ) 25 C W 771. 9 I C 9 0 ( 3) A PC 54 (PC).

(u) *R m Lal v Sit Chand* (1901) 23 All 439. *M ta Amber v Sri Dhar* (1904) 6 All 507.

(v) *Aditya Prasad v Harpovind S ngh* (19-3) 3 Luck 411. 108 I C 723 (23) A O 490.

(w) *B d un Nara v Shankar* (1919) 41 All 334. 49 I C 687.

- (iii) other costs, charges and expenses properly incurred by him up to that date, in respect of his mortgage security, together with interest thereon, or
- (b) declaring the amount so due at that date, and
- (c) directing—
  - (i) that, if the plaintiff pays into Court the amount so found or declared due on or before such date as the Court may fix within six months from the date on which the Court confirms and countersigns the account taken under clause (a), or from the date on which such amount is declared in Court under clause (b), as the case may be, and thereafter pays such amount as may be adjudged due in respect of subsequent costs, charges and expenses as provided in rule 10, together with subsequent interest on such sums respectively as provided in rule 11, the defendant shall deliver up to the plaintiff, or to such person as the plaintiff appoints, all documents in his possession or power relating to the mortgaged property, and shall, if so required, re transfer the property to the plaintiff at his cost free from the mortgage and from all incumbrances created by the defendant or any person claiming under him, or, where the defendant claims by derived title, by those under whom he claims, and shall also, if necessary, put the plaintiff in possession of the property, and
  - (ii) that, if payment of the amount found or declared due under or by the preliminary decree is not made on or before the date so fixed, or the plaintiff fails to pay, within such time as the Court may fix, the amount adjudged due in respect of subsequent costs, charges, expenses and interest, the defendant shall be entitled to apply for a final decree—
    - (a) in the case of a mortgage other than a usufructuary mortgage, a mortgage by conditional sale, or an anomalous mortgage the terms of which provide for foreclosure only and not for sale, that the mortgaged property be sold, or

- (b) in the case of a mortgage by conditional sale or such an anomalous mortgage as aforesaid, that the plaintiff be debarred from all right to redeem the property

(2) The Court may, on good cause shown and upon terms to be fixed by the Court, from time to time, at any time before the passing of a final decree for foreclosure or sale, as the case may be, extend the time fixed for the payment of the amount found or declared due under sub rule (1) or of the amount adjudged due in respect of subsequent costs, charges, expenses and interest

The old rule—The above rule has been substituted for old r 7 by the Transfer of Property (Amendment) Supplementary Act 1929 which comes into operation on the 1st April 1930. The old rule is as follows—

7 In a suit for redemption if the plaintiff succeeds the Court shall pass a decree—

- (a) ordering that an account be taken of what will be due to the defendant for principal and interest on the mortgage and for his costs of the suit (if any) awarded to him on the day next hereinafter referred to or

- (b) declaring the amount so due at the date of such decree

and directing—

- (c) that if the plaintiff pays into Court the amount so due on a day within six months from the date of declaring in Court the amount so due to be fixed by the Court the defendant shall deliver up to the plaintiff or to such person as he appoints all documents in his possession or power relating to the mortgaged property and shall, if so required, retransfer the property to the plaintiff free from the mortgage and from all incumbrances created by the defendant or any person claiming under him or where the defendant claims by derived title by those under whom he claims and shall if necessary put the plaintiff in possession of the property but

- (d) that if such payment is not made on or before the day to be fixed by the Court the plaintiff shall (unless the mortgage is simple or usufructuary) be debarred from all right to redeem or (unless the mortgage is by conditional sale) that the mortgaged property be sold

The old rule and the new rule—

1 The general changes in this rule are on the lines of those in new rules 2 and 4 above. See note to r 2 and to r 4. The old rule and the new rule

2 In sub rule (1) (c) (u) the cases in which a decree for sale and the cases in which a decree for foreclosure can be passed have been specifically mentioned. See Transfer of Property Act sec 67

3 Sub rule (2) empowers the Court to extend the time for payment until a final decree for foreclosure or sale has been passed.

Preliminary decree for redemption—This rule excepting sub rule (1) (c) (u) corresponds with r 2 above which relates to a preliminary decree for foreclosure. The notes on that rule apply mutatis mutandis to this rule. For the form of a preliminary decree for redemption see Appendix D form no 5

Other costs charges and expenses—See notes to r 2 above under the same head



Subsequent costs, charges and expenses —See r 10 below

Subsequent interest —See r 11 below

**Power to extend time in suit for redemption**—The proviso to old r 8 was in these terms provided that the Court may upon good cause shown and upon such terms (if any) as it thinks fit from time to time postpone the day fixed for payment. Under the present rule the Court has the power to extend the time *at any time before the passing of a final decree for foreclosure or sale*. It is clear that the new sub rule 7 ( ) applies in every case where a decree for redemption has been passed whatever may be the nature of the mortgage (x). When in a partition suit an alienation of part of the property was held binding for a certain amount only and the alienee was ordered to give possession on payment being made of that amount in a certain time this was held to be an effect a decree for redemption and subject to the power of enlargement of time (y). But this decision is of doubtful authority. See notes to r (2) above. Power to extend time in foreclosure suit. The application for extension of time should be made to the Court of the first instance even if the decree for redemption was passed by the appellate Court (z).

**Appeal**—An appeal lies from an order refusing to extend the time for payment under O 43 r 1 (o).

**8 [New Act 4 of 1892, s 93]** (1) Where, before a final decree debarring the plaintiff from all right to redeem the mortgaged property has been passed or before the confirmation of a sale held in pursuance of a final decree passed under sub rule (3) of this rule, the plaintiff makes payment into Court of all amounts due from him under sub rule (1) of rule 7, the Court shall, on application made by the plaintiff in this behalf, pass a final decree or, if such decree has been passed, an order—

(a) ordering the defendant to deliver up the documents referred to in the preliminary decree,

and, if necessary,—

(b) ordering him to re-transfer at the cost of the plaintiff the mortgaged property as directed in the said decree,

and, also, if necessary,—

(c) ordering him to put the plaintiff in possession of the property

(2) Where the mortgaged property or a part thereof has been sold in pursuance of a decree passed under sub rule (3)

(x) *Narayan v. Jantip* (19 8) 6 All 28 211  
 11 24 (8) A.A. 480  
 (y) *Idamba Rao v. Jetha Reddy* (19 0) 43  
 Mal 3 54 IC 451  
 (z) *Pam Das v. Lalit Das* (1900) 31 All

38 IC 6 *Dharmaraja v. Gnanas*  
 (1916) 39 Mal 8 631 IC 10 B 1  
*Prasad v. Harnam Das* (191) 29 All  
 396 39 IC 630

of this rule, the Court shall not pass an order under sub rule (1) of this rule, unless the plaintiff, in addition to the amount mentioned in sub rule (1), deposits in Court for payment to the purchaser a sum equal to five per cent of the amount of the purchase money paid into Court by the purchaser

Where such deposit has been made, the purchaser shall be entitled to an order for repayment of the amount of the purchase money paid into Court by him, together with a sum equal to five per cent thereof

(3) Where payment in accordance with sub rule (1) has not been made, the Court shall, on application made by the defendant in this behalf —

- (a) in the case of a mortgage by conditional sale or of such an anomalous mortgage as is hereinbefore referred to in rule 7, pass a final decree declaring that the plaintiff and all persons claiming under him are debarred from all right to redeem the mortgaged property and, also, if necessary, ordering the plaintiff to put the defendant in possession of the mortgaged property, or
- (b) in the case of any other mortgage not being a usufructuary mortgage, pass a final decree that the mortgaged property or a sufficient part thereof be sold, and the proceeds of the sale (after deduction therefrom of the expenses of the sale) be paid into Court and applied in payment of what is found due to the defendant, and the balance, if any, be paid to the plaintiff or other persons entitled to receive the same "

The old rule —The above rule has been substituted for old r 8 by the Transfer of Property (Amendment) Supplementary Act 1929 which comes into operation on the 1st April 1930 The old rule is as follows —

8 (1) Where on or before the day fixed, the plaintiff pays into Court the amount declared due as aforesaid together with such subsequent costs as are mentioned in rule 10 the Court shall pass a decree—

- (a) ordering the defendant to deliver up the documents which under the terms of the preliminary decree he is bound to deliver up and, if so required —
- (b) ordering him to re transfer the mortgaged property as directed in the said decree and also if necessary —
- (c) ordering him to put the plaintiff in possession of the property

(2) Where such payment is not so made and the mortgage is not simple or usufructuary the Court shall on application made in that behalf by the defendant pass a decree that the plaintiff and all persons claiming through or under him be debarred from all right to redeem the mortgaged property and also if necessary ordering the plaintiff to put the defendant in possession of the property.

(3) On the passing of a decree under sub rule (2) the debt secured by the mortgage shall be deemed to be discharged.

(4) Where such payment is not so made and the mortgage is not by conditional sale the Court shall on application made in that behalf by the defendant pass a decree that the mortgaged property or a sufficient part thereof be sold and that the proceeds of the sale (after defraying thereout the expenses of the sale) be paid into Court and applied in payment of what is found due to the defendant and that the balance (if any) be paid to the plaintiff or other persons entitled to receive the same.

Provided that the Court may upon good cause shown and upon such terms (if any) as it thinks fit from time to time postpone the day fixed for payment.

The old rule and the new rule.—The changes in this rule have been made on the lines of those in rules 3 and 5 above. See notes to rr 3 and 5. The old rule and the new rule.

The provision regarding the power of the Court to extend the time for payment which appeared as a proviso to old rule 8 (4) has been transferred to new rule 7.

Sub rule (1) decree for mortgagor.—Sub rule (1) of this rule corresponds with sub rule (1) of rules 3 and 5. See notes to rules 3 and 5. Where the amount declared due in a decree for redemption is paid by the mortgagor into Court the mortgagor does not lose his right to a decree under sub rule (1) because he has attached and withdrawn from Court a portion of the sum so paid in execution of that portion of the decree which awarded him costs against the mortgagee (a). If time for payment has been extended payment within the time so extended gives the mortgagor a right to a decree (b). The mortgagee is not entitled under O 21 r 1 (c) to notice of payment into Court (c).

Sub rule (2) decree for foreclosure.—The mere fact that the preliminary decree for redemption does not contain a direction for foreclosure or sale in default of payment on the day fixed does not disentitle the mortgagee to a decree for foreclosure or sale as the court may do. The omission of the Court to draw up the proper decree under r 7 does not deprive the mortgagee of the relief provided by this rule (d). The decree for foreclosure or sale under this rule should be passed by the Court which passed the preliminary decree for redemption notwithstanding that the latter decree has been varied by the appellate Court (e).

**8A [New]** Where the net proceeds of any sale held under the last preceding rule are found insufficient to pay the amount due to the defendant, the Court on application by him, may, if the balance is legally recoverable from the plaintiff otherwise than out of the property sold, pass a decree for such balance.

Recovery of balance on application in suit for redemption

(a) *Jarmanand v Lalman Das* (1903) 7 All

(b) *M v C ngolai* (1904) 50 Ind 730 94

(c) *Shri v Lalman* (1903) 45 Ind 1 3 647 73

(d) *Murti v I. A. Ram* (1901) 5 Ind 101  
(e) *Shri v Thiagaraya* (1901) 3 Ind 101  
51 *Shri v A. (Lal)* (1901) 3 All 88

**Personal decree in suit for redemption**—This rule is new. It has been added by the Transfer of Property (Amendment) Supplementary Act 1929. Rule 6 provides for a personal decree against the mortgagor in a suit for sale brought by the mortgagee. The present rule provides for a personal decree in a suit for redemption brought by the mortgagee.

**9 Notwithstanding anything heretofore contained** if it appears upon taking the account referred to in rule 7, that nothing is due to the defendant or that he has been overpaid, the Court shall pass a decree directing the defendant if so required, to retransfer the property and to pay to the plaintiff the amount which may be found due to him and the plaintiff shall, if necessary, be put in possession of the mortgaged property.

This rule provides for cases where nothing is found due to the mortgagee and for cases where the mortgagee has been overpaid as may well happen where he is in possession. There was no such provision in the Transfer of Property Act but the practice followed under that Act was the same as that prescribed by this rule (f).

**10 [New Act 4 of 1882 s 94]** In finally adjusting the amount to be paid to a mortgagee in case of a foreclosure sale or redemption the Court shall, unless in the case of costs of the suit the conduct of the mortgagee has been such as to disentitle him thereto, add to the mortgage money such costs of the suit and other costs, charges and expenses as have been properly incurred by him since the date of the preliminary decree for foreclosure, sale or redemption up to the time of actual payment.

**The old rule**—The above rule has been substituted for old r 10 by the Transfer of Property (Amendment) Supplementary Act 1929 which comes into operation on 1st April 1930. The old rule is as follows—

**10** In finally adjusting the amount to be paid to a mortgagee in case of a foreclosure or sale or redemption the Court shall unless the conduct of the mortgagee has been such as to disentitle him to costs add to the mortgage money such costs of suit as have been properly incurred by him since the decree for foreclosure or sale or redemption up to the time of actual payment.

**Other costs charges and expenses**—The words "and other costs charges and expenses" are new. The addition of these words makes it clear that all costs charges and expenses properly incurred by a mortgagee subsequent to the passing of the preliminary decree are to be added to the mortgage money and the mortgagor has to pay them before he can redeem the mortgage. Such cost charges and expenses were added to the mortgage money even before the amendment of the present rule by the Act of 1929 (g).

(f) See *Fau v. Lish* (1901) Bom 115; *Yad v. Dattaji* (1907) 6 Bom 661.

(g) *Allahabad Bank v. Motilal Barmen* (1917) 44 Cal 418.

But costs of a successful appeal by the mortgagee from an order striking off execution proceedings cannot be so added. The mortgagor is liable for them personally (h) If the costs of an appeal from a preliminary decree have by mistake been omitted in the final decree the Court of execution cannot include them (i) Subsequent interest not mentioned in the final decree must be taken as refused (j)

**11** [New] In any decree passed in a suit for foreclosure, sale or redemption, where interest is legally recoverable, the Court may order payment of interest to the mortgagee as follows, namely —

(a) Interest up to the date on or before which payment of the amount found or declared due is under the preliminary decree to be made by the mortgagor or other person redeeming the mortgage—

(i) on the principal amount found or declared due on the mortgage,—at the rate payable on the principal, or, where no such rate is fixed at such rate as the Court deems reasonable

(ii) on the amount of the costs of the suit awarded to the mortgagee,—at such rate as the Court deems reasonable from the date of the preliminary decree, and

(iii) on the amount adjudged due to the mortgagee for costs, charges and expenses properly incurred by the mortgagee in respect of the mortgage security up to the date of the preliminary decree and added to the mortgage money,—at the rate agreed between the parties or failing such rate, at the same rate as is payable on the principal, or failing both such rates, at nine per cent per annum, and

(b) Subsequent interest up to the date of realization or actual payment at such rate as the Court deems reasonable—

(i) on the aggregate of the principal sums specified in clause (a) and of the interest thereon as calculated in accordance with that clause, and

(ii) on the amount adjudged due to the mortgagee in respect of such further costs, charges and expenses as may be payable under rule 10

(A) *Het Ram v Paja D it* (19 6) 48 All 68  
96 I C 59 ( 6) A A "

(C) *Pam Sarup v Var n D* (19 ) 45 All

198 60 I C 944 ( 3) A A 141  
(J) *Telast Aravind v Surendra* (1900) 5 Pat  
L J 598 58 I C 2 3

The old rule—This rule relates to interest. The old rule had nothing to do with interest. It gave a right to a mesne mortgagee to redeem and foreclose. It is not transferred to the Transfer of Property Act as sec 94. It was as follows—

11 Where property is mortgaged for successive debts to successive mortgagees any mesne mortgagee may institute a suit to redeem the interests of the prior mortgagee and to foreclose the rights of those that are posterior to himself and of the mortgagor.

Interest in mortgage suits—This rule is new. It has been added by the Transfer of Property (Amendment) Supplementary Act 1930. It comes into operation on 1st April 1930. It gives effect to judicial decisions under the Transfer of Property Act 1882 and under O 34 of the Code. Summarising those decisions it may be said that in a suit on a mortgage the Court awarded—

- (1) interest on the principal prior to the date of the suit at the rate provided by the mortgage (Usury Laws Repeal Act 1850 s 2) unless the rate is penal in which case the Court may award such interest as it deems proper (A) [Indian Contract Act 1872 s 74] or the interest is excessive and the transaction was substantially unfair in which case also the Court may reduce it (Various Loans Act 1918 s 3) and
- (2) interest on the principal from the date of the suit up to the date fixed by the Court for payment of the mortgage debt also at the rate provided by the mortgage [Transfer of Property Act ss 86 88 now O 34 rr 1 and 4] unless the rate is penal in which case the Court may award interest at such rate as it deems proper (b) or the interest is excessive and the transaction was substantially unfair in which case also the Court may reduce it (c)
- (3) interest on the aggregate amount of principal interest and costs from the date fixed for the payment of the mortgage debt up to the date of redemption or actual payment at such rate as the Court deems proper. It may be allowed at the Court rate that is 6 per cent per annum (n) or at any other rate (o). The Court is not bound to award it at the contract rate (p).

As to item (3) above it was contended on behalf of the mortgagor before their Lordships of the Privy Council in *Maharaja of Bharatpur v Lanno Desai* (q) that according to the true construction of s 88 of the Transfer of Property Act the Court had no power to award interest subsequent to the date fixed for payment of the mortgage debt but this contention was overruled and it was held that that section did not preclude the payment of such interest and this view was reiterated by their Lordships in *Sunder Rao v Ras Sham Kishen* (r) and *Raja Gokuldas v Sheth Glasiram* (s). O 34 r 4 which is in substance a reproduction of sec 88 of the Transfer of Property Act now contains an express provision for payment of subsequent interest.

- (k) *P. Jaram v Ra. Sank* (1915) 4 Cal 6 27 I.C. 815 (interest reduced from per cent to 4 per cent)
- (l) *P. v. M. H. Hossain* (1899) 6 Cal 39 2 I.A. 19 as explained in *Sunder Rao v Ras Sham Kishen* (1907) 34 Cal 150 34 I.A. 9. *Jagannath Prasad v S. R. Jai* (1917) 4 I.A. 1. *S. R. Jai v Jog. d. d.* (1893) 8 Cal 360. *Chaturbhaj Harbh. ji* (1896) 8 Bom 44. *S. Bhojya v P. n. m.* (1898) 11 Mad 364. *R. Jaiya v. Sham* (1914) 36 All 20 31 C 88.
- (m) In *Jaiji Sirji Khamtai v. Qazi Ramzan* 4th (1907) 24 C.W.N. 8 58 I.C. 89 the I.C. disallowed interest for the period taken up by appeal by the mortgagee in the case having been hung up by his petis

- tence in a setting an unwarrantable claim for interest.
- (n) *S. da. Ko. v. P. R. Sh. m. K. Shen* (1907) 34 Cal 10 34 I.A. 9. *S. Bhojya v. J. n. m.* (1898) 21 M.D. 304. *S. n. nath v. S. n. nath* (1906) 9 Mal 10.
- (o) *Lark v. S. n. nath v. S. n. nath* (1907) 9 All 3 [where the Court awarded simple interest at the contract rate which was 10 per cent per annum]. *Bh. gat S. gh. v. J. Kam* (1911) 1 R.N. 11. *P. 1. 6* I.C. 40 [9 per cent per annum allowed].
- (p) *Su. i. r. Kor. v. P. n. m. Kishen* (1907) 34 Cal 150 34 I.A. 9.
- (q) (1907) 24 C.W.N. 8 58 I.C. 89.
- (r) (1907) 34 Cal 10 34 I.A. 9.
- (s) (1908) 3 Cal 1 34 I.A. 8.

11 On a preliminary decree for foreclosure or sale under rr 2 and 4 a mortgage is entitled to interest at the rate and with the rests stipulated in the mortgage down to the date fixed for redemption by the decree and if the decree is varied on appeal down to the date fixed for redemption by the Appellate Court (f)

Although a mortgage for ample security provides for excessive and usurious interest no presumption arises that it was induced by undue influence in the absence of proof by the mortgagor that the mortgagee was in a position to dominate his will (u)

There was a considerable conflict of decisions as to whether if there was no express provision in the mortgage deed for payment of interest after the due date for payment specified in the deed the Court could allow interest subsequent to that date. It was held in some cases that if on an examination of the deed the Court came to the conclusion that there was an intention to pay interest not only up to the due date but also after that date and up to the date of payment the Court should allow interest on the footing that the deed contained a provision for the payment of such interest (v). Where the deed contained a stipulation for periodical payment of interest and there was nothing in the deed to suggest that the liability in respect of interest should cease on the due date it was presumed by the Court that there was an intention to pay interest up to the date of payment (w). If on the other hand the Court came to the conclusion that there was no intention to pay interest after the due date the practice was to allow interest by way of damages at the contract rate. At the same time it was recognised that the contract rate was not necessarily the measure of damages (x). Where interest was allowed by way of damages it was held by the High Courts of Calcutta and Madras that it could be added to the mortgage money and recovered out of the mortgaged property (y). The High Court of Allahabad held that it could not be recovered out of the mortgaged property and that there could only be a personal decree against the mortgagor for such interest (z). It was thought in some cases that the claim for interest by way of damages being a claim for compensation for breach of contract the claim would be barred unless it was made in a suit on a mortgage within three years from the due date fixed for payment of the mortgage money in the case of an unregistered instrument and six years in the case of a registered instrument (a). In the undermentioned case (b) however the Judicial Committee observed that such a claim was a recurring one within the meaning of sec 23 of the Limitation Act and that so long as the principal was not barred interest for three or for six years as the case may be could be recovered. These nice distinctions have been done away by the present rule and provision is made in sub rule (b) for interest subsequent to the date of the preliminary decree and the rate of interest is left to the discretion of the Court.

- (t) J ga ath v S rajan l (19 ) 4 I A 1  
54 Cal 161 99 IC 646 ( ) A IC 1  
(u) Rajah ath Pra ad v S j P a d l (19 4)  
1 I A 101 3 Pat 79 8 IC 81  
(24 ) A FC 60  
(v) M th a Das v Pay v i l (189 ) 19  
All 33 23 I A 138 B de re v a i v  
a ga Da an hat l (1899) 20 All 171  
I A v Saral Das v J g nira (1898)  
Cal 46 I Ila v Ila nira v tange  
l dh ) 0 M d 149 v tpa da v Sra  
I dh (189 ) 0 M l 3 I G la taji v  
I pay, (1900) 3 M d 534  
(w) J a a v Ipp l s (1899) Mad 339  
M ger l th ba T ap Sa l g v  
l g s (1898) B m 10 wh re it  
l ppe ur d from th id n that th  
mortg gor h d i id int re t for a veral  
y ar aff th d d t  
(x) C j l Das v B j Bhulan L l (189 )  
1 All 511 v I A 193 Math R D s  
v Raja v a ndar (189 ) 19 All 39 3  
I A 138  
(y) Bakra j t v D rya Dami (1894) 1 C l  
-74 Mola v Ramohari (189 ) 24 C l  
699 Pama Padd v Ipp R d l (184 )  
18 M d 248 See also Chajad v Bra  
Bhikan (189 ) 17 All 511 I A  
199 wh re inter t awarded as dam es  
was directed to b added to the pr n ipal  
in taking the accounts  
( ) v ri Ira B l ad v I hat m Hus  
(189 ) 1 All 581 R E h T m v Shoo  
I a han (1896) 18 All 316  
(a) G d l Foer v Bh baneswari (189 ) 19 Cal  
19 M l v Ram hira (190 ) 4 Cal 63  
v a Itra v Kh l m (189 ) 1 All 81  
B l v v (189 ) 18 M l 7 Th m  
imnal v Laksh v (189 ) 18 Mad 531  
(b) M th ra Das v Raja v a ndar (189 ) 19  
All 39 4 3 I A 138

12 [Act 4 of 1882, s 96] Where any property the sale of which is directed under this Order is subject to a prior mortgage, the Court may, with the consent of the prior mortgagee, direct that the property be sold free from the same, giving to such prior mortgagee the same interest in the proceeds of the sale as he had in the property sold

*Sale of property subject to prior mortgage*  
 Sale of property free from prior mortgage—A puisne mortgagee may sue for foreclosure or sale without making the prior mortgagee a party to the suit [see the Explanation to r 1] In such a case as also where the prior mortgagee is joined as a party and his mortgage is admitted (c) the prior mortgagee may consent to the property being sold free from his mortgage in which case he acquires the right to have his claim satisfied first out of the proceeds of the sale of the mortgaged property [see r 13 below]

Where the prior mortgagee is a usufructuary mortgage—A holds two mortgages on the same property the first a usufructuary and the second a simple mortgage Can A sue for sale of the mortgaged property on the simple mortgage free from the usufructuary mortgage and claim to be paid out of the sale proceeds the amount due upon the usufructuary mortgage under this and the next rule? Yes according to the Madras ruling (d) No according to the Allahabad rulings unless the two mortgages are in favour of different persons (e)

The High Court of Patna has held that where a person holds two mortgages on the same property the first a usufructuary and the second a simple mortgage he is entitled to sue for the sale of the mortgaged property on the simple mortgage subject to his prior usufructuary mortgage and also that he is entitled to have the prior mortgage notified at the sale in execution of the decree obtained on the subsequent mortgage for the information of bidders at the sale though the prior mortgage was not mentioned in his plaint The omission to mention the prior mortgage in the plaint does not preclude him from keeping alive that mortgage by notifying it at the sale (f)

13 [Act 4 of 1882 s 97] (1) Such proceeds shall be brought into Court and applied as follows —

first in payment of all expenses incident to the sale or properly incurred in any attempted sale,

secondly, in payment of whatever is due to the prior mortgagee on account of the prior mortgage, and of costs, properly incurred in connection therewith

thirdly, in payment of all interest due on account of the mortgage in consequence whereof the sale was directed and of the costs of the suit in which the decree directing the sale was made,

(c) *Sri ranganatha v. Ramaswami* (1906) 9 Mad 84  
 (d) *J. G. M. v. Subbappa* (1907) 30 Mad 408  
 (e) *Bhajan Das v. Bhau* (1904) 6 All 14

(f) *Jagannath v. Mohra Kar* (1917) 21 at 1 J 118 391 C 6



fourthly, in payment of the principal money due on account of that mortgage, and

lastly, the residue (if any) shall be paid to the person proving himself to be interested in the property sold, or if there are more such persons than one, then to such persons according to their respective interests therein or upon their joint receipt

(2) Nothing in this rule or in rule 12 shall be deemed to affect the powers conferred by section 57 of the Transfer of Property Act, 1882

**Application of proceeds**—Compare s 73 proviso (c) which relates to subsequent and not prior incumbrances. See notes to s 73 Clauses (a) (b) and (c)

**Whatever is due to the prior mortgagee**—This includes interest on the mortgage up to the date of the confirmation of the sale (g)

**Persons interested in the property sold**—It is provided by the last clause of sub r (1) that the residue of the sale proceeds should be paid to *persons interested in the property sold*. This expression includes subsequent incumbrances (h). But it does not include unsecured creditors who cannot be said to be interested in the property sold; they are at liberty however to enforce their claims against any surplus payable to the mortgagee (i).

**Usufructuary mortgage**—See notes to r 12 above

**14** [Act 4 of 1882, s 99] (1) Where a mortgagee has obtained a decree for the payment of money in satisfaction of a claim arising under the mortgage, he shall not be entitled to bring the mortgaged property to sale otherwise than by instituting a suit for sale in enforcement of the mortgage, and he may institute such suit notwithstanding anything contained in Order II, rule 2

(2) Nothing in sub rule (1) shall apply to any territories to which the Transfer of Property Act, 1882, has not been extended

**Scope and object of the rule**—This rule corresponds with s 99 of the Transfer of Property Act except that the words *claim arising under the mortgage* have been substituted for the words *any claim whether arising under the mortgage or not*. The effect of this alteration is to confine the operation of the present rule to cases where a mortgagee has obtained a personal decree against the mortgagor on the mortgage debt. In such a case the rule provides that the mortgagee shall not be entitled to bring the mortgaged property to sale in execution of the decree; he can have the property sold only by instituting a regular suit for sale (j) and obtaining a decree for sale under rules 4 and 5. It is clear that where a mortgagee brings a regular suit for sale and a decree is passed

(g) *B. N. v. H. N.* (1910) 15 C. W. N. 783  
81 C. 4

(h) See *I. A. v. Klemu* (1904) 18 Bom.

634 637 648

(j) *Padmanab v. I. Hemu* (1904) 18 Bom. 634  
(j) See Transfer of Property Act 188 s 67

in such suit what would be sold is the mortgaged property free from the mortgage while in the other case where the suit is not for sale but on the mortgage debt only what would be sold is the mortgaged property subject to the mortgage in other words it is only the mortgagor's equity of redemption that would be sold. The object of the present rule is to prevent mortgages from suing their mortgagors on the mortgage debt as such and in the execution selling the bare equity of redemption thereby depriving the mortgagor of the right of redemption that would be given to him by the decree for sale (l) [see r 4 above]. A mortgages his property to B to secure repayment of Rs 5000 B sues A to recover Rs 5000 and obtains a personal decree against A. B then applies for attachment and sale of A's interest in the mortgaged property in execution of the decree. The property may be attached for there is nothing in this rule to bar the attachment (l) but the sale must be refused under this rule. B cannot bring the property to sale except by means of a regular suit for sale. Suppose now that B sues A on a debt unconnected with the mortgage and obtains a decree against A. Is he entitled to have A's interest in the mortgage sold in execution of such decree? Yes for the rule only precludes B from bringing the mortgaged property to sale in execution of a decree for the payment of money in satisfaction of a claim arising under the mortgage. Under sec 99 of the Transfer of Property Act however B could not bring the mortgaged property to sale even if the decree was for a debt unconnected with the mortgage debt (m). The scope of that section was very wide for it precluded a mortgagee from bringing the mortgaged property to sale in execution of a decree for the satisfaction of any claim whether arising under the mortgage or not. It may here be stated that the present rule is a rule of procedure and not a rule of substantive law it has therefore a retrospective operation (n).

**Sale made in contravention of this rule is voidable not void**—It was at one time thought that a sale made in contravention of this rule was absolutely void (o) and that the purchaser at such sale was not therefore entitled to recover possession from the mortgagor (p) and that if he did acquire possession he was bound to account for the rents and profits realized from the mortgaged property during the term of his possession (q). But this view is no longer tenable and it has been held in recent cases that a sale in contravention of this rule is not void but only voidable at the instance of the mortgagor or any other person interested in the equity of redemption (r). The sale in other words is valid until it is set aside. The procedure to set aside the sale is by way of application under sec 47 a separate suit is barred under that section. The application must be made before confirmation of the sale unless the applicant proves that owing to fraud or other reasons he was kept in ignorance of the sale proceedings preliminary to sale. The sale cannot be set aside after it is confirmed by the Court (s). Nor is it open to the mortgagor after confirmation of the sale to redeem the mortgage whether the property has been purchased by a third person (t) or by the mortgagee himself (u).

- (l) See *Arud Emam v. Taj Coo* 3 W. L. 187. *Ah. rajm. l. v. D. s.* (1890) 3 Cal. 96. *S. I. A. J. Ch. u. as. v. B. J. n.* (1930) 1st 787. *T. I. C. 114* (4) A. 1. 20.
- (l) *Ch. nd. a. Nath v. Burroda* (1890) Cal. 813. *Nathubha v. Bas. Ujam* (1908) 3 Bom. 0.
- (m) *T. rak. Nath v. Bhubaneswar* (1911) 4 Cal. 780. *30 I. C. 988*.
- (n) *Bas. Ga. ga. v. Rajaram* (1911) 35 Lam. 48. *10 I. C. 815*.
- (o) *Sleeden v. Jam. S. ran* (1899) 6 Cal. 161. *Sonus. g. v. B. h. rs. S. g.* (1908) 33 Cal. 83. *Vigne. wara. v. B. pajja* (1893) 16 M. l. d. 43.
- (p) *B. Id. v. Kal. s.* (1906) 33 Cal. 113.
- (q) *A. h. b. d. v. K. I. K. ma.* (1903) 30 Cal. 463.
- (r) *Ah. a. jmal. v. Da.* (1900) 3 Cal. 96. *S. I. A. J. Ashulash v. Behari Lal* (1908) 35

- Cal. 61. *M. hammad Abdul v. D. Isukh Rai* (1905) 7 All. 517. *J. h. n. Lal v. Lmr. o. S. g.* (1903) 30 All. 146.
- (s) *As. to. h. v. B. h. Lal* (1908) 3 Cal. 61. *J. h. Lal v. Lmr. o. S. g.* (1908) 30 All. 146. *I. ch. can. v. I. l. r. n.* (1907) 30 M. d. 313. *Mehr. Baksh v. Sa. Jhe Khan* (1916) P. J. Rec. 20. 18 p. 41. 33 I. C. 80. *Jhauchand v. Ranchhodas* (1909) 2 Lon. L. R. 670. 53 I. C. 231.
- (t) *I. h. r. n. v. I. h. r. n.* (1907) 30 Mad. 313.
- (u) *Dha. k. ta. v. B. d. k.* 12 (1907) 30 M. s. 1. 36. *L. I. B. d. v. A. b. a. an.* (1915) 37 All. 163. *7 I. C. 70*. [P. B.] P. d. t. S. h. o. v. P. m. J. ton (1917) 41 I. L. J. 587. 41 I. C. 533. *Raja. Jaga. lukehand. a. v. B. h. a. s.* (1919) 7 C. W. N. 38. 74 I. C. 41. (3) A. C. 11. *I. utsee. Martand v. Dhondo* (1899) Bom. C. 4.

**Decree** —An order directing a person who has stood surety on behalf of a judgment debtor for the performance of a decree to pay the amount specified in the surety bond is not a decree within the meaning of this rule. It is therefore competent to the decree holder to have the property secured by the bond for the performance of the decree sold in execution under sec 145 without instituting a regular suit for sale (1)

**Decree for the payment of money in satisfaction of a claim arising under the mortgage** —This rule does not apply unless the decree obtained by the mortgagee is for the payment of money in satisfaction of a claim arising under the mortgage. The mortgage referred to in this rule must be a mortgage existing prior to the date of the decree and not one created by the decree [ills (1) and (2)]. Further it must be a subsisting mortgage and not one which by reason of the efflux of time or any other like circumstance has ceased to be enforceable at law [ill (3)]. Again the rule is not applicable when a usufructuary mortgagee has leased to the mortgagor and sues for rent (4) unless the lease was part of the mortgage transaction (5). Nor does the rule prevent a mortgagee purchasing with leave of the Court the equity of redemption at a Court sale in execution of his money decree on a claim independent of the mortgage (y)

Further the rule does not prevent a mortgagee who has two distinct mortgages one on property A and another on property B from selling B in execution of a money decree on a claim arising out of the mortgage on A and selling A in execution of a money decree on a claim arising out of the mortgage on B ( )

### Illustrations

(1) A mortgages certain property to B which was then in the possession of X and agrees to deliver possession thereof to B after recovering possession thereof from X. A recovers possession of the property from X but does not deliver possession thereof to B. B sues A for possession and a decree is made in B's favour for possession and for costs. In execution of the decree for costs B applies for attachment and sale of the mortgaged property. Is B entitled to the order applied for? Yes for the claim in respect of cost is not a claim arising under the mortgage within the meaning of this rule. It arises under the decree passed for costs (a)

(2) In a suit for money a decree is passed by consent whereby the defendant is directed to pay to the plaintiff Rs 30,000. It is further declared by the decree that the plaintiff should have a first charge on certain immovable property belonging to the defendant. Is the plaintiff entitled to have the property sold in execution of the decree without instituting a regular suit for sale on the charge? Yes because their being no mortgage or charge prior to the decree the decree cannot be said to have been obtained for the payment of money in satisfaction of a claim arising under the mortgage within the meaning of this rule. The immovable property must have been made security for the payment of the money before the decree was obtained otherwise the provisions of this rule do not apply (b)

(1) *Ga ga De v Joti Lal* (191 ) Pat L J 197 33 I C 648

(u) *Lita cha d v R f f hna* (19 0) 47 Cal 377 55 I C 1 (1 B)

(x) *Ibrahim v A f f f d* (19 0) 44 I om 366 55 I C 536 *Mat hand Ktrpara v P n chhodas* (19 0) Bom L R 670 58 I C 231 *Laksh n kull v Mar n mamal* (19 4) 47 Mad L J 794 8 I C 504 ( ) A M 1 7 *Muk n mad l k b v Hamud Ali* (19 8) 5 Cal 104 104 I C 3 3 (7) A C 884

(y) *Pa a J adiah Cb ndra v Bhubaneswar* (19 ) 7 C W N 38 76 I C 41 (—3)

A C 11

(z) *B v Aoo ja v H rra* (19 4) 49 Bom 08 80 I C 870 ( ) A H 39

(a) *Ha ba P v Sri v was* (1913) 35 All 514 01 C 836

(b) *Ambalal v Narayan* (1919) 43 Bom 631 51 I C 9 9 *K ja B v e nd v Sar t Kumari* (1917) 2 Pat L J 3 35 I C 791 and *Hari S nkar v M Tapa* (19 5) 4 Pat 694 88 I C 9 3 ( ) A P 31 (charge created by a decree in a suit for maintenance) *Ram s ami v Subbaraya* (19 5) 49 Mad L J 490 88 I C 643 (—5) A M 1101

(3) *A* mortgages two properties *X* and *Y* to *B*. Subsequently by reason of the wrongful act of *A* *B* is deprived of part of his security namely property *Y*. *B* thereupon sues *A* under sec 68 of the Transfer of Property Act and obtains a personal decree for the mortgage debt against *A*. In execution of the decree *B* applies for sale of property *X*. At this date *B*'s remedy on the mortgage had become barred by limitation. The mortgage not being a subsisting mortgage [and *A* not having to redeem it] *B* is entitled to have property *X* sold in execution without bringing a regular suit for sale on the mortgage (c).

(4) *A* executes a usufructuary mortgage in favour of *B* to secure a debt of Rs 8 000 whereby he mortgages a fixed rate holding and his right to receive offerings at a temple. By a subsequent agreement between him and *B* *A* binds himself to pay annually Rs 100 to *B* in lieu of the offerings. Subsequently *B* sues *A* on that agreement and obtains a decree against *A* for Rs 3 200 being the arrears of the annual payments. This is a decree for the payment of money in satisfaction of a claim arising under the mortgage within the meaning of this rule, and *B* is not entitled to bring the mortgaged property to sale in execution of the decree. *B*'s right to receive the money rested on his position as mortgagee (d).

He may institute such suit notwithstanding anything contained in O 2 r 2. —See notes to O 2 r 2 under the head Exceptions to the rule against the pitting of reliefs.

**Charge**—This rule applies not only to mortgages but also to charges (e). In a Calcutta case the holder of a charge on certain properties brought a suit on the charge and obtained a decree against the defendant personally with a declaration that the plaintiff was entitled to a charge on the properties. It was held that the plaintiff was not entitled to sell the properties in execution but must file a suit to enforce the charge as provided by this rule (f). But where in a suit on a mortgage bond a decree was passed by consent in the terms that the plaintiff will be entitled to realise the whole amount by taking out execution the property mortgaged shall remain charged under the mortgage. It was held that the plaintiff was entitled to sell the property in execution (g).

In Patna it has been held that where in a suit for maintenance a decree is passed for the plaintiff directing the defendant to pay a fixed sum every month and declaring that the allowance fixed by the decree shall be a charge on certain property the plaintiff is entitled to sell the property in execution and no separate suit is necessary (h). In a Bombay case the suit was for money and a consent decree was passed directing the defendant to pay a sum of money to the plaintiffs and declaring a charge on certain properties belonging to the defendant. It was held that the plaintiff was entitled to sell the property in execution and that it was not necessary to bring a separate suit for sale (i).

**Security bond**—A security bond given during the pendency of an appeal creating a charge on the sureties' property can be enforced by summary procedure and this rule does not apply when no person is named as mortgagee for the Court is not

- (c) *Chedi Lal v S dat Yassa* (1917) 39 All 36  
36 I C 907 *Gaikh S. gh v Debi Singh*  
(1910) 3 All 377 5 I C 419 [mortgage  
put an end to by consent of parties]  
*S. gh v S. gh* (1904) 4 All  
568 57 I C 14 *Jomathi v Alagappa*  
(1914) 41 Mad L J 160 6 I C 756  
(1) *A. M. 477 T. n. S. v S.*  
*Gopal* (1914) 41 All 6 63 I C 445  
(1) *A. A. 131*
- (d) *Katma v Muhammad Ali* (1919) 41 All 399  
50 I C 134 *Rhacha v I. nuchhoddas*  
(1904) 2 Bom L R 60 58 I C 231
- (e) *Audhoyesury v Co. n. S. n.* (1895) Cal  
859 (a case under a 89 Transfer of Pro

- erty Act) *Fenl. ta v Menda* (1904) 43  
31 d 786 57 I C 764 *I. j. Kumar L. v.*  
*J. la* (1904) 5 Pat L J 248 57 I C  
63
- (f) *Gob. da v Kasas* (1917) 45 Cal 530 41  
I C 73
- (g) *K. sh. Chandra v Priya Nath* (1914) 8  
C W 550 83 I C 41 (4) *A. C. 645*
- (h) *Hari v M. n. m. 4 Top* (1904) 4 Pat 693  
88 I C 93 (6) *A. P. 31 Raja B. aja*  
*S. der v Surat* (1917) Pat L J 55 33  
I C 791
- (i) *Ambal. l. v. a. n. a. n.* (1919) 43 Bom 631  
51 I C 99 *Shank. v. Ga. pat* (1909)  
41 Bom L R 439 (29) *A. B. 27*



## ORDER XXXV

*Interpleader*

**1** [S 471] In every suit of interpleader the plaintiff shall, in addition to the other statements necessary for plaints, state—

Plaint in interpleader suits

- (a) that the plaintiff claims no interest in the subject-matter in dispute other than for charges or costs,
- (b) the claims made by the defendants severally, and
- (c) that there is no collusion between the plaintiff and any of the defendants

Interpleader suits —See s 88 and notes thereto

**2** [S 472] Where the thing claimed is capable of being paid into Court or placed in the custody of the Court the plaintiff may be required to so pay or place it before he can be entitled to any order in the suit

Payment of thing claimed into Court

May be required to so pay or place it —These words have been substituted for the words *must so pay or place it* in view of the addition of the words *immovable property* in s 88 The procedure by payment or deposit is plainly not applicable to immovable property

**3** [S 47] Where any of the defendants in an interpleader suit is actually suing the plaintiff in respect of the subject matter of such suit the Court in which the suit against the plaintiff is pending shall, on being informed by the Court in which the interpleader suit has been instituted, stay the proceedings as against him, and his costs in the suit so stayed may be provided for in such suit but if, and in so far as, they are not provided for in that suit, they may be added to his costs incurred in the interpleader suit

Procedure where defendant is suing plaintiff

Alteration in the rule —The words *on being informed by the Court in which the interpleader suit has been instituted* have been substituted for the words *on being duly informed by the Court which passed the decree in the interpleader suit in favour of the stakeholder that such decree has been passed* Under the old section proceedings in other litigation relating to the same subject matter could only be stayed on the *passing of a decree* in the interpleader suit Under the present rule they can be stayed on the very *instituted* of the interpleader suit

Appeal —An appeal lies from an order under this rule [O 43 r 1 cl (p)]

Procedure at first hearing **4** [S 473, R.S.C., O 57, r 7] (1) At the first hearing the Court may—

- (a) declare that the plaintiff is discharged from all liability to the defendants in respect of the thing claimed, award him his costs, and dismiss him from the suit, or
- (b) if it thinks that justice or convenience so require, retain all parties until the final disposal of the suit

(2) Where the Court finds that the admissions of the parties or other evidence enable it to do so, it may adjudicate the title to the thing claimed

(3) Where the admissions of the parties do not enable the Court so to adjudicate, it may direct—

- (a) that an issue or issues between the parties be framed and tried, and
- (b) that any claimant be made a plaintiff in lieu of or in addition to the original plaintiff,

and shall proceed to try the suit in the ordinary manner

**Non appearance of claimant defendants**—Where the claimants do not appear at the first hearing the Court may if the suit is properly instituted declare under sub r (1) that the plaintiff is discharged from all liability to the defendants in respect of the money claimed award him his costs and dismiss him from the suit (p)

**Sub rule 3**—This sub rule has been taken from O 57 r 7 of the English Rules.

**Appeal**—An appeal lies from an order under this rule [O 43 r 1 cl (p)]

**5** [S 474] Nothing in this Order shall be deemed to enable agents to sue their principals, or tenants to sue their landlords, for the purpose of compelling them to interplead with any person other than persons making claim through such principals or landlords

Agents and tenants may not institute interpleader suits

#### Illustrations

(a) *A* deposits a box of jewels with *B* as his agent. *C* alleges that the jewels were wrongfully obtained from him by *A* and claims them from *B*. *B* cannot institute an interpleader suit against *A* and *C*.

(b) *A* deposits a box of jewels with *B* as his agent. He then writes to *C* for the purpose of making the jewels a security for a debt due from himself to *C*. *A* afterwards alleges that *C*'s debt is satisfied and *C* alleges the contrary. Both claim the jewels from *B*. *B* may institute an interpleader suit against *A* and *C*.

**Interpleader suit by Agents**—In ill (a) *C* does not claim through *A* (principal) but *adversely* to him hence no interpleader suit can be brought In ill (b) *C* claims *through A* hence *B* may institute interpleader suit against *A* and *C*

**Interpleader suit by tenants**—*A* lets certain lands to *B* *C* alleges that the lands never belonged to *A* and claims the rent from *B* *B* cannot institute an interpleader suit against *A* and *C* this is because *C* claims *adversely* to *A* (landlord) But if *C* claims the rent alleging that the lands were sold to him by *A* after the same were let to *B* *B* may institute an interpleader suit against *A* and *C* the reason is that in this case *C* claims *through A* that is as purchaser from *A* The result is that an interpleader suit by a tenant can only be maintained if the defendant other than the landlord claims *through* the landlord (g) The following is a peculiar case *A* grants a perpetual lease of certain villages to his wife *B* *B* sub lets the villages to *C* *A* alleging that the lease granted by him to *B* was executed by him *benami* in the name of *B* gives notice to *C* claiming the rents of the villages *B* denies that the transaction was *benami* and she also claims the rents from *C* *C* can maintain an interpleader suit against *A* and *B* The reason given is that *A* must be deemed to claim *through B* (r) See *Indian Evidence Act s 116*

**Interpleader suit by a Railway Company**—A Railway Company is not an agent of the consignor within the meaning of this rule so as to preclude it from filing an interpleader suit against the consignor and a third party claiming adversely to the consignor (s)

**6 [S 475]** Where the suit is properly instituted the Court may provide for the costs of the original plaintiff by giving him a charge on the thing claimed or in some other effectual way

**Appeal**—An appeal lies from an order under this rule [O 43 r 1 cl (p)]

## ORDER XXXVI

### *Special Case*

**1 [S 527]** (1) Parties claiming to be interested in the decision of any question of fact or law may enter into an agreement in writing stating such question in the form of a case for the opinion of the Court, and providing that, upon the finding of the Court with respect to such question,—

(a) a sum of money fixed by the parties or to be determined by the Court shall be paid by one of the parties to the other of them, or

(g) *Sh H. Bonnerjee v P. Chandra Dutt* (1910) 37 Cal 5 5 IC 577

(r) *Orr v Chidambaram* (1910) 33 Mad 0

4 IC 319  
(s) *Chh. Ganial v B. B. d. C. I. Fy* (191) 17 Bom L R 339 28 IC 948



(b) some property, movable or immovable, specified in the agreement, shall be delivered by one of the parties to the other of them, or

(c) one or more of the parties shall do, or refrain from doing, some other particular act specified in the agreement

(2) Every case stated under this rule shall be divided into consecutively numbered paragraphs, and shall concisely state such facts and specify such documents as may be necessary to enable the Court to decide the questions raised thereby

**2 [S 528]** Where the agreement is for the delivery of any property, or for the doing, or the refraining from doing, any particular act the estimated value of the property to be delivered, or to which the act specified has reference, shall be stated in the agreement

Where value of subject matter must be stated

**3 [S 529]** (1) The agreement, if framed in accordance with the rules hereinbefore contained, may be filed in the Court which would have jurisdiction to entertain a suit, the amount or value of the subject matter of which is the same as the amount or value of the subject matter of the agreement

Agreement to be filed and registered as suit

(2) The agreement when so filed, shall be numbered and registered as a suit between one or more of the parties claiming to be interested as plaintiff or plaintiffs, and the other or the others of them as defendant or defendants, and notice shall be given to all the parties to the agreement, other than the party or parties by whom it was presented

**4 [S 530]** Where the agreement has been filed, the parties to it shall be subject to the jurisdiction of the Court and shall be bound by the statements contained therein

Parties to be subject to Court's jurisdiction

**5 [S 531]** (1) The case shall be set down for hearing as a suit instituted in the ordinary manner, and the provisions of this Code shall apply to such suit so far as the same are applicable

Hearing and disposal of case

(2) Where the Court is satisfied, after examination of O 3 the parties, or after taking such evidence as it thinks fit, —

- (a) that the agreement was duly executed by them,
- (b) that they have a *bona fide* interest in the question stated therein and
- (c) that the same is fit to be decided,

it shall proceed to pronounce judgment thereon, in the same way as in an ordinary suit, and upon the judgment so pronounced a decree shall follow

Birth after case set down — In the case of the subsequent birth of an infant the former order to set down should be discharged and the special case amended by making the infant a party (t) So also when an infant born a few days before was accidentally omitted to be made a party (u)

## ORDER XXXVII

### *Summary Procedure on Negotiable Instruments*

Application of order **1** [s 538] This Order shall apply O 3 only to—

- (a) the High Courts of Judicature at Fort William, Madras and Bombay,
- (b) the Chief Court of Lower Burma,
- (c) the Court of the Judicial Commissioner of Sind, and
- (d) any other Court to which sections 532 to 537 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1882, have been already applied

Courts of Small Causes in Calcutta Madras and Bombay — The corresponding Chapter of the Code of 1882 applied also to Presidency Small Cause Courts Cl (c) of s 538 of the Code which expressly mentioned those Courts has been omitted in this rule the reason given being that its appropriate place would now be in rules under the Presidency Small Cause Act See O 51 r 1

Clause (d) — Although sections 532 to 537 have been applied to a subordinate Court yet the subordinate Judge of that Court when exercising Small Cause Court powers has no jurisdiction under this order (t)

Lahore High Court. — The Lahore High Court is not mentioned in clause (a) of this rule See as to this the undermentioned case (w)

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
| (t) <i>Sarag v S H</i> (1870) L R 11 Lq 64     |  | (w) <i>Bhoj v Maf M An d</i> (1908) 8 Lah |
| (u) <i>Ba a v Tassell</i> (1880) L R 11 Eq 363 |  | 156 99 I C 643 (—) 4 L 14                 |
| (v) <i>Utubud v Irya y ja</i> (1908) 51 Mad    |  |   |

2      2 [S 532] (1) All suits upon bills of exchange, hundis or promissory notes may, in case the plaintiff desires to proceed hereunder, be instituted by presenting a plaint in the form prescribed, but the summons shall be in Form No 4 in Appendix B or in such other form as may be from time to time prescribed

Institution of summary suits upon bills of exchange etc

(2) In any case in which the plaint and summons are in such forms, respectively, the defendant shall not appear or defend the suit unless he obtains leave from a judge as hereinafter provided so to appear and defend, and, in default of his obtaining such leave or of his appearance and defence in pursuance thereof, the allegations in the plaint shall be deemed to be admitted, and the plaintiff shall be entitled to a decree—

(a) for the principal sum due on the instrument and for interest calculated in accordance with the provisions of section 79 or section 80, as the case may be, of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881, up to the date of the institution of the suit, or for the sum mentioned in the summons, whichever is less, and for interest up to the date of the decree at the same rate or at such other rate as the Court thinks fit, and

(b) for such subsequent interest, if any, as the Court may order under section 34 of this Code, and

(c) for such sum for costs as may be prescribed

Provided that, if the plaintiff claims more than such fixed sum for costs, the costs shall be ascertained in the ordinary way

(3) A decree passed under this rule may be executed forthwith

Old section—This rule corresponds with s 532 of the Code of 1882 except in the following particulars —

- 1 The explanation to s 532 has been omitted and in lieu thereof the words the allegations in the plaint shall be deemed to be admitted have been added into sub r (2) See notes below under the head The allegations in the plaint shall be deemed to be admitted

- The fourth paragraph of s 53<sup>1</sup> which provided that the Court should not require the defendant to pay the amount claimed into Court or to give security therefor unless the Court thought that the defendant had not a *prima facie* case or that the defence was not made in good faith has been omitted See r 3 sub r (2) below

3 See also notes below Changes in sub r (2)

Changes in sub rule (2) —Clauses (a) (b) and (c) of sub r (2) and sub rule (3) were substituted after the words shall be entitled to a decree in sub r (2) for the following words by Act 30 of 1926 s 4 —

for any sum not exceeding the sum mentioned in the summons together with interest at the rate specified (if any) to the date of the decree and such sum for costs as may be prescribed unless the plaintiff claims more than such fixed sum in which case the costs shall be ascertained in the ordinary way and such decree may be executed forthwith

See notes below Interest

Points of difference between summary suit and ordinary suit on negotiable instruments

- (1) A plaintiff enforcing a negotiable instrument may either bring a summary suit or he may bring a suit in the ordinary manner The advantage of a summary suit is that the defendant is not as in a suit brought in the ordinary manner entitled as of right to defend the suit The defendant in a summary suit must apply for leave to defend within 10 days from the service of the summons upon him (see Limitation Act 1908 sch I art 159) and such leave will be granted only if the affidavit filed by the defendant discloses such facts as would make it incumbent on the plaintiff to prove consideration or such other facts as the Court may deem sufficient for granting leave to the defendant to appear and defend the suit If no leave to defend is granted the plaintiff is entitled to a decree
- (2) A summary suit must be brought within one year from the date on which the debt becomes due and payable [Limitation Act 1908 sch I art 6] The period of limitation for a suit brought in the ordinary manner on a negotiable instrument is 3 years Article 5 of the Limitation Act 1908 as it originally stood referred to suits under the summary procedure referred to in section 128 (2) (f) of the Code and this was construed as not including suits under O 37 (z) That article was accordingly amended by Act 30 of 1925 by adding to the entry in the first column the words where the provision of such summary procedure does not exclude the ordinary procedure in such suits and under O 37 of the said Code At the same time the period of limitation was extended from six months to one year
- (3) A summary suit can only be brought in the Courts mentioned in r 1

A negotiable instrument means a promissory note bill of exchange or cheque expressed to be payable to a specified person or his order or to the order of a specified person or to the bearer thereof or to a specified person or the bearer thereof (Negotiable Instruments Act 26 of 1881 s 13)

A bill of exchange is an instrument in writing containing an unconditional order signed by the maker directing a certain person to pay a certain sum of money only to or to the order of a certain person or to the bearer of the instrument (Negotiable Instruments Act s 5)

2 A promissory note is an instrument in writing (not being a bank note or a currency note) containing an *unconditional* undertaking signed by the maker to pay a certain sum of money only to or to the order of a certain person or to the bearer of the instrument (Negotiable Instruments Act s 4)

#### Illustrations

(a) A executes an instrument whereby he promises to pay Rs 5 000 to B on demand. By the same instrument it is provided that B should not be entitled to call for payment of the said sum unless A fails to deliver certain goods to B within six months. The instrument is not a promissory note for the undertaking to pay Rs 5 000 is conditional upon A's failure to deliver the goods. *Simon v Hakim Mahomed* (1896) 19 Mad 368

(b) A executes an instrument whereby he promises to pay Rs 5 000 to B on demand. At the same time a separate agreement is made between the parties whereby B agrees not to demand payment of the sum of Rs 5 000 unless A fails to deliver certain goods to him within six months. The instrument is a promissory note. *Simon v Hakim Mahomed* (1896) 19 Mad 368

**Limitation for suit**—See notes above. Points of difference between summary suit and ordinary suit on negotiable instruments

**Limitation for application for leave to defend**—The period of limitation for an application for leave to appear and defend is 10 days from the date when the summons is served. Limitation Act sch 1 art 129. The Court has no power to extend the time (g) unless the Court has by a rule framed in that behalf made sec 3 of the Limitation Act applicable to such application as has been done by the High Court of Bombay. See App IV below [Rules made by the High Court of Bombay]

**Form of summons in a summary suit**—The summons in such a suit requires the defendant to obtain leave from the Court within 10 days from the service thereof to appear and defend the suit and within such time to cause an appearance to be entered on his behalf. see Appendix B Form No 4

**Defendant shall not appear unless he obtains leave**—This rule provides that a defendant who has failed to obtain leave to defend cannot be allowed to appear while the hearing is proceeding. It is therefore irregular for the Court to pass at his instance an order for the payment of the decretal amount by instalments under O 20 r 11 (1) above (2)

**Interest**—Sub rule (2) before it was amended by Act 30 of 1926 was in almost the same terms as s 33 of the Code of 1887. The sub rule has now been amended and provision has been made for interest first up to the date of the institution of the suit secondly up to the date of the decree and thirdly after the decree. As to interest up to the institution of the suit it is to be calculated in accordance with the provisions of sec 19 or sec 80 as the case may be of the Negotiable Instruments Act 1881. As to interest from the date of the institution of the suit to the date of the decree it may be awarded at the discretion of the Court at the same rate as aforesaid or at such other rate as the Court thinks fit. As to interest from and after the date of the decree the same may be awarded under sec 31 of the Code. Sec 79 of the Negotiable Instruments Act provides that when interest at the specified rate is expressly payable on a promissory note or bill of exchange interest shall be calculated at the rate specified on the amount of the principal money due thereon from the date of the instrument. Sec 80 of that Act was amended by Act 30 of 1926 being the same Act by which sub rule (2) was amended. By that section as amended it is provided that when no rate of interest is specified in the instrument interest on the amount due thereon shall notwithstanding any agreement relating to the interest between any parties to the instrument be calculated at the

rate of six per centum per annum from the date at which the same ought to have been paid by the parties charged. This excludes oral agreements to pay interest (a)

The allegations in the plaint shall be deemed to be admitted—These words have been substituted for the explanation to the old section. The explanation was inserted to negative the effect of a Calcutta decision (b). But the Explanation was characterized as wholly unintelligible and meaningless by Amir Ali J in the undermentioned case (c) and it has accordingly been replaced by the words cited in the head note. The effect of those words is to enable the plaintiff to succeed on his own allegations though the allegations may be of such a nature that if the defendant appear and denied them they would have to be proved by the plaintiff.

Suit against firm—The question whether when a summary suit is brought against a firm and service is effected upon a person as an alleged partner and such person appears under protest denying that he was a partner he could appear without obtaining leave under this rule is discussed in the undermentioned case (d).

**3 [S 533]** (1) The Court shall, upon application by the defendant, give leave to appear and to defend the suit upon affidavits which disclose such facts as would make it incumbent on the holder to prove consideration, or such other facts as the Court may deem sufficient to support the application.

(2) Leave to defend may be given unconditionally or subject to such terms as to payment into Court giving security, framing and recording issues or otherwise as the Court thinks fit.

Alterations in the rule—Under the old sections it was obligatory upon the Court to grant leave to the defendant to appear and defend if he paid into Court the amount claimed by the plaintiff and mentioned in the summons. It is no longer so under the present rule. The words upon the defendant paying into Court the sum mentioned in the summons or which occurred in s 533 after the word suit in the third line have been omitted.

Limitation—The application for leave to appear and defend must be made within 10 days from the date of service of the summons on the defendant. The date shown in the Sheriff's return as the date of service is the only date to which reference could be made to determine the question of limitation arising on an application under this section (e).

Sub rule (2)—As a rule leave to defend should be given unconditionally if the defendant shows a *prima facie* case or raises a triable issue. Leave should be made conditional if the Court doubts the *bona fides* of the defendant or thinks the defence is only put in to gain time (f).

Appeal—No appeal is allowed under the Code from an order under this rule. It has been recently held by the High Court of Calcutta that an order under this rule directing a defendant to give security as a term on which leave to defend should be

(a) See *K der B I & v Shail Sanyal* 1d n (19 )

49 C 1 716 O I C 130 ( ) A C 51

(b) *Pemfry v A H Gfo d* (18 6) 1 C 1 130

(c) *Bh p t v v re dhn* (1903) 30 Cal 446

(d) *Cherry v Poloo al* (19 0) 0 Pou 66 99

IC 49 ( 6) A H 8  
(e) *M d h b Lall v Hoop d n* n (1896) 23 C 1 5 3

(f) *Po l t v Fett ele* (1891) 18 Bom 1 *Perry*  
H v v 5 b a u *Iver* (19 1) 46  
Mad L J = 75 IC 50 ( 4) A J 61

given is not a judgment within the meaning of cl 16 of the Letters Patent and not therefore appealable as such (g)

**4 [S 534]** After decree the Court may, under special circumstances, set aside the decree, and if necessary stay or set aside execution and may give leave to the defendant to appear to the summons and to defend the suit, if it seems reasonable to the Court so to do, and on such terms as the Court thinks fit

Power to set aside decree

**5 [S 535]** In any proceeding under this Order the Court may order the bill, hundi or note on which the suit is founded to be forthwith deposited with an officer of the Court and may further order that all proceedings shall be stayed until the plaintiff gives security for the costs, thereof

Power to order bill etc to be deposited with officer of Court

**6 [S 536]** The holder of every dishonoured bill of exchange or promissory note shall have the same remedies for the recovery of the expenses incurred in noting the same for non acceptance or non payment, or otherwise, by reason of such dishonour, as he has under this Order for the recovery of the amount of such bill or note

Recovery of cost of noting non acceptance of dishonoured bill or note

**7 [S 537]** Save as provided by this order, the procedure in suits hereunder shall be the same as the procedure in suits instituted in the ordinary manner

Procedure in suits

## ORDER XXXVIII

### *Arrest and Attachment before Judgment*

#### *Arrest before judgment.*

**1 [Ss 447, 478]** Where at any stage of a suit, other than a suit of the nature referred to in section 16, clauses (a) to (d) the Court is satisfied, by affidavit or otherwise,—

Where defendant may be called upon to furnish security for appearance

(a) that the defendant, with intent to delay the plaintiff, or to avoid any process of the Court or to

obstruct or delay the execution of any decree that O 3  
may be passed against him,—

- (i) has absconded or left the local limits of the jurisdiction of the Court, or
- (ii) is about to abscond or leave the local limits of the jurisdiction of the Court, or
- (iii) has disposed of or removed from the local limits of the jurisdiction of the Court his property or any part thereof, or
- (b) that the defendant is about to leave British India under circumstances affording reasonable probability that the plaintiff will or may thereby be obstructed or delayed in the execution of any decree that may be passed against the defendant in the suit,

the Court may issue a warrant to arrest the defendant and bring him before the Court to show cause why he should not furnish security for his appearance

Provided that the defendant shall not be arrested if he pays to the officer entrusted with the execution of the warrant any sum specified in the warrant as sufficient to satisfy the plaintiff's claim, and such sum shall be held in deposit by the Court until the suit is disposed of or until the further order of the Court

The proviso to the rule is new

**Scope of the Order**—Order 21 deals with the arrest of a judgment debtor and the attachment of his property *in execution of a decree* passed against him. The present Order lays down rules for the arrest of a defendant and the attachment of his property *before judgment*. The object of these rules is to secure the plaintiff against any attempt on the part of the defendant to defeat the execution of any decree that may be passed against him

**Reasonable probability**—Where the defendant is about to leave British India it is not necessary to prove any intent on his part to obstruct or delay the execution of any decree that may be passed against him. It is enough of the circumstances under which he is about to leave British India afford a reasonable probability that any decree that may be passed against him in the suit will thereby be obstructed or delayed in execution (h). The Court must be satisfied on two points (1) that the plaintiff has a cause of action which is *prima facie* unimpeachable subject to his proving the allegations in his plaint and (2) that the Court should have reason to believe on adequate materials that unless jurisdiction is exercised there is real danger that the defendant will remove himself from the ambit of the powers of the Court (i)

(i) *C. I. v. P. v. P. v. P.* (18 0) 2 N. P. 3  
(i) *Ch. Ch. v. M. v. P. v. P.* (19 ) 0 |



The suit must be *bona fide*—In every case where an application is made under this rule the Court must be satisfied that the suit is *bona fide*. Where the plaintiff is indisputably entitled to a part of the relief claimed in the plaint the mere circumstance of the rest of the plaintiff's claim being of a disputable character does not render the suit *mala fide* (j)

*Consequences of obtaining arrest on insufficient grounds*—See e 93

Form—For form of warrant of arrest before judgment see App F form no 1

2 [S 479] (1) Where the defendant fails to show such cause the Court shall order him either to deposit in Court money or other property sufficient to answer the claim against him, or to furnish security for his appearance at any time when called upon while the suit is pending and until satisfaction of any decree that may be passed against him in the suit, or make such order as it thinks fit in regard to the sum which may have been paid by the defendant under the proviso to the last preceding rule

(2) Every surety for the appearance of a defendant shall bind himself, in default of such appearance, to pay any sum of money which the defendant may be ordered to pay in the suit

*Rateable distribution—Insolvency of defendant*—Where money is deposited by the defendant in Court under this rule it is a payment into Court to the general credit of the action and charged with a lien in favour of the plaintiff on the latter obtaining a decree in his favour. Where after payment into Court other judgment creditors of the defendant attach the money or the defendant becomes an insolvent the plaintiff on obtaining his decree is entitled to priority over the claims respectively of the attaching creditors and the Official Receiver. The reason is that the amount so paid cannot be taken to have been ordered and levied as security for the defendant's appearance (k). See notes to r 5 below. *Rateable distribution Insolvency of defendant*

*Money sufficient to answer the claim*—In a Calcutta case (l) Rankin C J said: "When one looks at Order 38 Rule 2 and Form 2 of Appendix F one does not find it contemplated that a defendant on failing to make deposit is to give security for appearance in a particular sum to be fixed by the Judge but that if this security takes the form of a bond by a surety it is to be the whole amount of the decree. If the defendant can give the security himself he will give it for the claim by deposit of money or property. Otherwise he will get some one to go bail for his appearance. This is I think the scheme of Order 38."

*Appeal*—An appeal lies from an order under this rule [O 43 r 1 cl (q)]

Form—For form of security see App F form no 2

(j) *Probodh Ch. der v. Doney* (1897) 14 Cal 695  
(k) *Famiah v. Gopal cr* (1918) 41 Mad 1053  
49 I C 20

(l) *Ell v. Goldberg v. Saroj* (1909) 46 Cal 90  
(9) A C 3

**3 [S 480]** (1) A surety for the appearance of a defendant may at any time apply to the Court in which he became such surety to be discharged from his obligation

Procedure on application by surety to be discharged

(2) On such application being made, the Court shall summon the defendant to appear or, if it thinks fit, may issue a warrant for his arrest in the first instance

(3) On the appearance of the defendant in pursuance of the summons or warrant, or on his voluntary surrender, the Court shall direct the surety to be discharged from his obligation, and shall call upon the defendant to find fresh security

**Appeal**—An appeal lies from an order under this rule [O 43 r 1 cl (q)]

**Form**—For form of summons to defendant see App F form no 3

**4 [S 481]** Where the defendant fails to comply with any order under rule 2 or rule 3, the Court may commit him to the civil prison until the decision of the suit or, where a decree is passed against the defendant, until the

Procedure where defendant fails to furnish security or find fresh security

decree has been satisfied

Provided that no person shall be detained in prison under this rule in any case for a longer period than six months, nor for a longer period than six weeks when the amount or value of the subject matter of the suit does not exceed fifty rupees

Provided also that no person shall be detained in prison under this rule after he has complied with such order

**Appeal**—An order for arrest is appealable (m) under section 104 (b) though it is not specified under O 43 r 1

**Form**—For form of order for committal see App F form no 4

### *Attachment before Judgment*

**5 [Ss 483, 484]** (1) Where, at any stage of a suit, the Court is satisfied, by affidavit or otherwise, that the defendant, with intent to obstruct or delay the execution of any decree that may be passed against him,—

Where defendant may be called upon to furnish security for production of property

(a) is about to dispose of the whole or any part of his property, or

5

(b) is about to remove the whole or any part of his property from the local limits of the jurisdiction of the Court,

the Court may direct the defendant, within a time to be fixed by it, either to furnish security, in such sum as may be specified in the order, to produce and place at the disposal of the Court, when required, the said property or the value of the same, or such portion thereof as may be sufficient to satisfy the decree, or to appear and show cause why he should not furnish security

(2) The plaintiff shall, unless the Court otherwise directs, specify the property required to be attached and the estimated value thereof

(3) The Court may also in the order direct the conditional attachment of the whole or any portion of the property so specified

**Alterations in the rule**—The words or has quitted the jurisdiction of the Court leaving therein property belonging to him which occurred in the old section after cl (b) of sub r (1) have been omitted

**Object of the rule**—The main object of an attachment before judgment is to enable the plaintiff to realize the amount of the decree if one is eventually passed from the defendant's property (n)

**The Court is satisfied**—Vague allegations are insufficient (o) The power to attach is not to be exercised lightly and without clear proof of the mischief aimed at (p)

**Is about to dispose of the whole or any part of his property**—The expression property includes property of every description whether movable or immovable (q) The expression his property refers to the property of the defendant It does not refer to property which is the joint property of the plaintiff and the defendant Thus where A sued B for partnership accounts and applied for an attachment before judgment of the Partnership property on the allegation that B was about to dispose of the same it was held that the case was not one for an attachment before judgment but for the appointment of a receiver under O 40 below (r) A man is not debarred from dealing with his property because a suit is filed against him and an attempt to sell a small portion of a large estate does not warrant the inference that the defendant intends to obstruct or delay execution (s)

**Effect of order of adjudication on attachment before judgment**—See notes to r 10 below under the same head

**Rateable distribution**—Where money is paid into Court by the defendant under this rule the plaintiff acquires no charge on the money and it passes to the Official Assignee

( ) *Ga. S. gh v Janys Lal* (1899) 6 Cal 531  
at p 533  
(o) *Sena v Ja* (1917) 46 Bom 431 611 C  
580 ( ) A 11 76  
(p) *Ch. drida Ira at v if ralat* (1931) 32 C  
1 (4) A 1 31° B 111 1 asat v  
*Colhe Lal* (1907) 48 All 100 9 1 C 8 8

( ) 61 A 4 406  
(q) *Ched L I v A arj* (1892) 17 All 8 F  
*shambar v kade* (1894) 16 All 1 6  
( ) *D nodir v Ja alai* (1907) 9 Bom L R  
40  
(s) *Vorrr v D ecc B n* (1911) 45 Bom 1-56  
611 C 9 4 (11) A 11 61

on the insolvency of the defendant (t) For the same reason the amount deposited is subject to rateable distribution under sec 73 above (u)

**Liability of surety**—The Rangoon High Court holds that the liability of the surety ceases with the dismissal of the suit and does not continue during the appeal (v) The Bombay High Court makes the liability continue during the appeal (u) If the defendant dies pending the suit and the cause of action survives against his legal representatives and the legal representatives are brought on the record the death of the defendant does not operate as a discharge of the surety (x)

**Mortgage suit**—An attachment before judgment may be granted in a suit on a mortgage (y)

**Principle of sec 64 applies to attachment before judgment**—Sec 64 of the Code provides that when property is attached in execution of a decree any private transfer of the property contrary to the attachment shall be void as against all claims enforceable under the attachment The same principle applies to the case of attachment before judgment provided that a decree is ultimately passed for the plaintiff at whose instance the attachment was made This clearly appears from r 9 below which provides that an attachment before judgment shall be removed when the suit is dismissed (z)

**Property situated outside jurisdiction**—Where the property sought to be attached is outside the local limits of the jurisdiction of the Court the proper course to follow is to transmit the order for attachment to the Court in whose jurisdiction the property is situated (a) See s 136 above

**Provincial Small Cause Court**—See r 13 below

**Divorce proceedings**—An order for attachment before judgment will not be made in divorce proceedings governed by the Indian Divorce Act 4 of 1869 (b)

**Forms**—For form of attachment before judgment with order to call for surety see App F form no 5 For form of security for productions of property see App F form no 6

**6 [S 485]** (1) Where the defendant fails to show cause why he should not furnish security, or fails to furnish the security required, within the time fixed by the Court, the Court may order that the property

Attachment where cause not shown or security not furnished

specified, or such portion thereof as appears sufficient to satisfy any decree which may be passed in the suit, be attached

(2) Where the defendant shows such cause or furnishes the required security and the property specified or any portion of it has been attached, the Court shall order the attachment to be withdrawn, or make such other order as it thinks fit

- (t) *Irralappa v. T. Off. 14s. 100 (1916)*  
*33 N. 1 903 3 1 C 130 1 12a v. th*  
*v. Mohi. 127 Den (191) 19 C W. 1*  
*100 31 I C 3*
- (u) *Gh. 1 v. Toof. R (19 1) 6 C W. N 162*  
*0 I C 533 ( ) A C 19*
- (v) *M. nekjee D. v. J. M. v. Ch. n. jar (19 7) 5*  
*R. n. 49 105 I C 540 ( 7) A R 310*
- (w) *I. g. ada v. I. bas ppa (19 7) 51 Lom 31*  
*99 I C 80 ( ) A B 84*

- ( ) *Cla. dulal v. J. sha gah (1917) 41 Bom*  
*40 39 I C 88*
- (y) *Jog. m. ja v. Baulyanath (1910) 46 Cal. 15*  
*01 C 9 1 1 1 Jot m. ye v. Pagh. nath*  
*(19 1) 31 at 966 8 I C 9 ( ) A F 91*
- (z) *Cana. v. jh v. J. n. Lat (189 1) 26 (al) 531*
- (a) *Gaj. an v. F. ash (19 6) 3 Bom L R*  
*380 94 I C 118 ( 6) 4 R 8*
- (b) *Phul. ps v. P. H. ps (1910) 37 Cal 613 7 I C*  
*69*

**Property specified**—That is the property specified by the plaintiff as required by r 5 sub r (2). Such property may be within or without the jurisdiction of the Court. The words in sec 483 of the Code of 1882 were property within the jurisdiction of the Court. It was accordingly held by the High Courts of Madras and Bombay that the only property that could be attached *before judgment* was property within the jurisdiction of the Court (c). On the other hand it was held by the High Court of Calcutta and recently also by the Madras High Court that sec 483 was to be read with sec 648 [now s 136] and that the two sections read together enable the Court to attach before judgment property situate beyond the local limits of its jurisdiction (d). The omission of the words within the jurisdiction of the Court clearly shows that the Court may attach property before judgment even though it may be situated beyond the local limits of its jurisdiction (e).

**Appeal**—An appeal lies from an order under this rule in so far as it directs an attachment. The portion of the order which demands security is not appealable (f). See O 43 r 1 cl (q).

**Form**—For form of attachment before judgment see App F form no 7.

**7 [S 486]** Save as otherwise expressly provided, the attachment shall be made in the manner provided for the attachment of property in execution of a decree.

Mode of making attachment

Mode of attachment—See O 21

**8 [S 487]** Where any claim is preferred to property attached before judgment, such claim shall be investigated in the manner herein before provided for the investigation of claims to property attached in execution of a decree for the payment of money.

Investigation of claim to property attached before judgment

**Investigation of claim**—The claim is investigated as under O 21 r 58 and the property is either released from attachment or the claim disallowed. The party against whom such summary order is passed may institute a suit as under O 21 r 63. Limitation is under article 120 but if the claim is preferred in execution proceedings article 11 applies (g).

**9 [S 488]** Where an order is made for attachment before judgment, the Court shall order the attachment to be withdrawn when the defendant furnishes the security required, together with security for the costs of the attachment, or when the suit is dismissed.

Removal of attachment when security furnished or suit dismissed

- (c) *Krishnasami v E g I* (1895) 8 Mal 20. *Taja v Jani bai* (1903) 5 Bom L R 570.  
(d) *P m Jertab v M dho Rai* (190) 7 C W N 16. *Am ra v Annam la* (1908) 31 M d 50.  
(e) *Ch d i v Firm D a Vath* (19 6) 8 Lab L J 15 93 I C 361 (-6) A L 330.

- (f) *H J Moh mmudli & Co v The Eastern J pa Trading Co* (19 3) 50 Cal 15 79 I C 1 (-3) A C 639. *Mengha v S ha* (19 3) 3 Bang 307 90 I C 92 (-23) A R 767.  
(g) *Ar coach lam v Periasami* (19 1) 41 Mal 902 70 I C 439 (-1) A M 163 (f B).

**Removal of attachment where suit dismissed**—The latter part of the rule which requires that the attachment shall be removed when the suit is dismissed is no more than directory. Hence even if no order is made withdrawing the attachment the attachment falls to the ground on dismissal of the suit (A) or if the suit abates the attachment dies with it (1). A sues B and obtains an attachment before judgment. The suit is dismissed but the Court omits to make an order withdrawing the attachment. A then appeals from the decree. Pending the appeal B sells the property that was attached before judgment to C. Thereafter the suit is decreed on appeal. A then applies for execution of the decree by the sale of the property on the footing that the attachment before judgment subsisted and that it was not therefore necessary to re-attach it. A is not entitled to have the property sold. The attachment before judgment came to an end on the dismissal of A's suit though no order was made withdrawing the attachment (2). Thus the reversal of the order dismissing of the suit does not revive the attachment and in this respect the rule differs from that in regard to attachment after judgment. For in the case of attachment in execution a decree in a suit under O 21 r 63 setting aside a release from attachment operates to revive the attachment and a private transfer made after release from attachment under O 21 r 60 will be void under sec 64 if the right to attach is subsequently established by suit (3). See notes to O 21 r 60. **Effect of order of release**

**10 [S 489]** Attachment before judgment shall not affect the rights, existing prior to the attachment, of persons not parties to the suit, nor bar any person holding a decree against the defendant from applying for the sale of the property under attachment in execution of such decree.

Attachment before judgment not to affect rights of strangers nor bar decree holder from applying for sale

**Effect of order of adjudication on attachment before judgment**—Attachment before judgment does not confer any priority as against the Official Assignee though the plaintiff at whose instance the attachment was made may ultimately obtain a decree in the suit. A sues B and attaches B's property before judgment. A decree is then passed for A. Between the date of the attachment and the date of the decree B's property vests in the Official Assignee under a vesting order. The Official Assignee applies to the Court for removal of the attachment on the ground that the property has vested in him. A contends that the attachment being prior to the date of the vesting order his claim has a priority over that of the Official Assignee. A's contention will not be upheld and the attachment will be removed (1). See notes to s 64 under the head **Effect of order of adjudication on attachment** on p 213 above.

**Attachment before judgment not to affect rights of persons not parties to the suit**—A and B are members of a joint Hindu family. C sues A and obtains an attachment before judgment of A's interest in the joint family property. C then obtains a decree against A. A dies after the decree. On A's death his interest in the property passes by survivorship to B and C is not entitled to have A's share

- (A) *Seetha Ammal v Aa Jan* (19 8) M W 10 113 I C 63 (5) A M 976 Co tr. *Yam 2 Amm v Muthu k l ppe* (19 8) M W 1466 111 I C 887 (28) A M 910
- (1) *Jyot h Chandra v Har Cha dra* (19 8) 47 Cal L J 9 109 I C 164 (28) A C 34
- (2) *Abd l Fahm n v Amin* (1918) 45 Cal 780 44 I C 9 *Pan Chand v Pisham M l* (1898) 10 All 506 *Saayrama v Mehe ban*

- (1911) 13 Cal L J 213 9 I C 918
- (3) *Protappa d v S of Chandra* (19 1) 25 C W 541 6 I C 318, (1) A C 101
- (4) *Sa b Kri to v Muller* (1894) 10 Cal 150 *Sada jappa v Foo ama* (188 ) 6 Mad 554 *T rner v Pertonji Fardu j* (1896) 50 Bom 403 *Krist rom, j v Official Assignee of Madras* (1903) 6 Mad 673

1 sold in execution of the decree (m) But according to the Madras High Court attachment before judgment followed by a decree does operate to defeat the right of survivorship (n)

Attachment before judgment not to bar rights of other decree holders — A institutes a suit against B and obtains an attachment before judgment of B's property. Subsequently C another creditor of B obtains a decree against B. C is entitled to have the property attached and sold in execution of this decree. The attachment before judgment does not confer any right upon A to have his decree satisfied in priority to that of C (o)

11 [ S 490 ] Where property is under attachment by virtue of the provisions of this Order and a decree is subsequently passed in favour of the plaintiff, it shall not be necessary upon an application for execution of such decree to apply for a re attachment of the property

Property attached before judgment not to be re attached in execution of decree

Scope of the rule — The effect of this rule is merely to do away with the necessity for a re attachment of the property. But it does not exempt the plaintiff when a decree follows the attachment from making the usual application for execution under O 21 r 11 (7) (p). This is now made clear by the substitution of the words "it shall not be necessary upon an application for execution of such decree to apply for re attachment of the property" for the words "it shall not be necessary to re attach the property in execution of such decree". The rule was applied when the property attached before judgment was attached and brought to sale by another decree holder. The judgment debtor paid the amount of the second decree and on the sale being set aside it was held that the attachment before judgment revived and that the first decree holder could in execution bring the property to sale without a fresh attachment (q). The rule does not give the decree holder at whose instance the property was attached before judgment any right to preferential treatment over other decree holders who may have applied for a rateable distribution under s 73 (r). Again if the execution application is dismissed O 21 r 57 applies and the attachment ceases (s).

Whether re attachment in execution operates as a waiver — Re attachment in execution of a decree though no re attachment is necessary under this rule is not of itself a waiver or abandonment of the attachment before judgment. The case is different whether there is an express or manifest abandonment (t).

Objection that property attached before judgment is not saleable — The defendant's omission to object to an application for attachment before judgment on the ground that the property is not saleable within the meaning of s 60 does not preclude him from raising that objection when an application is made for execution of the decree passed in the suit (u).

- (m) *S. hr. a. v. Moh. Isha* (1914) 34 B. m. 10, 1  
1 C 330 v. *derlat v. I. gh. adham* (19 4)  
311 v. 0 831 v. 413 (24) 21 46  
(n) *S. nk. r. l. gav. Ufford's decree* (19 3) 49  
M. I. L. J. 616 v. I. C. 201 (6) A. M. 70  
(o) *L. h. kar. Das v. Amb. ka* (1915) 37 All  
5 21 C. 66  
(p) *Palla j. v. Jorj. n* (1894) 1 Lom. 400 *Aru*  
*h. lam v. H. ji. shuck. Meera* (1911) 34  
Mad. 217 I. C. 88  
(q) *Firm. Cha. t. ya v. Jagat. Ch. dra* (19 7) 44  
Cal. L. J. 553 49 I. C. 87 ( ) A. C. 40

- ( ) *Sri. dat. I. o. j. v. Sree. Cu. to* (1906) 3 Cal. 639  
(s) *M. ru. ppa v. Ch. dambarram* (19 4) 4 Mad.  
423 29 I. C. 144 ( ) A. M. 491 o. rulline  
*Penk. la. abb. ah v. Tenkela* (1919) 4 Mad.  
1 49 I. C. 3  
(t) *Sh. ath. v. Sh. E. h* (19 9) 56 Cal. 418, (20)  
A. C. 381 ( ) A. v. B. won. (191 1) 16  
( ) W. v. 109 *M. vany. p. v. (Hid. mbaroo*  
(19 3) 47 Mad. 483  
(u) *B. gram v. A. (nyayani* (1911) 39 Cal. 464,  
10 I. C. 305

**12 [New]** Nothing in this order shall be deemed to authorize the plaintiff to apply for the attachment of any agricultural produce the possession of an agriculturist, or to empower the Court to order the attachment or production of such produce

O 38,  
rr 12-13

**13 [New]** Nothing in this Order shall be deemed to empower any Court of Small Causes to make an order for the attachment of immovable property

This rule was added by the Amending Act I of 1926 and as that Act was a declaratory Act the section is retrospective (c) See notes to Sec 7 above

## ORDER XXXIX

### *Temporary Injunctions and Interlocutory Orders*

#### *Temporary Injunctions*

Cases in which temporary injunction may be granted

**1 [S 402]** Where in any suit it is proved by affidavit or otherwise—

O 39, r 1

(a) that any property in dispute in a suit is in danger of being wasted, damaged or alienated by any party to the suit, or wrongfully sold in execution of a decree, or

(b) that the defendant threatens, or intends, to remove or dispose of his property with a view to defraud his creditors

the Court may by order grant a temporary injunction to restrain such act, or make such other order for the purpose of staying and preventing the wasting, damaging, alienation, sale, removal or disposition of the property as the Court thinks fit, until the disposal of the suit or until further orders

**Temporary and perpetual injunctions**—Injunctions are of two kinds temporary and perpetual Temporary injunctions are regulated by rr 1 and 2 of this order perpetual injunctions are regulated by ss 55 57 of the Specific Relief Act I of 1877 A party against whom a perpetual injunction is granted is thereby restrained forever from doing the act complained of A perpetual injunction can only be granted by final decree made at the hearing and upon the merits of the suit A temporary or interlocutory injunction on the other hand may be granted on an interlocutory application at any stage of the suit The injunction is called *temporary* for it endures only until the suit is disposed of or until the further order of the Court (w) Thus if A's neighbour commences to build on a plot of land belonging to him a house which if completed, would obstruct the access of light and air over the said plot to the windows of A's house in respect of which A claims an easement he may sue his neighbour for a perpetual

(c) *Muthu Krishna v Appayaram* (19 8) 65 Mad L J 38 113 IC 416 (8) A M 1173

(w) Specific Relief Act 1877 s 53



sold in execution of the decree (m) But according to the Madras High Court attachment before judgment followed by a decree does operate to defeat the right of survivorship (n)

Attachment before judgment not to bar rights of other decree holders—*A* institutes a suit against *B* and obtains an attachment before judgment of *B*'s property Subsequently *C* another creditor of *B* obtains a decree against *B* *C* is entitled to have the property attached and sold in execution of this decree The attachment before judgment does not confer any right upon *A* to have his decree satisfied in priority to that of *C* (o)

**11 [S 490]** Where property is under attachment by virtue of the provisions of this Order and a decree is subsequently passed in favour of the plaintiff, it shall not be necessary upon an application for execution of such decree to apply for a re attachment of the property

Property attached before judgment not to be re attached in execution of decree

Scope of the rule—The effect of this rule is merely to do away with the necessity for a re attachment of the property But it does not exempt the plaintiff when a decree follows the attachment from making the usual application for execution under O 21 r 11 (2) (p) This is now made clear by the substitution of the words it shall not be necessary upon an application for execution of such decree to apply for re attachment of the property for the words it shall not be necessary to re attach the property in execution of such decree The rule was applied when the property attached before judgment was attached and brought to sale by another decree holder the judgment debtor paid the amount of the second decree and on the sale being set aside it was held that the attachment before judgment revived and that the first decree holder could in execution bring the property to sale without a fresh attachment (q) The rule does not give the decree holder at whose instance the property was attached before judgment any right to preferential treatment over other decree holders who may have applied for a rateable distribution under s 73 (r) Again if the execution application is dismissed O 21 r 57 applies and the attachment ceases (s)

Whether re attachment in execution operates as a waiver—Re attachment in execution of a decree though no re attachment is necessary under this rule is not of itself a waiver or abandonment of the attachment before judgment The case is different whether there is an express or manifest abandonment (t)

Objection that property attached before judgment is not saleable—The defendant's omission to object to an application for attachment before judgment on the ground that the property is not saleable within the meaning of s 60 does not preclude him from raising that objection when an application is made for execution of the decree passed in the suit (u)

- (m) *Sut v M h Ives* (1914) 34 Bom 10 21  
1 C 330 5 *Arl v Iugh nadl* (19 4)  
31 t 0 83 I L 413 ( 4) A I 46  
(n) *S Loral nga v Official Receiver* (19 4) 49  
N I L J 616 9-1 C 504 ( 6) A M 7  
(o) *Li he har D v Anbika* (1915) 37 All  
575 99 I C 66  
(p) *Palla i v Jo d n* (1884) 1 Bom 400 *Aru  
nach liam v U J' Sh ek Meera* (1911) 34  
M d 5 71 C 8 6  
(q) *Firm Ch la va v J g t Ch Ira* (19 7) 44  
Cal L J 553 99 1 C 83 ( 7) A C 40

- (r) *Seed t Roj v Sree Cantu* (1906) 33 Cal 659  
(s) *Meeru pi v Chidambarram* (19 3) 4 Mad  
443 79 I C 144 ( -4) A M 494 overr *Ind  
Ind la 16 A v Te kta* (1919) 4 Mad  
1 45 I C  
(t) *Sh n th v S J 14* (19 9) 56 (Al 416 ( 99)  
A C 464 ( 4) A v B r r (191 1 16  
( W v 100 M J ppa v Ch J mbaram  
(12 3) 47 Mad 483  
(u) *B stream v Kallj yoni* (1911) 33 Cal 413  
10 I C 305

**Effect of temporary injunction**—A temporary injunction granted under this rule has not the effect of making a subsequent alienation of the property void. Hence if a party against whom a temporary injunction is granted restraining him from alienating the property sells or mortgages the property pending the injunction the sale or mortgage is not void. The only penalty *A* incurs by alienating the property in spite of the injunction is that prescribed by r 2 (3) namely that other property belonging to him may be attached and sold in order to award out of the sale proceeds compensation to the party on whose application the injunction was granted and he may also be detained in the civil prison. In this respect a temporary injunction has a different effect from an attachment for it will be seen on referring to s 64 that when property is attached any private transfer of the property contrary to the attachment is void against all claims enforceable under the attachment (f).

**Property in dispute in a suit**—Note that the property in respect of which an injunction may be granted in the circumstances mentioned in cl (a) of this rule must be property in dispute in the suit and no other (g) for you cannot get an injunction to restrain a man who is alleged to be a debtor from parting with his property (h). Where a plaintiff who is out of possession claims possession the Court will not grant an injunction against the defendant in possession under a claim of right unless the threatened injury will be irreparable and an injunction may be granted as to the user of premises which the plaintiff has leased to the defendant (i). In any event the plaintiff must show a *prima facie* case in support of the title asserted by him (j). For this reason the Court will as a rule refuse interim injunctions to protect patents of recent origin (k). See notes to r 7 below.

An application for an injunction restraining a party to the suit from interfering with the applicant's right to worship in and to have free access to a temple which was the subject matter of the suit pending the disposal of the suit does not fall either under cl (a) or cl (b) of this rule (l).

**Disposal of property in fraud of creditors**—The threat or intent to remove or dispose of property with a view to defraud creditors must be proved by definite evidence (m).

**Property in danger of being wrongfully sold in execution of a decree**—Certain property attached in execution of a decree obtained by *A* against *B* is notified for sale at the instance of *A*. *C* alleging that the property belongs to him and not to *B* sues *A* and *B* for a declaration of his title to the property and applied for an injunction under this rule to restrain *A* from bringing the property to sale until the suit is disposed of. Has the Court power to grant the injunction under this rule? Yes for the case is one in which the property in dispute in the suit is in danger of being wrongfully sold in execution of the decree. It is immaterial that the Court in which the suit is brought is different from the Court executing the decree or so long as it has jurisdiction to entertain the suit that it is a Court of lower grade than the Court executing the decree. Thus if the Court executing the decree is the Court of a District Judge and the Court in which the suit is brought is the Court of a Subordinate Judge the latter Court though a Court of inferior grade has power under this rule to stay the sale and execution proceedings pending before the District Court (n).

- (f) *Delhi and London Bank v Ram Narain* (1887) 9 All 497. *Mohar Das v Ram Aulair* (1903) 5 All 431. *Beti Ram v Ram Lal* (1906) 6 Lah 380. 90 I C 937 (5). A L 644.  
(g) *Joyntin v Shibpersad* (1886) 8 W R 315. 1.  
(h) *Sunda Si gh v K m Sa an* (1935) 5 Lah L J 26. 81 I C 32. (23) A L 27.  
(i) *Pobinson v Pickering* (1891) 16 Ch D 660.  
(j) *Kesho Prasad v Srinibash* (1911) 38 Cal 791. 10 I C 256. *Legg Du lop & Co v Satish*

- Chandra* (1919) 46 Cal 1001. 54 I C 88.  
(k) *Smith v Grigg Ltd* (1941) 1 K B 65.  
(l) *Kaori v Bhadraraj Bhadraraj* (1916) 1 Pat L J 560. 34 I C 48.  
(m) *Khan S gh v Must Shanno* (1946) 6 Lah L J 99. 8 I C 83. (24) A L 718.  
(n) *Bajendra v Rup Lal* (1896) 12 Cal 515. *Amir Dhan v Admin at or General Bengal* (1896) 23 Cal 351. *Abdulla Khan v Nile Lal* (1910) 33 All 79. 7 I C 183 [F.B.]

**Injunction against a person not a party to the suit**—No injunction can be granted under this rule against a person who is not a party to the suit (o)

**Appeal**—An appeal lies from an order refusing as well as from one granting a temporary injunction (p). An appeal also lies from an order purporting to be made under this rule though not warranted by it (q). Sec O 43 r 1 cl (r)

**Revision**—No appeal lies to the High Court from an order made by the lower Appellate Court under this rule [s 104 sub s (2)]. In two recent cases where a temporary injunction was refused by the lower Appellate Court the High Court of Calcutta without deciding whether it has power to revise the order made an order granting an injunction in the exercise of powers conferred upon High Courts by s. 15 of the Charter Act (r)

**Breach**—Disobedience of an injunction can be punished by the High Court as a contempt of Court (s)

**Power of Chartered High Courts to restrain a party from proceeding with a suit pending in another Court**—As regards Chartered High Courts it has been held that the powers of these Courts to grant an injunction are not confined to the terms of rules 1 and 2 of this Order. A carrying on business at D sues B in the Court of the Subordinate Judge of D to recover from B a sum of Rs 1 100 as balance due to him in respect of certain goods sent by him from D to B in Calcutta for sale as commission agent. B then sues A in the High Court of Calcutta to recover from A a sum of Rs 2 300 as balance due to him in respect of the same transactions and applies to the High Court of Calcutta for a temporary injunction to restrain A from proceeding with the suit in the Court at D until the disposal of the suit in the High Court. It is clear that this case is not covered either by r 1 or r 2 of this Order. Has the High Court power to grant the injunction? It has been held by the Calcutta High Court that the powers of High Court to grant a temporary injunction are not confined to the terms of rr 1 and 2 and that these Courts have inherent power under their general equity jurisdiction to grant such an injunction independently of the provisions of the Code and also that such power can be exercised by a single Judge sitting on the Original Side of the High Court (t). The same view has been recently taken by the High Court of Bombay but the injunction granted in that case was rather peculiar in form namely that A should be restrained from proceeding with the suit in the Court of the subordinate Judge at D in such a way as to delay or embarrass the trial of the suit in the High Court (u). The Calcutta decision however are not uniform as to whether this power can be exercised if A is not resident within the local limits of the ordinary original civil jurisdiction of the Calcutta High Court for Sale J held that the power can be exercised even if A did not reside within the limits of the jurisdiction (v) while Fletcher J (w) and Stephen J (x) held that it cannot be exercised unless A resided within those limits. The point arose in a Bombay case but it was there held that as A had been served and had appeared in the suit without protest he must be deemed to have submitted to the jurisdiction of the Bombay Court and the Court had therefore power to grant the injunction (y) so also in a Patna case (z)

(o) *P m S under v P m Dhryani* (1918) 3 Pat 1 J 456 455 46 IC 3

(p) *La hmi v Lam Charan* (1913) 35 All 4 20 IC 653

(q) *Abd l v G napatli* (1900) 43 Mad 517

(r) *Lera l v Sh m er* (1914) 41 Cal 438 1 IC 861 *Hema la v Dara ayora* (1914) 19 C W N 442, 24 IC 313

(s) *Fam Prasad v gh v Bena es Bank* (1920) 42 All 99 54 IC 600

(t) *Mu gla Chand v opal P m* (1907) 31 Cal 101 *Lash B hary v Bhown 6 Ch m*

(1907) 31 Cal 97

(u) *Mul h d v full & Co* (1900) 41 Bom 43 53 IC 518

(v) (1901) 31 C 1 101 *supra*

(w) *Sulra l on Horta v Buth mliar* (1909) 36 Cal 233 11 C v

(x) *Jumna Das v Harcharen Das* (1911) 25 Cal 405 11 C 415

(y) *Mul hand v GH & Co* (1900) 41 Bom 281 43 IC 315

(z) *Kumar Co op v Prishik & Lal* (1907) 1 Pat 306 69 IC 821 (27) A P 31

The High Court of Bombay has also held that it has inherent power to restrain by injunction a defendant in a suit in the High Court from proceeding with a suit filed by him in the Small Causes Court at Bombay referring to the same matter (a)

The next question to consider is whether the power of a Chartered High Court to restrain a party from proceeding with a suit pending in another Court is confined to suits pending in a Court subordinate thereto or whether it extends to suits pending in any Court in British India. In one of the cases cited above (b) the High Court of Calcutta made an order restraining a party from proceeding with a suit pending in the Court of the Subordinate Judge of Bareilly a Court subordinate to the High Court of Allahabad. In a recent Bombay case Macleod J. expressed the opinion that though the High Court has power to restrain a party from proceeding with a suit pending in a Court subordinate to it it has no such power in respect of a suit pending in a Court not subordinate to it (c). In support of the above view the learned Judge relied on the provisions of s. 56 cl. (b) of the Specific Relief Act 1877 by which it is enacted that an injunction cannot be granted to stay proceedings in a Court not subordinate to that from which the injunction is sought.

A further question that arises in this connection is whether a British Indian Court has power to restrain a party from proceeding with a suit pending in a Court of a Native State. It has been held by the High Court of Bombay that it has if there was a real hardship on the party before it or something vexatious or oppressive (d). The Calcutta High Court will grant such an injunction if applied for promptly and before time and trouble has been expended in the foreign suit (e). In England an injunction is granted to stay an action commenced in a foreign jurisdiction only if the applicant proves a substantial case of vexation resulting from the identity of proceedings remedies and benefits or from the existence of some motive other than a bona fide desire to determine disputes (f).

**Appeal**—No appeal lies from an order of a High Court refusing to restrain a defendant from prosecuting his suit in another Court. Such an order is not appealable under the Code. Nor is it a judgment within the meaning of cl. 12 of the Charter (g).

**Power of High Court to stay proceedings pending in a subordinate Court**—The preceding paragraph refers to the power of a Chartered High Court to restrain a party to a suit pending before it from proceeding with a suit pending in another Court. The question now to be considered is whether a Chartered High Court has power in a suit pending before it to issue a prohibition to a subordinate Court to refrain from proceeding with a suit pending before the latter Court and if so whether that power can be exercised by a single Judge sitting on the Original Side of the High Court. It has been held by a Full Bench of the Bombay High Court that a Chartered High Court has power to make an order directing a Subordinate Court not to proceed further with a suit pending in the latter Court but that such an order appertains to the Appellate and not to the Original Side of the High Court and that it can therefore only be made by those Judges to whom the Appellate Side work so assigned by Rules made under sec. 13 of the Charter Act that is by a Division Court consisting of two Judges and that it cannot be made by a single Judge sitting on the Original Side of the High Court (h). In the case cited above an order was made by Macleod J. in a suit pending

(a) *Ud am v Hyderabad* (1909) 33 Bom 469  
3 I C 990 *ditto* *Gulshing J ramdas*  
*v Zamonal* (1903) 27 Bom 357

(b) *Mungie Chand v Gopal Ram* (1907) 34 C I  
101

(c) *Narayn v Janki Bai* (1915) 39 Bom 604  
30 I C 560

(d) *Lakshmi Bai v. (19 7) 29 Bom L R 138*  
100 I C 91 (2) A B 135 See also  
*Jankichand v Lakhmichand* (19 0) 44

Bom 27 63 I C 395 and *Lakhm ram*  
*v Poonam C/o d* (1921) 45 Bom 550 56  
I C 414 (1) A B 128

(e) *Tiwanchand v S. N. K. Chand* (19 0) 24  
C W N 735 59 I C 218

(f) *Cohen v Rothfeld* [1919] 1 K B 410 414

(g) 44 Bom 77 53 I C 39 *supra*

(h) *Narayn v Janki Bai* (1915) 39 Bom 604  
30 I C 560

before him *staying a suit* pending in the Ratnagiri Court. It was assumed by a majority of the Full Bench that such an order was a prohibition to the *Ratnagiri Court* and not merely to the parties from proceeding with the suit in that Court and it was held that Macleod J. had no jurisdiction to make the order. On the other hand Macleod J. who was one of the Judges constituting the Full Bench declined to read his order as a *direct prohibition to the Ratnagiri Court* and held that a single Judge sitting on the Original Side was competent to restrain the parties in a suit before him from proceeding with a suit in a Subordinate Judge's Court in the mufassal and so in effect stay the proceedings within the meaning of sec 56 cl (b) referred to above. As to transfer of suits from Presidency Small Cause Courts to High Court see notes to cl 13 of the Letters Patent.

This rule does not apply to probate proceedings—An injunction cannot be granted under this rule in a probate proceeding. The reason is that the only question in controversy in such a proceeding is that of *representation* of the estate of the deceased there is no question of title in such a proceeding and it cannot therefore be said that there is any property in dispute in such a proceeding as contemplated by this rule. If the Court is satisfied that the estate of the deceased is in danger of being wasted or wrongfully alienated it may appoint an administrator *pendente lite* and it may also make an order under r 7 below, but it cannot grant an injunction under this rule (i).

Form—For form of temporary injunction see App F form no 8

2 [S 493] (1) In any suit for restraining the defendant from committing a breach of contract or other injury of any kind, whether compensation is claimed in the suit or not, the plaintiff may, at any time after the commencement of the suit, and either before or after judgment, apply to the Court for a temporary injunction to restrain the defendant from committing the breach of contract or injury complained of, or any breach of contract or injury of a like kind arising out of the same contract or relating to the same property or right

Injunction to restrain repetition or continuance of breach

(2) The Court may by order grant such injunction, on such terms as to the duration of the injunction, keeping an account, giving security, or otherwise, as the Court thinks fit

(3) In case of disobedience, or of breach of any such terms, the Court granting an injunction may order the property of the person guilty of such disobedience or breach to be attached, and may also order such person to be detained in the civil prison for a term not exceeding six months, unless in the meantime the Court directs his release

(4) No attachment under this rule shall remain in force for more than one year, at the end of which time if the disobedience or breach continues, the property attached may be

sold, and out of the proceeds the Court may award such compensation as it thinks fit, and shall pay the balance, if any, to the party entitled thereto

#### Alterations in the rule —

- 1 The words of any kind after the word injury in sub r (1) are new See notes below under the head Scope of the rule
- 2 The words unless in the meantime the Court directs his release in sub r (3) are also new See in this connection the undermentioned case (j)

Scope of the rule—Rule 1 enables the Court to grant temporary injunctions in the cases specified in cls (a) and (b) thereof The present rule enables the Court to grant temporary injunctions to restrain a defendant from committing the breach of a contract or other injury of any kind The words of any kind are new They have been added to supersede an Allahabad decision where it was held that the words other injury in the old section did not include acts of trespass upon property (k) Such acts are now within this rule In a Bombay case a lessee sought to execute a decree to evict his sub lessee But at the date of the decree the term of the head lease had expired and the head lessor sued to restrain the lessee from taking possession Macleod C J held that neither rule 1 nor rule 2 applied (l) A Court hearing an election petition under rules framed under the Madras District Municipalities Act cannot grant a temporary injunction restraining the candidate from taking his seat (m)

#### Principles governing temporary injunction to restrain breach of contract —

Temporary injunctions to restrain the breach of a contract are regulated by the present rule Perpetual injunctions to restrain the breach of a contract are regulated by the Specific Relief Act 1877 s 56 cl (f) and s 57 Section 56 cl (f) of the Specific Relief Act provides that a perpetual injunction cannot be granted to prevent the breach of a contract the performance of which would not be specifically enforced Now the performance of a contract is not specifically enforced where damages would afford adequate relief Hence no injunction can be granted where damages afford adequate relief

The very first principle of injunction law is that you do not obtain injunctions for actionable wrongs [or for breach of contracts] for which damages are the proper remedy (n) In the Bombay case of *Nusserwanji v Gordon* (o) Sir Charles Sargent said that the issue of a temporary injunction is governed by the same principles as the granting of a permanent injunction at the trial of a case Referring to these observations Sir Arnold White in a Madras case said Now having regard to the fact that the law with regard to the granting of a perpetual injunction is to be found in the Specific Relief Act and is laid down with great precision and that the law with regard to the granting of a temporary injunction is to be found in the Code of Civil Procedure and is declared to be a matter for discretion if it were necessary to consider the point I am not sure I should be prepared to go quite so far as Sir Charles Sargent (p) However that may be the following two rules seem to govern all cases on the subject now under consideration —

- 1 If a suit is brought for specific performance of a contract and for an injunction to restrain the defendant from committing a breach of the contract and the plaintiff applies for a temporary injunction to prevent the breach of the contract until the suit is disposed of the Court will decline to grant a temporary injunction if the plaintiff and

(j) *Advocate-General of Bombay v G ngji* (1895) 19 Bom 15  
 (k) *De ad Kwar v Gomis Kua* (1900) 2 All 449  
 (l) *Nusserwanji v Shaji Begam* (1901) 46 Bom 939 66 I C 764 ( ) A B 385  
 (m) *Penlata Subba v Seetha A yar* (1914) 47 Mad

60 60 I C 664 ( ) A M 797  
 (n) *Per Lindley L J in London and Blackwall Ry Co v Cross* (1836) 31 C D 354 369  
 (o) (188 ) 6 Bom 66 p 3 9  
 (p) *Saba v H ji Dad ha* (1903) 6 Mad 169 175

the affidavits filed by the parties show *on the face of them* that the case is not one for a perpetual injunction or for specific performance. The refusal of the application for a temporary injunction in (1) *Bhikaji v Bapu Saju (q)* (2) *Haji Abdul v Haji Abdul (r)* (3) *Nusserwanji v Gordon (s)* (4) *Assur v Ratanbhai (t)* and (5) *In the matter of Ganpat Narain (u)* may be referred to this rule. In the first case the suit was by an association of artisans consisting of 57 members for an injunction against one of them to restrain him from committing the breach of a contract which provided that all the members of the association should bring the business of working and carving in wood into one shop and should divide the profits among them and *that no member should take any order on his own account*. The plaintiffs applied for a temporary injunction against the defendant to prevent the breach of the contract until the disposal of the suit but the injunction was refused for the agreement being on the face of it illegal (as the association though it consisted of 57 members was not registered as a Company) no specific performance or injunction could be granted. In the second case the suit was for a perpetual injunction to prevent the breach of an agreement for a charter party. The Court refused to grant a temporary injunction to restrain the breach on the ground that a perpetual injunction could not be granted to restrain the breach of such an agreement though a perpetual injunction might be granted to prevent the breach of an *actually completed charter party*. In the third case an application for a temporary injunction was made by the agents of a company as plaintiffs to restrain the company from employing a firm of solicitors in contravention of an agreement between the company and the agents whereby the plaintiff's firm were appointed agents of the company for 25 years and the agents were empowered to employ solicitors for the company during that period. The Court refused the application on the ground that since a perpetual injunction could not be granted to restrain the company from employing persons other than the plaintiff's firm as agents of the company a temporary injunction should not be granted to restrain the company from employing solicitors other than those of the plaintiff's choice. In the fourth case the Court refused to grant a temporary injunction to restrain a Hindu widow from adopting a son in breach of an agreement entered into by her not to adopt a son. The order of refusal was based on the ground that the Court could not grant a perpetual injunction to prevent the breach of such a contract. In the last of the cases cited above the parties were Hindus and the suit was brought by the plaintiff against the defendant for specific performance of a contract whereby the defendant agreed to give his minor daughter in marriage to the plaintiff. The plaintiff applied for an interim injunction to restrain the defendant from giving away the girl in marriage to another person but the application was refused on the ground that the contract was not one of which specific performance could be enforced or the breach of which could be restrained by a perpetual injunction.

2 The converse of rule (1) is not always true that is the Court will not grant a temporary injunction before the hearing in every case where a perpetual injunction might fitly be granted at the hearing for to justify a temporary injunction not only must the case be such that an injunction is the appropriate relief but there must be the further ingredient that unless the defendant is restrained *forthwith* by a temporary injunction irreparable injury or inconvenience may result to the plaintiff before the suit is decided upon its merits (v). But if a case is a proper one for specific performance and irreparable injury is likely to be caused to the plaintiff unless the breach of the contract is forthwith restrained the Court will grant a temporary injunction to restrain the breach of the contract. Thus where A sued B for specific performance of a contract whereby in consideration of A having advanced money to B to working certain mica mines B had

(q) (1877) 1 Bom 550  
(r) (1884) 6 Bom 5  
(s) (1885) 6 Bom 766  
(t) (1889) 13 Bom 56

(u) (1878) 1 Cal 74  
(v) See Collett's Specific R. Rel Act 263 61  
*Yashbhai v Jendarshan* (1895) 1 Bom  
110

agreed to deliver all the mica produced from the mines to *A* and not to deliver any portion thereof to any other person and also sued for an injunction to restrain the breach of this agreement and in the suit applied for a temporary injunction to restrain *B* from delivering any portion of the mica to another firm to whom *B* had arranged in breach of his contract to consign a portion the Court held that the case was a fit one for a temporary injunction and the injunction was granted (w) But if the existence of the contract itself is denied no temporary injunction can be granted (x)

Sub rule (3) —The powers conferred by this sub rule can only be exercised if the Court is set in motion by a party who deems himself aggrieved hence where a District Court committed a defendant to jail of its own motion for disobeying an injunction of the Court it was held that the order of committal was *ultra vires* Note however that a High Court has inherent power to commit a defaulting party for contempt hence a High Court can commit a defendant to jail of its own motion for disobeying an injunction issued by such Court (y) See sec 151 above

Under sub r (3) the Court can in its discretion order either arrest or attachment of property it is not bound in the first instance to make an order of attachment and then order imprisonment ( ) There is no foundation for the proposition that the Court can only make an order of imprisonment after an order of attachment Persons who abet disobedience of an injunction cannot be punished under this rule (a)

If the application to commit was made while the suit was pending the fact that the order on the application was made after the suit was dismissed does not affect the powers of the Court to take action for disobedience to the injunction (b)

A Court to which the business of the Court granting the injunction is transferred can exercise powers of punishment under this sub rule (c)

Temporary mandatory injunction—The Courts in England have the power to grant mandatory injunctions on interlocutory applications (d) And so have Chartered High Courts in the exercise of their ordinary original civil jurisdiction (e) The same power is possessed by Courts in the mofussil (f)

Appeal—An appeal lies under O 43 r 1 (r) from an order declining to order arrest or attachment of property for disobedience of an interlocutory injunction granted under this rule and the Appellate Court may on appeal pass the order which the lower Court should have passed (g)

**3 [S 494]** The Court shall in all cases, except where it appears that the object of granting the injunction would be defeated by the delay, before granting an injunction, direct notice of the application for the same to be given to the opposite party

Before granting injunction Court to direct notice to opposite party

- (w) *S b a v H j Badsha* (1903) 28 Mad 169  
31 Ind 117 Co v I at (1891) 14 Mad 18
- (x) *Monoh v Jas Na agra* (19 0) — Lah LJ 83 55 I C 403
- (y) *Govt ppa v S ch De v* (1903) 6 Mad 494
- (z) *Mawaz m v Shetash* (19 7) 51 C W 814 10 I C 319 ( 7) A C 598
- (a) *Mawaz m v Shetash* supra
- (b) *S j p v A n h i* (1918) 39 Mad 907 34 I C 568
- (c) *Mou a Gu samy v Sher I Muhammadu* (19 1) 46 Mad 83 86 I C 650 ( 3) A M 9
- (d) *F b nson v Lord Byre* (1785) 1 Brown Ch Cas 583 *Hertey v Smith* (1855) 1 B

- and J 389 *Allport v S erit Co Ltd* (1895) 7 L 1 533 *Bonner v G eat* 11 est rn l y Co (1883) 5 Ch D 1
- (e) *Ch m p j v J na k lo Mills* (1914) 10 Bom L R 566 61 C 121
- (f) *Kandaswami v Sub ama is* (1918) 41 Mad 98 41 I C 334 [yes] *I arul Aarim v I rubh* (1914) 33 Bom 381 41 C 63 [Yes according to Shah J No according to B n n J I arul v Shamerr (1914) 41 Cal 436 443 445 1 I C 601 (e)]
- (g) *Supp v A e A* (1918) 9 M d 907 34 I C 45 *D w n Cha d v Jhara Coal Co* (19 3) 6 Lah L J 14 66 I C 9 (—) A L 347



4 [S 496] Any order for an injunction may be discharged, or varied, or set aside by the Court, on application made thereto by any party dissatisfied with such order

Order for injunction may be discharged varied or set aside

Appeal —An appeal lies from an order under this rule [O 43 r 1 cl (r)]

5 [S 495] An injunction directed to a corporation is binding not only on the corporation itself, but also on all members and officers of the corporation whose personal action it seeks to restrain

Injunction to corporation binding on its officers

*Interlocutory Orders*

6 The Court may, on the application of any party to a suit, order the sale, by any person named in such order, and in such manner and on such terms as it thinks fit, of any movable property, being the subject-matter of such suit, or attached before judgment in such suit, which is subject to speedy and natural decay, or which for any other just and sufficient cause it may be desirable to have sold at once

Power to order interim sale

The words or which for any other just and sufficient cause it may be desirable to have sold at once have been added to as to empower the Court to order a sale of securities where the state of the market requires such a course

7 [S 499, S C R, O 50, r 3] (1)  
The Court may, on the application of any party to a suit, and on such terms as it thinks fit—

Detention preservation inspection etc of subject matter of suit

- (a) make an order for the detention, preservation or inspection of any property which is the subject-matter of such suit, or as to which any question may arise therein,
- (b) for all or any of the purposes aforesaid authorize any person to enter upon or into any land or building in the possession of any other party to such suit, and
- (c) for all or any of the purposes aforesaid authorize any samples to be taken or any observation to be made or experiment to be tried, which may seem necessary or expedient for the purpose of obtaining full information or evidence

(2) The provisions as to execution of process shall apply, *mutatis mutandis*, to persons authorised to enter under this rule

The words or a to which any question may arise therein in sub r 1 cl. (a) are new

Inspection of property which is the subject matter of the suit—In a suit by A against B for damages for injury alleged to have been caused to A's house by the erection of B's house the Court may make an order on B's application for inspection of A's house to determine the alleged injury A's house being in such a case the subject matter of the suit (A)

8 [S 500] (1) An application by the plaintiff for an order under rule 6 or rule 7 may be made after notice to the defendant at any time after institution of the suit

Application for such orders to be after notice

(2) An application by the defendant for a like order may be made after notice to the plaintiff at any time after appearance

9 [S 501] Where land paying revenue to Government or a tenure liable to sale, is the subject matter of a suit, if the party in possession of such land or tenure neglects to pay the Government revenue, or the rent due to the proprietor of the tenure, as the case may be, and such land or tenure is consequently ordered to be sold, any other party to the suit claiming to have an interest in such land or tenure may, upon payment of the revenue or rent due previously to the sale (and with or without security at the discretion of the Court), be put in immediate possession of the land or tenure,

When party may be put in immediate possession of land the subject matter of suit

and the Court in its decree may award against the defaulter the amount so paid, with interest thereon at such rate as the Court thinks fit, or may charge the amount so paid, with interest thereon at such rate as the Court orders, in any adjustment of accounts which may be directed in the decree passed in the suit

10 [S 502] Where the subject matter of a suit is money or some other thing capable of delivery, and any party thereto admits that he holds such money or other thing as a

Deposit of money etc in Court

**4 [S 496]** Any order for an injunction may be discharged, or varied, or set aside by the Court, on application made thereto by any party dissatisfied with such order

Order for injunction may be discharged varied or set aside

**Appeal**—An appeal lies from an order under this rule [O 43 r 1 cl (r)]

**5 [S 495]** An injunction directed to a corporation is binding not only on the corporation itself, but also on all members and officers of the corporation whose personal action it seeks to restrain

Injunction to corporation binding on its officers

### *Interlocutory Orders*

**6** The Court may, on the application of any party to a suit, order the sale, by any person named in such order, and in such manner and on such terms as it thinks fit, of any movable property, being the subject-matter of such suit, or attached before judgment in such suit, which is subject to speedy and natural decay, or which for any other just and sufficient cause it may be desirable to have sold at once

Power to order interim sale

The words or which for any other just and sufficient cause it may be desirable to have sold at once have been added to as to empower the Court to order a sale of securities where the state of the market requires such a course

**7 [S 499, S C R, O 50, r 3] (1)** The Court may, on the application of any party to a suit, and on such terms as it thinks fit—

Detention preservation inspection etc of subject matter of suit

- (a) make an order for the detention, preservation or inspection of any property which is the subject-matter of such suit, or as to which any question may arise therein,
- (b) for all or any of the purposes aforesaid authorize any person to enter upon or into any land or building in the possession of any other party to such suit, and
- (c) for all or any of the purposes aforesaid authorize any samples to be taken or any observation to be made or experiment to be tried, which may seem necessary or expedient for the purpose of obtaining full information or evidence

(2) The provisions as to execution of process shall apply, *mutatis mutandis*, to persons authorised to enter under this rule

The words or a to which any question may arise therin in sub r 1 cl (a) are

Inspection of property which is the subject matter of the suit—In a suit by A against B for damages for injury alleged to have been caused to A's house by the erection of B's house the Court may make an order on B's application for inspection of A's house to determine the alleged injury A's house being in such a case the subject matter of the suit (h)

8 [S 500] (1) An application by the plaintiff for an order under rule 6 or rule 7 may be made after notice to the defendant at any time after institution of the suit

Application for such orders to be after notice

(2) An application by the defendant for a like order may be made after notice to the plaintiff at any time after appearance

9 [S 501] Where land paying revenue to Government, or a tenure liable to sale, is the subject matter of a suit, if the party in possession of such land or tenure neglects to pay the Government revenue, or the rent due to the proprietor of the tenure, as the case may be, and such land or tenure is consequently ordered to be sold, any other party to the suit claiming to have an interest in such land or tenure may, upon payment of the revenue or rent due previously to the sale (and with or without security at the discretion of the Court), be put in immediate possession of the land or tenure,

Wh a party may be put in immediate possession of land the subject matter of suit

and the Court in its decree may award against the defaulter the amount so paid, with interest thereon at such rate as the Court thinks fit, or may charge the amount so paid, with interest thereon at such rate as the Court orders, in any adjustment of accounts which may be directed in the decree passed in the suit

10 [S 502] Where the subject matter of a suit is money or some other thing capable of delivery, and any party thereto admits that he holds such money or other thing as a

Deposit of money etc in Court

0 trustee for another party, or that it belongs or is due to another party, the Court may order the same to be deposited in Court or delivered to such last named party, with or without security, subject to the further direction of the Court

**Deposit of money in Court.**—If *A* sues *B* to recover a sum of Rs 5 000 and *B* admits Rs 4 000 to be due to *A* and contests *A*'s claim as to the balance of Rs 1 000 this will be a proper case for *A* to apply to the Court to direct *B* to deposit Rs 4 000 in Court or to deliver the same to him

**Holds.**—This rule applies only when the party making the admission holds the property or other thing which the party in whose favour the order is made seeks to have delivered to him (1)

**Appeal.**—An appeal lies from an order under this rule [O 43 r 1 cl (r)]

## ORDER XL

### *Appointment of Receivers*

**Appointment of Receivers** 1 [S 503] (1) Where it appears to the Court to be just and convenient, the Court may by order—

- (a) appoint a receiver of any property, whether before or after decree,
- (b) remove any person from the possession or custody of the property,
- (c) commit the same to the possession, custody or management of the receiver, and
- (d) confer upon the receiver all such powers as to bringing and defending suits and for the realisation, management, protection, preservation and improvement of the property, the collection of the rents and profits thereof, the application and disposal of such rents and profits, and the execution of documents as the owner himself has, or such of those powers as the Court thinks fit

(2) Nothing in this rule shall authorize the Court to remove from the possession or custody of property any person whom any party to the suit has not a present right so to remove

Alterations in the rule—

- 1 The words to be just and convenient have been substituted for the words to be necessary for the realization preservation or better custody or management of any property movable or immovable the subject of a suit or attachment The effect of this amendment is that the Court may now appoint a receiver not only in the particular cases specified in the old section but in every case in which it appears to the Court to be just and convenient to do so Thus a receiver may be appointed in a suit for partition (j) See notes below under the head Just and convenient As to execution of decrees by appointment of a receiver see s 51 cl (d)
- 2 The words whether before or after decree in cl (a) are new They give effect to the undermentioned decision under the old section (l)
- 3 The words subject matter of a suit which occurred in the corresponding s. 503 of the Code of 1882 have been omitted See notes below under the head Receiver in proceedings other than a suit

Receiver in proceedings other than a suit—Sec 503 of the Code of 1882 contained the words subject matter of a suit The result was that under that section a receiver could only be appointed in a suit Those words have been omitted in the present rule so that a receiver may now be appointed even in proceedings other than a suit (i) A Court has no jurisdiction to appoint a receiver in proceedings under the Succession Certificates Act (m) or in proceedings for the removal of a trustee under s 74 of the Trusts Act (n) but may appoint a receiver in a testamentary suit (o) or proceeding under the Guardian and Wards Act (p) If no suit or litigious proceeding is pending with reference to the property the Court has no jurisdiction to appoint a receiver of it A receiver therefore cannot be appointed after the suit is compromised (q)

Courts empowered under this order—Under the Code of 1882 (s. 503) a receiver could only be appointed by High Courts and District Courts and not by the Courts subordinate to District Courts This bar has been now removed by the omission of s. 503 A receiver may now be appointed by Subordinate Judges also

A receiver is an officer of the Court—The object and purpose of the appointment of a receiver may generally be stated to be the preservation of the subject matter of the litigation pending a judicial determination of the rights of the parties thereto (r) The receiver is appointed for the benefit of all concerned he is the representative of the Court and of all parties interested in the litigation wherein he is appointed (s) The appointment [of a receiver] is the act of the Court and made in the interests of justice [A receiver] is an officer or representative of the Court and subject to its orders His possession is the possession of the Court by its receiver and the tenants in possession when he is appointed to receive rents and profits of immovable property become virtually tenants *pro hac vice* of the Court their landlord His possession is the possession of all the parties to the proceedings according to their titles The moneys in his hands are in *custodia legis* for the person who can make a title to them (t)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>(j) <i>Lamji Pann v S I gram</i> (1909) 14 Cal W N 48 51 C 98 C 1 dv 1 <i>Halder o</i> (19 0) Lom L R 17 55 IC 8 7</p> <p>(k) <i>Shu gam v Ji th</i> (185) 8 Mad 9</p> <p>(l) <i>As dals v Jafahmed</i> (19 6) 43 Cal 986 36 IC 177</p> <p>(m) <i>Ka f v K haysa Lal</i> (19 4) 46 AH 37 9 IC 363 ( ) A A 376</p> <p>( ) <i>As d v M st Thakurba</i> (19 7) S L R 146 103 IC 816 ( 7) A S 37</p> <p>(o) <i>I e hu t v Sh kar</i> (1893) 17 Bom 748</p> <p>(p) <i>In re Bas J minabai</i> (191 ) 36 Bom 0 11 IC 554 <i>Cha d oswali v Jag ath</i> (19 5)</p> | <p>7 Lah L J 81 90 I C 611 ( 2 ) A L 469</p> <p>(q) <i>Chand chur Pra ad v Dufeswar</i> (19 0) 51st L J 513 53 I C 40</p> <p>(r) <i>Jag t Ter Dars v Vabai G pal</i> (1907) 31 Cal 30 316</p> <p>(s) <i>Is p</i> 317</p> <p>(t) <i>Orr v M Usa</i> (1894) 17 Mad 501 503 <i>Ad 11 for Gen ly I rem Lall</i> (189 ) Cal 1011 1015 I A 03 <i>Ducy nd a v Joyce</i> (19 4) 39 Cal L J 40 9 I C 0 ( ) A C 600</p> |
|--|---|

, r 1 Legal consequences arising from the fact that a receiver is an officer of the Court —

(1) *Attachment*—Property in the hands of a receiver cannot be attached without the leave of the Court first obtained. Thus if a receiver is appointed of certain property in a suit between A and B and C obtains a decree against A or B C cannot in execution of his decree attach the property in the hands of the receiver without the leave of the Court such an attachment is an interference with the Court's possession through its officer the receiver (u). But if a receiver is appointed of certain property in a suit between A and B and the property was mortgaged by A to C before the receiver was appointed and C obtains a decree for sale of the mortgaged property C may bring the property to sale though it may be in the hands of the receiver without the leave of the Court. The reason is that no attachment is necessary before sale in the case of a mortgage-decree and no attachment being necessary there cannot be any interference with the possession of the receiver (v).

(2) *Suit by or against receiver Leave of Court*—A receiver cannot sue or be sued except with the leave of the Court by which he was appointed receiver (w). A party feeling aggrieved by the conduct of a receiver may seek redress against him in the very suit in which he was appointed receiver or he may bring a separate suit against the receiver in which case he must obtain the leave of the Court (x). The application in the suit is for an examination *pro interesse suo* (y). The Court will dispose of the matter summarily in simple cases (z) and if the applicant has shown diligence (a). But if questions of title are involved the Court will authorize a suit to be brought against the receiver (b). No appeal lies against an order granting leave to sue a receiver (c). There is no statutory provision which requires a party to take the leave of the Court to sue a receiver. The rule has come down to us as a part of the rules of equity binding upon all Courts of Justice in this country. It is a rule based upon public policy which requires that when the Court has assumed possession of a property in the interest of the litigants before it the authority of the Court is not to be obstructed by suits deemed to disturb the possession of the Court. The institution of such suits is in the eye of the law a contempt of the authority of the Court and therefore the party contemplating such a suit is required to take the leave of the Court so as to absolve himself from that charge. The grant of such leave is made not in exercise of any power conferred by statute but in exercise of the inherent power which every Court possesses to prevent acts which constitute or are akin to an abuse of its authority (d). By giving leave to sue its receiver the Court does not relinquish possession of the property to the Court where the claim of the third party is asserted (e). The Court in which the suit is filed has no jurisdiction to issue an injunction restraining the receiver from dealing with the property (f) nor can the third party if he obtains a decree enforce it in execution. His proper course is to apply to the Court which appointed the receiver to direct the receiver to act in accordance with the decree (g). In *Pramatha Nath v Khetra Nath* (h) Bodilly J held that the leave of the Court to sue a receiver was a condition precedent to the right to sue and that if the leave was not obtained before suit it could not be granted subsequent to the

- (u) *Ash v Alf M Lomed* (1893) 16 Bom 377  
 (v) *Josend v Lebend* (1899) 6 Cal 1<sup>st</sup>  
 (w) *Miler v J m la ja* (1884) 10 Cal 1014  
*D n e v A mar (La dm)* (1903) 30 Cal 503, *La e v C parison of C leulla* (1903) 31 Cal 111, *La e v M g v La h m* (1908) 6 H ng 64, 110 E C 6 ( )  
 A R 1  
 ( ) *Kam t h v A la m* (1907) 6 Cal 19—  
 (y) *Vedde v J mon* (1905) 41 Cal L J 19—  
 86 L C 674 ( ) A R 641  
 (z) *K A New der v J A V Ka va* (1903) 11 Cal 134 76 L C 441 ("3) A R 399  
 ( ) (1907) 41 Cal L J 197 86 L C 877 (—3)

- A C 681 *supra*  
 (b) (1905) 41 Cal L J 197 86 L C 6 ("3)  
 A C 641 *supra*  
 (c) *Shri was v B n* (1900) 45 Bom 99 39 L C 41  
 (d) *Fraja Bh au v Sri Chandra* (1912) 4 Pat L J 719  
 ( ) *Shri v M n ram* (1904) 3 Pat 35 4  
 I B 87 ( ) A R 491  
 (f) *J m A hor v J m J m* (1907) 11 Cal 110 L C 700 ("2) A R 441  
 (g) (1907) 41 Cal L J 197 86 L C 877 (—3)  
 A R 399  
 (h) (1907) 22 Cal 10

institution of the suit and the suit should be dismissed. This decision was disapproved in subsequent Calcutta cases where it was held that the leave may be granted even after the institution of the suit (i). In a recent Bombay case (j) Pratt J. after an exhaustive review of the case law on the subject came to the same conclusion. The learned judge held that failure to obtain leave prior to the institution of the suit was cured by subsequent leave. As regards suits by a receiver it has been recently held by the High Court of Calcutta that if the suit is instituted without the leave of the Court the Court may grant leave after the institution of the suit to continue the suit (k). So also by the Madras High Court (l).

It may here be noted that a receiver is not a necessary party to a suit for a declaration of title and possession of property of which he is appointed receiver (m) nor can he be made a party to a proceeding under sec. 145 of the Criminal Procedure Code in his capacity of receiver (n). There is no right of action against a Tahsildar or other officer appointed by a receiver (o).

(3) *Debts incurred by receiver in business*—If a receiver is appointed of the estate of a deceased person with authority to continue the business carried on by the deceased and in the course of such business debts are properly incurred by the receiver the persons to whom the debts have become due may proceed not only against the receiver personally but also against the estate of the deceased for the recovery of their debts. They are entitled to payment of their debts in priority to other creditors of the estate. The right to proceed against the estate is founded on the just and equitable principle that as the acts of a receiver acting within his authority are the acts of the Court the estate cannot be permitted to enjoy the benefits of those acts without being held liable for the obligations arising out of them (p).

(4) *Loss occasioned by receiver's default*—If any loss is occasioned to the party by the wilful default or gross negligence of the receiver the loss is to be borne by the party on who an application the receiver was appointed (for a receiver is not a party to such party) but by the estate in the first instance. The party damaged by the loss may then proceed against the receiver (q). See r. 4 below.

(5) *Agreement controlling receiver's powers*—A receiver being an officer of the Court it is contempt of Court on the part of any of the parties to enter into an agreement with him restricting and controlling his powers. The Court alone has the power to determine the powers of a receiver (r).

(6) *Remuneration*—A receiver being an officer of the Court it is for the Court to determine his fees or remuneration (s. below). Hence a promise by a party for the remuneration of a receiver without leave of the Court is against law and void as to the promisee (t).

(7) *Criminal Procedure Code s. 145*—Where a receiver is appointed in a suit for property the subject of a suit a Magistrate has no jurisdiction under sec. 145 of the C.P.C. (u).

- (i) *Bohri Behari v. Narendra Nath* (1910) 15 C.W.N. 54 81 C. 1 41 Chandra v. Apurba (1911) 15 C.W.N. 9 511 C. 187 [Execution proceeding] *M. Narayan of B. d. r. Apurba* (1911) 15 C.W.N. 87 101 C. 57.
- (j) *J. Meedy v. His ex. dhan* (1910) 41 Bom. 903 58 I. C. 411.
- (k) *Rust mjeer v. Frederic G. b. le* (1912) 46 Cal. 350 51 I. C. 486.
- (l) *Ammukutty v. Ma a. k. r. an* (1910) 43 M. d. 793 59 I. C. 509.
- (m) *S. H. y. v. (olap)* (1900) 5 Cal. W. N. 97.
- (n) *Jodger v. Ashutosh* (1901) 6 Cal. W. N. 89.
- (o) *Bloor v. Abdul M. s. an* (1915) 27

- Bom. L. R. 1117 90 J. R. 53.
- (p) *Dunne v. F. mar Chand et al* (1911) 15 C.W.N. 99 61 C. 768 (1) 41.
- (q) *M. A. r. Biba v. Shyamal* (1911) 15 C.W.N. 937 58 I. C. 139.
- (r) *Orr v. Aluthia* (1901) 17 Cal. 101 51 I. C. 221.
- (s) *M. A. r. Biba v. Shyamal* (1911) 15 C.W.N. 937 58 I. C. 139.
- (t) *Prakash Chandra v. Alka* (1911) 15 C.W.N. 937 58 I. C. 139.



r 1 of Criminal Procedure to interfere with him in respect of his possession of the property without the sanction of the Court his possession being the possession of the Court (t). It may here be noted that a Civil Court has no power under this rule to appoint a receiver in supersession of a receiver appointed by a Magistrate under sec 140 cl. (2) of the Criminal Procedure Code (u) See sub rule (2)

(8) *Prosecution of receiver*—A receiver appointed by the High Court who has under its orders taken possession of property cannot be prosecuted for criminal breach of trust in respect thereof without first obtaining the leave of the Court (v)

(9) *Attorney of party*—The attorney of a party should not be appointed receiver as such an appointment interrupts the arrangement made by the party for his defence in the suit (w)

‘Just and convenient.—These words have been taken from the Judicature Act 1873 s 25 subs (8). The words in that Act are just or convenient but they have been constructed to mean just and convenient (x). The words just and convenient do not mean that the Court is to appoint a receiver simply because the Court thinks it convenient they mean that the Court should appoint a receiver for the protection of rights or for the prevention of injury according to legal principles (y). The order is discretionary and the discretion must be exercised in accordance with the principles on which judicial discretion is exercised (z). Hence the Court should not appoint a receiver of property in the possession of the defendant who claims it by a legal title unless the plaintiff can show *prima facie* that he has a strong case and a good title to the property (a). The Court must consider whether special interference with the possession of a defendant is required there being a well founded fear that the property in question will be dissipated or that other irreparable mischief may be done unless the Court gives its protection (b). On the other hand where property is shown to be in *medio res* in the enjoyment of no one the Court can hardly do wrong in appointing a receiver for it is the common interest of all parties to prevent a scramble (c). The mere circumstance that the appointment of a receiver will do no harm to any one is no ground for appointing a receiver (d) and a receiver cannot be appointed merely for the purpose of ascertaining the income of an estate in order to fix the amount of maintenance to be paid out of it (e). See notes above Alterations in the rule No 1 and notes below Cases in which a receiver may be appointed.” See also Specific Relief Act 1 of 1877 s 44

**Which Court may appoint a receiver.**—The power to appoint a receiver rests only with the Court trying the suit in which it is sought to appoint a receiver. Hence a District Judge has no power to appoint a receiver of property which is the subject of a suit in another Court even though subordinate to his own (f). A Court should not appoint a receiver when another receiver has been appointed of the same property by another Court in another suit for such a procedure will lead to a conflict of jurisdiction (g).

(1) *Du v Kum Cha dra* (1903) 30 Cal 93  
(u) *Bulaprasad v Ashraf* (1913) 40 Cal 86

(v) *Sa tot (A d v Emperor)* (1919) 48 Cal 43

(w) *Joh null v Kalarn th* (19 4) 55 Cal 113

(x) *Belton v Belton* (18 4) 9 C D 89 93

(y) *Day v Brown* (18 4) 10 C D 91 307

(z) *Lat v Lat* (18 4) 10 C D 91 307

(a) *Lat v Lat* (18 4) 10 C D 91 307

(b) *Lat v Lat* (18 4) 10 C D 91 307

(c) *Lat v Lat* (18 4) 10 C D 91 307

(d) *Sith wari v Abbey wari* (1884) 15 Cal 818

(e) *Penoy Kri a v Sai A Chandra wari*

(f) *Owen v Owen* (18 3) 11 L C 97

(g) *Lat v Lat* (18 4) 10 C D 91 307

(h) *Lat v Lat* (18 4) 10 C D 91 307

(i) *Lat v Lat* (18 4) 10 C D 91 307

(j) *Lat v Lat* (18 4) 10 C D 91 307

(k) *Lat v Lat* (18 4) 10 C D 91 307

(l) *Lat v Lat* (18 4) 10 C D 91 307

Whether a receiver can be appointed when an executor is in possession—In England the rule is that the Court will not appoint a receiver against an executor unless gross misconduct is shown (h) and the same rule it is submitted applies to the case of an executor of the will of a person subject to the provisions of the Indian Succession Act. This rule however does not apply in the case of an executor of the will of a Mahomedan. The reason is that while in the case of persons governed by the Succession Act a testator can dispose of the whole of his property by his will a Mahomedan testator cannot dispose of more than one third of the property by his will (i).

Where a receiver is appointed of the estate of a deceased person and the estate is being administered by the Court the Court may authorize the receiver to pay out of the estate in his hands pressing claims against the estate (j).

Company—The Court has no jurisdiction to appoint a receiver of a company (k). If it is necessary to protect the assets recourse must be had to the provisions of the Companies Acts.

Reference to arbitration—The Court has power to appoint a receiver even after a suit has been referred to arbitration (l).

Temporary injunctions and appointment of receiver—The distinction between a case in which a temporary injunction may be granted and a case in which a receiver may be appointed is that while in either case it must be shown that the property should be preserved from waste or alienation in the former case it is sufficient if it be shown that the plaintiff in the suit has a fair question to raise as to the existence of the right alleged while in the latter case a good *prima facie* title to the property over which the receiver is sought to be appointed has to be made out (m).

When receiver may be appointed—The appointment of a receiver is in the discretion of the Court. The power to appoint a receiver is not to be exercised as a matter of course or for the reason that it can do no harm to appoint one. A receiver should not be appointed in supersession of a bona fide possessor of the property in dispute unless there is some substantial ground for interference (n). The mere fact that a plaintiff in his plaint makes violent and wholesale charges of waste is no ground for the appointment of a receiver (o). The Court will not in a suit against trustees for the possession of land and for mesne profits appoint a receiver merely because the trustee is a poor man from whom mesne profits if awarded could not be recovered unless it is alleged and shown that he was wasting the property (p). The removal however under suspicious circumstances of a large amount of property by the defendant during the pendency of a suit in which the question of title to that property would be determined is a good ground for the appointment of a receiver (q). The anxiety of a life tenant to transfer lands to a stranger is a danger to the interests of the reversioner and it is a matter to be taken into consideration on an application for the appointment of a receiver (r).

Joint Hindu family—The Court will not as a general rule appoint a receiver in a partition suit between members of a joint Hindu family especially where the family property consists of immovable property. To appoint a receiver in such a case special circumstances must be proved (s). A receiver may be appointed in a suit for partition

(h) *Suendra Kum v S Ali K mar* (1908) 55 Cal 219 = 9 109 I C 759 (8) A C 456-56

(i) *Haji b v Kazi Abd I K m* (1899) 19 Bom 83

(j) *Moti ah v Premrahu* (1899) 18 Bom 511

(k) *Ka l sh Ch nd a v Sal M* (1910) 5 Cal 513 89 I C 86 (5) A C 817

(l) *Surendra Kum v Sushil Kumra supra*

(m) *Chaddi v Padmana I* (1895) Cal 459  
See *Iso Sham Chand v Bhaya I am* (1900) 5 Cal W N 365

(n) *Bhupat a Nath v M nohar* (1903) 3 C W N 86 77 I C 783 (4) A C 456  
See *Iso Ma B v Ma OA* (1907) 5 Rang

0 101 I C 717 (2) A R 19

(o) *Srimati Prasanna v B Madham* (1853) 5 All 556

(p) *Muhammad Ali v Nara Hussa n* (1911) 43 All 311 60 I C 901 (1) A A 91

(q) *Sa F m v Msh b* (1900) 27 Cal 279  
(r) *Ahmed Armat v Bai B b* (1900) 44 Bom 77 57 I C 553

(s) *Gund Na aya n v Vall bh so* (1900) 22 Bom L R 17 55 I C 8-7

1 of joint Hindu family property where there is a *prima facie* case of misappropriation by the manager of the family (f)

**Mortgage suits**—In a mortgagee's suit for foreclosure or sale where the mortgagee is entitled to enter into possession on default in payment of the mortgage moneys the mortgagee is entitled *prima facie* to an order for the appointment of a receiver (u). The mortgagee in possession also is entitled to the appointment of a receiver notwithstanding that he has been paid all his interest and costs out of rents received by him while in possession and that he has surplus rent in his hands. It was so held in *Mason v Westoby* (v). In that case Bacon V.C. said: "It is said that the appointment of a receiver will cause great expense to the mortgagors but that cannot be helped. The mortgagee acting in accordance with her strict right enters into possession because she cannot get her interest. As mortgagee in possession she becomes subject to heavy responsibilities and from those responsibilities she is entitled to be relieved by the appointment of a receiver. She has however while in possession received more than the amount of her interest and costs but that surplus she must pay to the receiver. The appointment of a receiver will be made almost as a matter of course in the case of an English mortgage on an application of the mortgagee if the interest payable under the mortgage is in arrears and the mortgagee is entitled to sell the property for default in payment of interest (u). A receiver may also be appointed at the instance of an equitable mortgagee (x)." *See also* *Re Bannister* (1893) 1 Ch 280.

**Testamentary suit**—A receiver may be appointed in a testamentary suit (y).

**Receiver in charity suits**—A receiver may be appointed in a suit by the Advocate General under sec. 92 of the Code for the administration of public religious or charitable trusts (z).

**Partnership suits**—In considering the question of the appointment of a receiver in partnership suits a distinction has to be drawn between cases in which the contest is between partners and cases in which the contest is between partners on the one hand and non-partners on the other.

In the first class of cases that is where one partner seeks to have a receiver appointed against his co-partners it is necessary to distinguish cases in which the partnership has already been dissolved from those in which the partnership is still subsisting. If the partnership is already dissolved the Court usually appoints a receiver almost as a matter of course (a). The jurisdiction of the Court to appoint a receiver is not ousted by an arbitration clause providing for a reference to arbitration of all matters in dispute between the parties (b). But if the partnership is still subsisting no receiver will be appointed unless some special grounds for the appointment can be shown. There must be fraud or gross misconduct of some kind (c) or wilful denial of the complaining partners' rights (d) or persistence under cover of right in conduct endangering the assets (e).

(f) *Hanumayya v Yenlatarubbayya* (1895) 18 Mad 43

(u) *Pratchett v Drew* (19 4) 1 Ch 280. *Jankisond v Zenabai* (1890) 14 Bom 431. *Ghaashy m v Gob da* (190 ) 7 Cal W N 45. *Pamashu v Sh. Chunt Lal* (19 0) 47 Cal 418 56 I C 839.

(v) (1886) 3 Ch D 406. *See also* *Com. v Gloucester Bank v Rudry Merthyr Co* (189 ) 1 Ch 63.

(w) *Weatherall v Eastern Mortgage Agency Co* (1911) 13 Cal L J 495 9 I C 985. *Eastern Mortgage Agency Co v Fakuruddin* (191 ) 17 Cal W N 16 17 I C 419.

(x) *Pam Kum v Charley & Co & Hindu* (19 5) 41 Cal L J 403 87 I C 3 (3) A C.

661. *See also* Kerr on Receivers 8th ed., pp 34 36.

(y) *Teshwant v Shankar* (1893) 17 Bom 343.

(z) *Krupp Ismail v Subh Maniyam* (19 1) 41 Mad L J 545 63 I C 565 (3) A 31 545. *Balukrishna v Jag nuda* (19 5) 49 Mad L J 534 8 I C 194 (-4) A 31 870.

(a) *Pi v Itancononi* (189 ) 1 Ch 633. *Taylor v Vento* (1893) 9 Ch D 634.

(b) *Pi v Itancononi* (189 ) 1 Ch 633 637.

(c) *Ex parte Borne & Rose* 69 *Estwick v Connors* (168 ) 1 Vern 118 (one partner colluding with debtors of the firm). *Smith v Jey* (1841) 4 Leav 503 (making away with partnership assets).

(d) *Il v Hale* (1841) 4 Leav 369.

(e) *Maduraj v Bumble* (1913) 6 Leav 493.

In the second class of cases that is where the contest is between partners on the one hand and non partners on the other *e.g.* legal representatives of a late partner a receiver will not be granted *against a member of the firm* at the instance of the legal representatives unless some special grounds for the interference of the Court can be established But it is a matter of course to appoint a receiver where such appointment is sought by a partner *against the legal representatives* of his late co partner or where all the partners are dead and an action is pending between their representatives (f)

**Decree for maintenance**—Where a decree is passed for maintenance and a charge is created on a specified property to secure payment of the allowance it is desirable in order to facilitate execution and to avoid further litigation to appoint a receiver by the decree itself with directions in case of default of payment to take possession of the property and sell the same and out of the sale proceeds to pay the allowance (g)

**Criminal Procedure Code sec 145**—The fact that there exists in respect of any immovable property an order of a Magistrate passed under sec 145 of the Code of Criminal Procedure is no bar to the exercise by a Civil Court of the power conferred on it by this rule to appoint a receiver in respect of the same property (h) It is however different where a receiver is appointed by a Magistrate under sec 146 cl (2) of that Code See note above Legal consequences arising from the fact that a receiver is an officer of the Court no (7)

**Receiver and administrator pendente lite**—A receiver may be appointed under this rule in a testamentary suit governed by the Probate Act 1881 (i) The Chancery Division of the High Court of England may appoint a receiver of the estate of the deceased though proceedings have been commenced by the defendant in the Probate Court and though the defendant is prepared to apply at once in that Court for an administrator *pendente lite* (j)

**Remove any person**—This refers to a person other than the receiver (k) The Court should inquire into any claims made by persons not parties to the suit before appointing a receiver (l) A usufructuary mortgagee who has obtained a decree for sale is not entitled to possession as against the receiver on an agreement made with the mortgagor (m)

**Where security not furnished by receiver**—Where the order whereby a person is appointed receiver requires him to give security so that the order is conditional upon his giving the security he cannot be receiver until the security is given (n) It is otherwise where the order is not conditional but absolute in its terms in such a case the order takes effect immediately it is made (o)

**Receiver of future earnings of judgment debtor**—The Court has no jurisdiction to enforce satisfaction of a judgment debt by appointing a receiver of the future earning of the judgment debtor Unless a man has assigned or charged his future earnings or has made a sum payable out of them they cannot be prospectively impounded by any of his creditors by any ordinary process of execution, whether legal or equitable (p) Similarly a receiver cannot be appointed of future allowances of maintenance payable to a judgment debtor (q) See notes to sec 51 above

(f) *Lindley on Partnership* Book III Chap 10 sec 6 sub sec 3 (Of receiver)

(g) *Hemanzi o v I umoda Chander* (1890) 26 Cal 441

(h) *Barkat u nissa v 4011 Az r* (1900) 27 All 14

(i) *Ye hvant v Shanker* (189 ) 1 Bom 355

(j) *O tes In re* (1917) 1 Ch 0

(k) *Pamaisama v du v Avjt* (19 4) 46 Mad L J 198 78 I C 6 5 (4) A M 614

(l) *S pati v B h h ts* (19 6) 53 Cal 319 9 I C 940 ( 6) A C 593

(m) *H m d v J n sila* (19 1) 34 Cal L J 1 3 65 I C 837 ( 1) A C 908

(n) *Htend a v Sur I menhur* (19 1 6 Pat

L J 37 61 I C 67 ( 1) A P 43 on appeal (19 4) 6 Bom L P 1161 8 I C 744 (24) A 1 C 906 [P C] See note on this case at p. 913 ante

(n) *Eda da v Edwards* (18 6) Ch D 91 See also *Sri vas v Aesha* (1911) 14 Cal L J 489 10 I C 745

( ) *Bh t ad v Na diram* (1919) 46 Cal 70 43 I C 804

(p) *H lmes v Millage* [1893] 1 Q B 551 See also *A d Al v Haidar Ali* (1911) 33 Cal 13 6 I C 8 6 *Pa e Annap rai v Secum atha* (1911) 34 Mad 7 9 6 I C 439

(q) *Patikandy v Krishnan* (1917) 40 Mad 30 34 I C 381

- 1 Receiver in execution proceedings—See notes to sec. 51 See also notes to O 21 r 46 Procedure where garnishee denies debt

Receiver after decree—A receiver may be appointed even after a decree has been passed (r) See cl (a) of the rule

All such powers as to bringing and defending suits as the owner himself has —These words are wide enough to empower the Court to authorise a receiver to sue in his own name hence where a receiver is authorised in that behalf he may sue in his own name (s) And it has been held by the High Court of Calcutta that where a receiver is appointed with full powers under sub r (1) cl (d) that is with such powers as to bringing suits as the owner himself has the receiver is entitled to sue in his own name though not expressly authorized to do so (t) As regards suits for possession it is to be noted that though ordinarily a suit to recover possession of property can only be brought by him in whom there is a present title to it yet if a receiver is appointed under this rule with such powers as to bringing suits as the owner himself has he is entitled to sue for possession (u) But a receiver takes such title as the owner himself had in the property and he cannot therefore sue for possession in a case in which the owner himself could not have done so (t) A receiver empowered to collect outstandings and do all things necessary for the realization and preservation of the assets of a firm has no power to mortgage the property of the firm (u) But a receiver of mortgaged properties on whom has been conferred the same powers of realization management and protection as the owners themselves have has a discretionary power of sale (z)

Realization of property —After the dismissal of a suit in which a receiver has been appointed the Court has no power to give the receiver any fresh power as for instance liberty to sell (y)

All such powers as to the execution of documents which the owner himself has —This includes a power to the receiver to execute a conveyance including the share of a minor defendant (z)

Suit by or against receiver—leave of Court—See notes above under the same head

Contempt proceedings—Where a receiver is appointed of property the subject of a suit and the property is forcibly taken possession of by any person not only the parties interested in the property but also the receiver may proceed against such person for contempt There is nothing to prevent the receiver from himself applying for a rule for contempt (a)

Appointment of new receiver in place of old receiver—Where a receiver appointed under this rule institutes civil proceedings and is then replaced by another receiver it is necessary that the new receiver should be made a party to the proceedings (b)

Continuance of office—A Court appointing a receiver may by its order provide that the office should continue permanently after the decree when such continuance is necessary or for so long as it may be so (c)

( ) *Shunmug m v Moid* (1945) 8 M d 29

(i) *Orient L B & C P* is *n v Gobankoll* (1881)

10 Cal 713 73 733

(ii) *Fak v Mahar* 5 H Indu 56 (1904) 25

Cal 61—*J & I Tern v Dast v Vata*

( Cal (1907) 34 Cal 305

(a) *Haji Cas im v D H* (1914) 19 C W.N 45 7

1 C 459

(r) *M. Lams v Pa. Lapsaka* (191 ) 35 Mad

578 171 C 33

(s) *Subramania v L. Lkman* (1923) 50 I A

77 1 Rang 66 12 C 60 (1913) A

IC 50

(z) *S. Ram. Awar v H tent* (1911) 6 F m L

R 1153 541 C 576 ( 11A FC 27 (1 C )

(u) *J b Holmes v Smith* (1907) 31 Cal 336

(z) *Ha. Ali v H R* (1916) 43 Cal 1 ( 301 C

406

(a) *Grew v Hoosaramah* (1901) 3 Cal 700

(b) *Atula v Dhali* (190 ) 24 Mad 157

(c) *Malkari v Malkari* (1906) 19 Mad 170

231 A 3

*A* sues *B* in the Court of a Subordinate Judge. The suit is dismissed on a preliminary ground. *A* appeals to the High Court and pending the appeal *B* is appointed receiver of the property in dispute in the suit. The High Court sets aside the decree of the lower Court and the case is remanded to the lower Court for trial on the merits. When the appeal is over *T* forcibly enters into possession of the property in the possession of *R* as receiver. *R* applies to the High Court that *T* may be committed for contempt. It is contended for *T* that the appeal being over *R* must be decreed to have been discharged from the office of receiver when the appellate decree was passed. This contention will not prevail, though the appeal may be over *R* must be regarded as receiver of the property until he is finally discharged by the Court. Therefore *R* is entitled to make the application to commit *T* for contempt (*d*).

A receiver in a partition suit is not discharged merely by the passing of a preliminary decree for partition (*e*).

**Receiver's liability to account**—The Court appointing a receiver in a suit has authority incidental to its jurisdiction to order him to account although the suit may be no longer pending (*f*). Although the dismissal of a suit may in some cases mean the discharge of the receiver still the Court has jurisdiction over the receiver who is an officer of the Court. The Court has jurisdiction to require accounts from a receiver to enable the parties to examine accounts and to deal with all matters connected with the management of the receiver (*g*). See r 3 (b) below.

**Suit by subsequent against former receiver**—A suit cannot be maintained by a present receiver of an estate against the former receiver for the recovery of money alleged to be due by the former receiver to the estate (*h*).

**Receiver's lien**—A receiver though discharged is entitled to a lien on the estate for all his just claims and allowances. Hence the Court will not compel a receiver who has been discharged to make over the property in his possession until his lien has been satisfied or provided for by a sufficient indemnity (*i*).

**Joint receivers**—As a general rule appointment of more than one receiver whether by the same or a different Court except in case of joint receiver is not allowable (*j*).

**Appeal**—An appeal lies not only from an order granting an application to appoint a receiver but from an order rejecting such application (*k*) [O 43 r 1 cl (a)]. The Calcutta High Court holds that no appeal lies from an order appointing a receiver on condition of his furnishing security until the security is furnished (*l*) but such an order is appealable as a judgment under the Letters Patent (*m*). But no appeal lies from directions given by a Court in passing receiver's accounts. Such directions do not come within any of the four clauses of sub r (1) (n). No appeal however lies to the Privy Council from an order refusing to appoint a receiver (*o*). An order refusing to remove a receiver is not appealable (*p*). The Calcutta High Court has held that an appeal lies under O 43 r 1 (a) from an order removing a receiver on the ground that a power to

(d) *G. E. v. Hoogram & A.* (1901) 28 Cal. 90.

(e) *Shankar D. v. Behari* (1906) 34 Lah. 49. 89 I.C. 93 (1), A.L. 445.

(f) *Adams v. Lorrain* (1859) 10 L.R. 1011.

(g) *Chaudhary v. P. & A. v. B. Shewar* (1900) 5 Lat. L.J. 513. 58 I.C. 40.

(h) *Perrett v. J. In D. H. v. Shamal* (1913) 41 Cal. 9. 24 I.C. 763.

(i) *Freemantle v. Sumbhoo Nath* (1899) 2 Cal. 960. 973.

(j) *Woodroffe on Receivers* p. 78.

(k) *Leela v. Sridhar* (1896) 10 M.L. 170. *Dangappa v. S. S. S. S.* (1899) 24 Bom. 35. *C. S. S. S. S.* (1915) 17 Bom. L.R. 680. 30 I.C. 515. *Modiga Nath*

*v. Mallik* (1890) 17 C.L.J. 620. *Jagendra*

*v. Shal* (1904) 31 Cal. 405. *Sant Ram*

*v. Ram Chandra* (1901) 28 Cal. 90. 36 P. 99.

61 C. 659. *C. S. S. S.* (1913) 35 All. 45. 0 I.C. 63 [injunction].

(l) *Paja Shyam v. Raj* (1907) 45 Cal. L.J. 63. 100 I.C. 140. (7) A.C. 53.

(m) *Dr. M. S. v. Kanappa* (1907) 5 Ran. 99. 101 I.C. 791. (7) A.R. 130.

(n) *K. H. v. M. S. S.* (1903) 3 Cal. 568. *S. S. S. S.* (1903) 5 Pat. L.J. 97. 55 I.C. 15.

(o) *C. S. S. S. v. P. S. S.* (1893) Cal. 93.

(p) *S. S. S. S. v. S. S. S.* (1904) 46 Mad. L.J. 196. 78 I.C. 6. (4) A.M. 614.

0, r 1 appoint includes a power to remove (q) but it is difficult to see what this principle has to do with the right of appeal

It has been held by the High Courts of Calcutta (r) Bombay (s) and Allahabad (t) that an order that a receiver be appointed without appointing anybody by name as receiver and adjourning the application to a later date for nominating a receiver is not an order within the meaning of this rule and it is not therefore appealable under O 43, r 1 cl (s). The contrary has been held by a Full Bench of the Madras High Court (u) and by the Patna High Court (v). No appeal lies from an order merely expressing an intention of appointing a receiver and calling upon parties to suggest names (w).

A receiver is appointed of B's property in a suit by A against B. C claims to be in possession of the property under an agreement between him and B and he objects to the appointment of the receiver but the objection is dismissed. The order comes within this rule though C is not a party to the suit and is therefore appealable (x). But a stranger who is not in possession has no right to object and no appeal lies from an order dismissing his objection (y). An order appointing a receiver pending an application for the appointment of a common manager under s 93 of the Bengal Tenancy Act of 1880 also falls under this rule and is therefore appealable under O 43 r 1 cl (s) (z).

Letters Patent appeal.—An order directing a receiver in a suit to advance money to a guardian *ad litem* to enable him to conduct the defence on behalf of a minor defendant is not a judgment within the meaning of cl 15 of the Letters Patent and no appeal lies therefrom (a). An order appointing a receiver is a judgment under the letters patent and appealable (b).

Revision.—If a Court appoints a receiver in a case in which it has no jurisdiction to do so as for instance in a proceeding under the Succession Certificate Act 1889 the High Court may interfere in revision (c).

A receiver cannot delegate his powers to others.—Where a receiver is appointed to collect the rents of an estate it is his duty to collect the rents himself or where the rents are collected by a clerk on his behalf to receive the rents and to keep proper accounts thereof. If the rents received by the clerk are misappropriated the receiver is bound to make good the loss. He is not justified in delegating or entrusting to another a duty entrusted to him by the Court (d).

Summary jurisdiction.—Where the matter complained of rests on an agreement which has not been carried out the Court may interfere to prevent its receiver giving effect to the proposed agreement and thus it may do on the mere application of a party to the suit (e). But where the matter has passed out of the stage of agreement as where a lease has already been granted by the receiver no summary order could be passed to set aside the lease but the party aggrieved must proceed by suit against the receiver (f).

When receiver should be joined as a party to a suit.—It has been held by the High Court of Calcutta that where the property in the hands of a receiver is intended

- (g) *Sripati v. B. L. S.* (1905) 52 Cal 319 9  
1 C 940 (10) A C 593  
(r) *Uppend Nath v. B. L. S.* (1911)  
13 Cal L J 15 9 I C 500  
(s) *N. L. S. v. K. L. S.* (1915) 17 Bom  
L R 510 9 I C 508  
(t) *P. M. v. K. M.* (1914) 13 All L J 9 7 I  
C 616  
(u) *P. L. S. v. P. L. S.* (1911) 40 Mad 18  
40 I C 145  
(v) *Colind. I. M. v. C. L. S.* (1900) 1 Pat  
6 6 I C 900 (1901) A 1 577  
(w) *M. A. M. d. Askari v. N. M. Hussain* (1900)  
4 All 100 54 I C 520  
(x) *H. L. v. M. S.* (1909) 36 C 1 713 1 I C  
3 6 1909 3 6 1910 3 1 I L J

- 53 48 I C 133  
(y) *Jas. L. d. v. B. L. S.* (1900) 5 O W 5  
463 110 I C 410 (1) A O 25  
(z) *A. L. v. M. S.* (1916) 43 C 1 9 6 36 I  
C 177  
(a) *K. P. S. v. P. L. S.* (1901) 4 Mad 511  
(b) *Uppend Nath v. K. L. S.* (1911) 5 K. L. S. 97  
101 I C 921 (1) A R 112  
(c) *K. L. S. v. K. L. S.* (1901) 46 A 2 500  
9 I C 563 (1901) A 3 6  
(d) *H. L. v. P. M. S.* (1905) 19 P. M. S.  
(e) *C. L. S. v. K. L. S.* (1909) 36 C 1 713 1 I C  
3 6 1909 3 6 1910 3 1 I L J  
(f) *A. L. S. v. K. L. S.* (1909) 36 C 1 713 1 I C 400

affected by the result of a suit the receiver is a proper and necessary party to the by way of addition to the parties primarily responsible the reason given being that though the appointment of a receiver does not of itself debar the creditor of the person whose estate the receiver has been appointed from suing for his claim yet if the effect of the suit is to interfere with the possession of the receiver of the jurisdiction of Court appointing the receiver leave of the Court must be obtained and the receiver be a party to the suit (g) In one of these cases (h) a receiver was appointed of the estate

Hindu in a suit brought by his sons for administration of his estate One of the sons of the deceased filed a suit against the sons and joined the receiver as a party to the suit It was held that the receiver was a proper and a necessary party to the suit and that if he were not added as a party to the suit the suit was liable to be dismissed a Bombay case (i) also a creditor of the deceased in a suit brought by him against the sons of the deceased joined as a party the receiver of the estate of the deceased pointed in an administration suit brought by the sons The Small Causes Court made a decree not only against the sons but also against the receiver In revision it was held that no relief could be granted against the receiver in a suit filed in the Small Causes Court and the decree passed by that Court was set aside In the course of the appeal C J said If a party makes a claim for money due by a person who is dead against his representatives then he can only get a decree against the representatives to the extent of the assets in their hands and if the estate is not in their hands but in the hands of a receiver the plaintiff will have to go to the Court that appointed the receiver in order to attach the property in his hands But by no possible conception could the receiver be a necessary party in a suit to decide whether the plaintiff was entitled against the legal representatives of the deceased to recover money which he had advanced to the deceased in his life time

Form —For form of appointment of receiver see App F no 9

2 [ S 503 cl (d) ] The Court may by general or special order fix the amount to be paid as remuneration for the services of the receiver

Remuneration

Remuneration —See notes to r 1 above under the same head See also notes to r 1 Receiver's lien It has been held that the Court has inherent jurisdiction to order a plaintiff to refund to a party whom he has wrongly impleaded in a suit the expenses and charges incurred by a receiver of the property of that party when the suit as against him is dismissed and the receivership cancelled (j)

3 [ S 503, 2nd part ] Every receiver so appointed shall—

Duties

- (a) furnish such security (if any) as the Court thinks fit duly to account for what he shall receive in respect of the property ,
- (b) submit his accounts at such periods and in such form as the Court directs ,

(g) *Joti dora Nath v S f aj* (1910) 14 C W N 653 6 I C 114 *Banku Beha v Harendr Nath* (1910) 15 C W N 54 8 I C 1 *Z Ira Bibi v Zohed* (1910) 1 Cal L J 368 7 I C 75

(h) *Ba lu Beh v Ha nd a Nath supra*  
(i) *Moss v Abd I Hussain* (19 5) 7 Bom L R 1147 90 I C 600 (25) AB 5 3  
(j) *M S Na Iwara v Ma Aye Buu* (19-3) 1 Rang 770 79 I C 224 (24) A R 181



It has been held by the High Courts of Calcutta (r) Bombay (s) and Allahabad (t) that an order that a receiver be appointed without appointing anybody by name as receiver and adjourning the application to a later date for nominating a receiver is *not* an order within the meaning of this rule and it is not therefore appealable under O. 41 r. 1 cl. (s). The contrary has been held by a Full Bench of the Madras High Court (u) and by the Patna High Court (v). No appeal lies from an order merely expressing an intention of appointing a receiver and calling upon parties to suggest names (w).

A receiver is appointed of B's property in a suit by A against B. C claims to be in possession of the property under an agreement between him and B and he objects to the appointment of the receiver but the objection is dismissed. The order comes within this rule though C is not a party to the suit and is therefore appealable (x). But a stranger who is not in possession has no right to object and no appeal lies from an order dismissing his objection (y). An order appointing a receiver pending an application for the appointment of a common manager under s. 93 of the Bengal Tenancy Act of 1890 also falls under this rule and is therefore appealable under O. 43 r. 1 cl. (i) (z).

**Letters Patent appeal**—An order directing a receiver in a suit to advance money to a guardian *ad litem* to enable him to conduct the defence on behalf of a minor defendant is not a judgment within the meaning of cl 15 of the Letters Patent and no appeal lies therefrom (a) An order appointing a receiver is a judgment under the letters patent and appealable (b)

Revision—If a Court appoints a receiver in a case in which it has no jurisdiction to do so as for instance in a proceeding under the Succession Certificate Act 1889 the High Court may interfere in revision (c)

A receiver cannot delegate his powers to others—Where a receiver is appointed to collect the rents of an estate it is his duty to collect the rents himself or where the rents are collected by a clerk on his behalf to receive the rents and to keep proper accounts thereof. If the rents received by the clerk are misappropriated the receiver is bound to make good the loss. He is not justified in delegating or entrusting to another a duty entrusted to him by the Court (d)

**Summary jurisdiction**—Where the matter complained of rests on an agreement which has not been carried out the Court may interfere to prevent its receiver giving effect to the proposed agreement and this it may do on the mere application of a party to the suit (e). But where the matter has passed out of the stage of agreement as where a lease has already been granted by the receiver no summary order could be passed to set aside the lease but the party aggrieved must proceed by suit against the receiver (f).

When receiver should be joined as a party to a suit.—It has been held by the High Court of Calcutta that where the property in the hands of a receiver is intended

- (g) Sripati v Bida h (1906) 3 Cal 319 9  
C 910 ( ) A C 593
- ( ) Upend Nath v Bh p tra Nath (1911)  
15 Cal L S 357 9 C 59
- ( ) Nripal Das k v Ke Id s (1915) 27 Bom  
L R 510 9 I t -04
- (n) P m j v Kom (1914) 13 All LJ 9 7 I  
C 618
- (u) Tal appa v Pala uppa (191 ) 40 Mad 18  
40 I t 185
- ( ) Coland I m v Ca h Pam (19 ) 1 Pat  
65 6 J C 99 ( ) A I 5
- (v) M kamund Askari v Na H s i (1900)  
4 All 54 I C 520
- (x) H f v Morja (1909) 6 C I 713 I C  
3 6 3 p bag v d (1910) 3 I t L J
- (y) S 3 48 I C 133
- (z) Jan i dra v Balloo S sh (1903) 5 O W T  
463 110 I C 410 ( ) A O 95
- (2) Anaj h v Mishon ed (1916) 43 Cal 9 6 16  
C 177
- (a) K pp mi v I th aru (1901) 1 Mad 511
- (b) Iron gn v K appa (1975 Ea g F  
102 I C 91 ( ) A R 139
- ( ) Ko An v A la va (1914) 46 All 57-  
70 I C 363 ( ) A A 3 6
- (d) Balaj v F m la dra (1925) 19 Gam 64
- (e) S end o Kehrab Roy v Durj mandy (1900)  
15 C I 7
- (f) Aris t k dra Choo v A a alia Ghos  
(1913) 38 C 15 I t C 40

affected by the result of a suit the receiver is a proper and necessary party to the suit by way of addition to the parties primarily responsible the reason given being that although the appointment of a receiver does not of itself debar the creditor of the person whose estate the receiver has been appointed from suing for his claim yet if the result of the suit is to interfere with the possession of the receiver of the jurisdiction of the Court appointing the receiver leave of the Court must be obtained and the receiver is a party to the suit (j) In one of these cases (k) a receiver was appointed of the estate of a Hindu in a suit brought by his sons for administration of his estate One of the sons of the deceased filed a suit against the sons and joined the receiver as a party to the suit It was held that the receiver was a proper and a necessary party to the suit and that if he were not added as a party to the suit the suit was liable to be dismissed (l) In a Bombay case (1) although a creditor of the deceased in a suit brought by him against the sons of the deceased joined as a party the receiver of the estate of the deceased was not pointed in an administration suit brought by the sons The Small Causes Court made a decree not only against the sons but also against the receiver In revision it was held that no relief could be granted against the receiver in a suit filed in the Small Causes Court and the decree passed by that Court was set aside In the course of the judgment Macleod C J said If a party makes a claim for money due by a person who is dead against his representatives then he can only get a decree against the representatives to the extent of the assets in their hands and if the estate is not in their hands but in the hands of a receiver the plaintiff will have to go to the Court that appointed the receiver in order to attach the property in his hands But by no possible conception could the receiver be a necessary party in a suit to decide whether the plaintiff was entitled against the legal representatives of the deceased to recover money which he had advanced to the deceased in his life time

Form—For form of appointment of receiver see App F no 9

**2 [ S 503, cl (d) ]** The Court may by general or special order fix the amount to be paid as remuneration for the services of the receiver

Remuneration

Remuneration—See notes to r 1 above under the same head See also notes to r 1 Receiver's lien It has been held that the Court has inherent jurisdiction to make a plaintiff to refund to a party whom he has wrongly impleaded in a suit the commission and charges incurred by a receiver of the property of that party when the suit against him is dismissed and the receivership cancelled (2)

**3 [ S 503, 2nd part ]** Every receiver so appointed shall—

Duties

- furnish such security (if any) as the Court thinks fit duly to account for what he shall receive in respect of the property,
- submit his accounts at such periods and in such form as the Court directs,

(j) *Jotindra Nath v Saifaj* (1910) 14 C W N 636 IC 14 *Basu Behari v Harendra Nath* (1910) 15 C W N 54 8 IC 1 *Zohra Bibi v Zoheda* (1910) 1 Cal LJ 363 7 IC 5

(k) *Bhaku Behari v Harendra Nath* *supra*  
(l) *Moon v Abdul Husan* (1905) 7 Bom LR 1147 90 IC 600 (25) AB 53  
(1) *M S Nalwara v Ala Ayo Bhu* (193) 1 Rang 70 79 IC 4 (4) A R 181

(c) pay the amount due from him as the Court directs, and

(d) be responsible for any loss occasioned to the property by his wilful default or gross negligence

**Submit his accounts**—The accounts should be supported by vouchers which will be admitted as evidence of payment unless reasonable ground for impeaching them is shown (l) Objections to the system of management adopted by the receiver cannot be heard as exceptions to the receiver's accounts but may be the subject of a scheme to be submitted for the orders of the Court (h) An application to take accounts against a receiver on a footing of wilful default and neglect must be made by suit and cannot be entertained when the receiver is passing his accounts (m) See notes to r 1 above

**Receiver's liability to account**

**Appeal**—There is no right of appeal from the orders of the Court giving directions in passing a receiver's accounts (n)

**Form**—For form of bond to be given by receiver see App F form no 10

**Enforcement of receiver's duties** 4 [New] Where a receiver—

(a) fails to submit his accounts at such periods and in such form as the Court directs, or

(b) fails to pay the amount due from him as the Court directs, or,

(c) occasions loss to the property by his wilful default or gross negligence,

the Court may direct his property to be attached and may sell such property, and may apply the proceeds to make good any amount found to be due from him or any loss occasioned by him, and shall pay the balance (if any) to the receiver

**Loss to property**—The word property includes the income of property (o) See notes to r 1 above Loss occasioned by receiver's default

**Removal of receiver**—A receiver should not be allowed to continue in office if he fails to comply with the order of the Court to submit his accounts. Application for removal should be made to the Court which appointed him (p)

**The Court may direct his property to be attached**—The property may be attached even after the receiver's death in the hands of his legal representatives (q)

**Wilful default**—In Calcutta when a party seeks accounts against a receiver on the basis of wilful default and neglect the practice is to proceed by a suit and not by an application (r)

**Appeal**—An appeal lies from an order under this rule [O 43 r 1 cl (s)]. But no appeal lies from an order declaring a receiver liable in respect of a sum of money unless the order includes a direction for the attachment of his property (s) See notes

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>(2) <i>Tiller v Colm</i> (1911) 40 Cal L J 248<br/>         1 C 419 (21) A C 1063<br/>         (1) <i>Lal v Anand</i> (1913) 7 Lah L J 686 1 C 16 (25) A L 319<br/>         (m) <i>Subal Chandra v Jit Lal</i> (1908) 53 Cal L J 841 92 L C 761 (1908) 13 Com 519 1 C 16 (1908) 53 Cal L J 841 92 L C 761<br/>         (1) <i>Keshab Chandra v Jit Lal</i> (1908) 35 Cal L J 761</p> | <p>(o) <i>Lal v Gopal</i> (1916) 39 Mad 551 97 L C 543<br/>         (p) (1913) 7 Lah L J 686 1 C 16 (25) A L 319<br/>         (q) <i>Kama v Jit Lal</i> (1916) 39 Mad 541 33 L C 243<br/>         (1) <i>Lal v Anand</i> (1913) 7 Lah L J 686 1 C 16 (25) A L 319<br/>         (r) <i>Lal v Anand</i> (1913) 7 Lah L J 686 1 C 16 (25) A L 319<br/>         (s) <i>Lal v Anand</i> (1913) 7 Lah L J 686 1 C 16 (25) A L 319</p> |
|---|---|

n appeal lie from an order deciding that a receiver is liable to submit accounts (f)  
r to pay a sum of money into Court (u) or to pay damages (i)

O  
rr 4

5 [S 504] Where the property is land paying re-  
venue to the Government, or land of which  
the revenue has been assigned or redeemed,  
and the Court considers that the  
interests of those concerned will be promoted by the manage-  
ment of the Collector, the Court may, with the consent of the  
Collector, appoint him to be receiver of such property

When collector may be  
appointed receiver

## ORDER XLI

### *Appeals from Original Decrees*

1 [S 541] (1) Every appeal shall be preferred in the form of a memorandum signed by the appellant or his pleader and presented to the Court or to such officer as it appoints for this behalf. The memorandum shall be accompanied by a copy of the decree appealed from and (unless the appellate Court dispenses therewith) of the judgment on which it is founded.

Form of appeal. What to  
accompany memorandum

(2) The memorandum shall set forth concisely and under distinct heads, the grounds of objection to the decree appealed from without any argument or narrative, and such grounds shall be numbered consecutively.

Contents of memoran-  
dum

Appeal from original decree—See s 96 and notes thereto

Defective vakalatnama.—A memorandum of appeal cannot be said to be properly presented if it is presented by a vakil whose name does not appear in the vakalatnama, even though the omission is due to an oversight. In such case the appeal should be dismissed though the objection to its validity is taken at a very late stage of the proceedings (u). A power of attorney expressly authorising presentation of the appeal is sufficient (x).

Signed.—If the memorandum of appeal is signed it matters not that the grounds of appeal are set forth in an unsigned annexure (y).

Memorandum shall be accompanied by a copy of decree and judgment.—O 41 r 1 makes it an inflexible rule that in the case of appeals from decrees the memorandum of appeal shall be accompanied by a copy of the decree and judgment.

- (f) *S. Mah. v. S. Gh. v. B. Gh. v. S. Gh.* (19 0) 6 Lat. L. J. 97, 55 I. C. 15  
(u) *P. Janappa v. J. Janappa* (19 1) M. W. N. 806 65 I. C. 403 ( ) A. L. 34  
(r) *A. Ramachandram v. P. Ram* (19 5) 3 Rang. 318 9 I. C. 631 ( ) A. L. 266  
(w) *Muhammad v. Jas. Ram* (1914) 36 All. 46

- 23 I. C. 461 [objection taken after  
of remand]  
(x) *K. Ram v. U. Ram* (19 5) 7 Ind. L. J. 22 1  
C. 208 ( ) A. L. 331  
(y) *K. Ram v. S. Ram* (1920) 2 Ind. L. J. 117  
55 I. C. 4



for the first time in appeal (q) And where in a suit for a declaratory decree it was contended for the first time in appeal that the Court had on the facts of the particular case no power to pass a declaratory decree it was held that the objection should not be entertained Such an objection does not affect the *jurisdiction* of the Court (r)

**Limitation**—As to the period of limitation for appeals see Limitation Act 1908 ch I arts 151 15- and 156 S 5 of the Limitation Act provides that an appeal may be admitted after the period of limitation if the appellant satisfies the Court that he had sufficient cause for not preferring the appeal within such period S 12 of the same Act provides that in computing the period of limitation provided for an appeal the time requisite for obtaining a copy of the decree appealed from should be excluded An appeal under s 169 of the Indian Companies Act 1882 to which the Code of Civil Procedure applies was filed as a joint appeal under the mistaken impression that the cases had been consolidated but the Lahore High Court on the ground that the mistake was one of form allowed the second appellant to put in a separate appeal (s) See notes to r a below Leave of Court Limitation

When appellate Court may not interfere with findings of fact—Two conflicting view points have to be reconciled namely on the one hand the undoubted duty of the Court of appeal to review the recorded evidence and to draw its own inferences and conclusions and on the other hand the unquestioned weight which must be attached to the opinion of the Judge of the primary Court who had the advantage of seeing the witnesses and noting their looks and manner (t) Generally speaking it is undesirable for an appellate Court to interfere with the findings of fact of the trial judge who sees and hears the witnesses and has an opportunity of noting their demeanour especially in cases where the issue is simple and depends on the credit which attaches to one or other of conflicting witnesses The view of the trial judge as to the credibility of witnesses should not be put aside on a mere calculation of probabilities by the appellate Court (u)

**Consolidation of appeals**—The Code contains no provisions for consolidating suits or appeals Whether or not the Court has jurisdiction to consolidate appeals it will not do so unless before the hearing of the suits consolidation is asked for of the suits and unless the evidence given in the two cases is common to both of them (v) See notes to s 101 Inherent powers of Court Cf (a)

**Form**—For form of memorandum of appeal see App G form no 1

**2 [S 542]** The appellant shall not, except by leave of the Court, urge or be heard in support of any ground of objection not set forth in the memorandum of appeal, but the appellate Court, in deciding the appeal, shall not be confined to the grounds of objection set forth in the memorandum of appeal or taken by leave of the Court under this rule

Provided that the Court shall not rest its decision on any other ground unless the party who may be affected thereby

- (q) *Ah b Lal v Jagdish* (1911) 1 Pat 369 I C 185 ( ) A P 395  
 (r) *Bomb v B v A T ad g Co p ation v Smith* (1893) 17 Lam 197 ( ) A C 260  
 (s) *Dev D agmal v Office t Liq dator* (1900) 1 Lah 368 56 I C 69  
 (t) *Pr namay v Baik ntha vath* (1911) 49 Cal 132 60 I C 8 ( ) A C 260  
 (u) *Bombay Cotton Mfg Co v Moti Lal* (1915) 4 I A 110 39 Lam 366 ( ) I C 1

- C 9 P m Pa lash Das v A and Das (1916) 43 I A 73 83 43 Cal 97 33 I C 583 *Andal v P nra an* (1918) 45 Cal 60 71 4 I C 484 S d r S gh *Krushna Mills Co Ltd* (1914) 1 m Rec no 63 p 14 - I C 79 See also *Ba v Central Vermontly Co* (1911) 2 A C 41 p 415  
 (v) *Jannardan v Shih Pershad* (1910) 43 Cal 9 36 I C 19

r 2 has had a sufficient opportunity of contesting the case on that ground

**Leave of Court Limitation**—The appellant cannot except by leave of the Court urge or be heard in support of any ground of objection not set forth in the memorandum of appeal. Thus if the plea that the *suit* is barred by limitation is not taken in the memorandum of appeal the appellant cannot urge that plea in appeal *without the leave of the Court*. The appellate Court may grant leave but it is not bound to do so. Notice to the respondent does not dispense with the necessity for leave of the Court (v). But the leave should not be refused if the point of limitation arises on the face of the plaint (x). Again under the latter part of this rule the appellate Court can of its own motion take cognizance of the question as to whether the *suit* is barred by limitation though the plea of limitation has not been taken in the memorandum of appeal and rest its decision on that ground provided the opposite party is given an opportunity of being heard on the point. In either case however the bar of limitation must be patent on the face of the proceedings (y). If it is not and the plea involves a fresh finding of fact the plea should not be allowed (z). The same rules apply where the plea that the *suit* is barred by limitation is raised for the first time in second appeal (a).

The case put above must be distinguished from the case contemplated by s. 3 of the Limitation Act 1908. That section provides that every *suit* instituted and every appeal preferred after the period of limitation shall be dismissed although limitation has not been set up as a defence. This means that under s. 3 it is the duty of the Court of first instance to dismiss a *suit* if it is barred by limitation *whether the plea of limitation has been taken by the defendant or not* (b). Similarly it is the duty of the appellate Court to dismiss an *appeal* before it if the appeal was barred by limitation when presented *whether limitation has been set up as a defence or not* that is to say if it is a first appeal the appeal should be dismissed by the first appellate Court and if it is a second appeal it should be dismissed by the second appellate Court. But that section does not impose any duty upon an appellate Court to entertain the plea of limitation if the question is not whether the *appeal* before it is barred by limitation but whether the *suit* was so barred. Similarly the said section does not impose any duty upon the second appellate Court to entertain the plea of limitation if the question is not whether the second appeal is barred by limitation but whether the *first appeal* was so barred. It is the provisions of the present rule that apply to the two last mentioned cases and not the provisions of s. 3 of the Limitation Act. Hence in those cases the plea of limitation must be specifically taken in the memorandum of appeal or by leave of the Court under this rule.

**Proviso to the rule**—The appellate Court is not precluded from taking its decision upon a ground not set forth in the memorandum of appeal nor taken by leave of the Court under this rule (c) but this power is exercised by the Court alone and neither party can claim it as of right (d). A litigant who has all along maintained a position in support of one branch of his *suit* cannot be permitted when he fails upon that branch to withdraw from the position and assert the contrary before the appellate Court more especially when he thereby places his opponent at a great disadvantage. In such a case the doctrine of estoppel owing to the conduct of the litigant applies (e). Further a litigant should not be allowed to take in appeal a point in the pleadings which has been

- (v) *Shri Ka. v. Jay S. A.* (1941) 3 Pat. 818 811 C. 923 (23) A. P. 57  
 (x) *E. L. m. v. Jhanga Das* (1907) 34 Cal. 941  
*Bh. sa. v. Narendra* (1905) 3 Cal. L.J. 236 841 C. 40  
 (y) *Am. J. Ali v. Wario H. sin* (1893) 15 All. 13  
*Dro. Varai v. Mohb* (1901) 24 Cal. 86  
*Ve. J. la v. Bha. Ayaka lu* (1900) 5 Mad. 367 99 I. A. 70  
 (z) *Wazir Chand v. Vailu Ram* (1941) 6 Lah. L.

- J. 131 801 C. 31 (24) A. L. 444  
 (a) *Bhadat v. Sheikh M. Nowar* (1919) 4 Pat. L. J. 615 619 S.O. 5 I. C. 13  
 (b) *Ghulam Khan v. M. Ammal Hassan* (1907) 29 Cal. 167 185 21 A. 51  
 (c) *Thak. ray. Ku. das* (1893) 17 All. 40  
 (d) *Ita. Siddhar v. Ita. Ram* (1891) 13 All. 241  
 (e) *Moh. oja of B. L. v. Garam v. Secretary of B. L.* (1905) 57 I. A. 64 549 Mad. 13 51 I. C. 501 (20) A. P. 15

*deliberately abandoned* by a party at the trial of the suit before the lower Court (f) See notes to r 1 above grounds of objection which may be taken for the first time in appeal

New questions of fact.—In this connection may be noted the following observations made in the course of a judgment in a Madras case Though we may perhaps consider in appeal any *question of law* arising from facts which are either admitted or undisputed we cannot allow without any satisfactory reason new *questions of fact* to be raised for the first time in appeal (g)

Making a new case in appeal—A court of appeal is not justified in exposing a party after he has obtained his decree to the brunt of a new attack of which he had never had notice during the hearing of the suit (h)

3 [S 543] (1) Where the memorandum of appeal is not drawn up in the manner hereinbefore prescribed, it may be rejected or be returned to the appellant for the purpose of being amended within a time to be fixed by the Court or be amended then and there

Rejection or amendment of memorandum

(2) Where the Court rejects any memorandum, it shall record the reasons for such rejection

(3) Where a memorandum of appeal is amended, the Judge, or such officer as he appoints in this behalf, shall sign or initial the amendment

*Returned for amendment.*—When a memorandum of appeal is returned for amendment the Court should fix a time for its return (i) See s 107

Appeal—A decision rejecting a memorandum of appeal on the ground that it is barred by limitation (j) or that it is insufficiently stamped (k) or that it was not duly presented (l) has the force of a decree within the meaning of s. 2 and is therefore appealable

Appellate Court to have same power as Courts of original jurisdiction.—It is important to note at this stage the provisions of s 107 That section provides that the appellate Court shall have the same powers and shall perform as nearly as may be the same duties as are conferred and imposed on Courts of original jurisdiction in respect of suits instituted therein.

4 [S 544] Where there are more plaintiffs or more defendants than one in a suit, and the decree appealed from proceeds on any ground common to all the plaintiffs or to all the defendants, any one of the plaintiffs or of the defendants may appeal from the whole

One of several plaintiffs or defendants may obtain reversal of whole decree where it proceeds on ground common to all

- (f) *Corundras v Babu* (189 ) 16 Bom 596
- (g) *Varadana v Chengalamma* (1887) 10 Mad 18
- (h) *Naidu v Unadmal* (1909) 33 Bom 35 1 I C 456
- (i) *Jagan Nath v Lalman* (18 8) 1 All. 20

- (j) *Gulab F v M of Lal* (1895) 7 All. 4
- Jag Nath v Ndu* (1885) 9 Bom 45
- Ganga Dass v P mjoy* (1886) 12 Cal 30
- (k) *P p S ngh v Mukaray* (1885) 7 All 887
- (l) *Ayyanna v Vaputhoosham* (1893) 16 Mad 285



r 2 has had a sufficient opportunity of contesting the case on that ground

**Leave of Court Limitation**—The appellant cannot except by leave of the Court urge or be heard in support of any ground of objection not set forth in the memorandum of appeal. Thus if the plea that the suit is barred by limitation is not taken in the memorandum of appeal the appellant cannot urge that plea in appeal without the leave of the Court. The appellate Court may grant leave but it is not bound to do so. Notice to the respondent does not dispense with the necessity for leave of the Court (x). But the leave should not be refused if the point of limitation arises on the face of the plaint (y). Again under the latter part of this rule the appellate Court can of its own motion take cognizance of the question as to whether the suit is barred by limitation though the plea of limitation has not been taken in the memorandum of appeal and rest its decision on that ground provided the opposite party is given an opportunity of being heard on the point. In either case however the bar of limitation must be patent on the face of the proceedings (y). If it is not and the plea involves a fresh finding of fact the plea should not be allowed (z). The same rules apply where the plea that the suit is barred by limitation is raised for the first time in second appeal (a).

The case put above must be distinguished from the case contemplated by s. 3 of the Limitation Act 1908. That section provides that every suit instituted and every appeal preferred after the period of limitation shall be dismissed although limitation has not been set up as a defence. This means that under s. 3 it is the duty of the Court of first instance to dismiss a suit if it is barred by limitation whether the plea of limitation has been taken by the defendant or not (b). Similarly it is the duty of the appellate Court to dismiss an appeal before it if the appeal was barred by limitation when presented, whether limitation has been set up as a defence or not that is to say if it is a first appeal, the appeal should be dismissed by the first appellate Court and if it is a second appeal, it should be dismissed by the second appellate Court. But that section does not impose any duty upon an appellate Court to entertain the plea of limitation if the question is not whether the appeal before it is barred by limitation but whether the suit was so barred. Similarly the said section does not impose any duty upon the second appellate Court to entertain the plea of limitation if the question is not whether the second appeal is barred by limitation but whether the first appeal was so barred. It is the provisions of the present rule that apply to the two last mentioned cases and not the provisions of s. 3 of the Limitation Act. Hence in those cases the plea of limitation must be specifically taken in the memorandum of appeal or by leave of the Court under this rule.

**Proviso to the rule**—The appellate Court is not precluded from basing its decision upon a ground not set forth in the memorandum of appeal nor taken by leave of the Court under this rule (c) but this power is exercised by the Court alone and neither party can claim it as of right (d). A litigant who has all along maintained a position in support of one branch of his suit cannot be permitted when he fails upon this branch to withdraw from the position and assert the contrary before the appellate Court more especially when he thereby places his opponent at a great disadvantage. In such a case the doctrine of estoppel owing to the conduct of the litigant applies (e). Further a litigant should not be allowed to take in appeal a point in the pleadings which has been

(w) *Saif K. v. Jay S. A.* (1941) 3 Pat 818 81 I C 23 (23) A P 57

(x) *Balaram v. Manoj's Da.* (1907) 31 Cal 961. *J. A. v. Vorendra* (1923) 37 Cal L.J. 236 60 I C 240

(y) *Jam. d. Ali v. Waris Hussain* (1923) 15 All 123. *Two Varma v. Webb* (1901) 28 Cal 86. *Venkata v. Bha. Ayala lu* (1907) 3 Mad 867 79 I A 78

(z) *Wazir Chand v. Nath. Ram* (1941) 6 Lah L.

J 131 80 I C 31 (1941) A L 444. *Bhand v. Shaikh M. Nour* (1919) 4 Pat L. J 615 619-620 52 I C 13

(b) *Chuliam Khan v. J. Kammal Hassan* (1907) 79 Cal 167 145 23 I A 31

(c) *Thakur v. K. ad.* (1925) 17 All 240. *Stanicher v. Bala I. m.* (1911) 13 All 241. *Wah v. Ja. J. Umanagar v. Secretary f.* (1907) 53 I A 64 0 49 M L J 91

I C 201 (20) A P 18

*deliberately abandoned by a party at the trial of the suit before the lower Court (f)* See notes to r 1 above, grounds of objection which may be taken for the first time in appeal

New questions of fact—In this connection may be noted the following observations made in the course of a judgment in a Madras case Though we may perhaps consider in appeal any *question of law* arising from facts which are either admitted or undisputed we cannot allow without any satisfactory reason new *questions of fact* to be raised for the first time in appeal (g)

Making a new case in appeal—A court of appeal is not justified in exposing a party after he has obtained his decree to the brunt of a new attack of which he had never had notice during the hearing of the suit (h)

3 [S 543] (1) Where the memorandum of appeal is not drawn up in the manner herein-before prescribed, it may be rejected or be returned to the appellant for the purpose of being amended within a time to be fixed by the Court or be amended then and there

Rejection or amendment of memorandum

(2) Where the Court rejects any memorandum, it shall record the reasons for such rejection

(3) Where a memorandum of appeal is amended, the Judge, or such officer as he appoints in this behalf, shall sign or initial the amendment

Returned for amendment—When a memorandum of appeal is returned for amendment the Court should fix a time for its return (i) See s 107

Appeal—A decision rejecting a memorandum of appeal on the ground that it is barred by limitation (j) or that it is insufficiently stamped (k) or that it was not duly presented (l) has the force of a decree within the meaning of s 2 and is therefore appealable

Appellate Court to have same power as Courts of original jurisdiction—It is important to note at this stage the provisions of s 107 That section provides that the appellate Court shall have the same powers and shall perform as nearly as may be the same duties as are conferred and imposed on Courts of original jurisdiction in respect of suits instituted therein

4 [S 544] Where there are more plaintiffs or more defendants than one in a suit, and the decree appealed from proceeds on any ground common to all the plaintiffs or to all the defendants, any one of the plaintiffs or of the defendants may appeal from the whole

One of several plaintiffs or defendants may obtain reversal of whole decree where it proceeds on ground common to all

- (f) *Govindrav v Bhu* (1892) 16 Bom 586  
 (g) *Narayana v Chengulamma* (1887) 10 Mad 18  
 (h) *Nathu v Umedmal* (1909) 33 Bom 25 11 C 436  
 (i) *Jagan Nath v Lalman* (1876) 1 All 280

- (j) *Gulab Fati v Mangh Lal* (1855) 7 All 42  
*Jagh Nath v Ndu* (1855) 9 Ptn 6  
*Ganga Dass v Pamjoy* (1886) 12 Cal 31  
 (k) *P S gh v Alukharaj* (1885) 7 All 687  
 (l) *Ayyanna v Vagabhooshanam* (1891) 16 M 235

decree, and thereupon the appellate Court may reverse or vary the decree in favour of all the plaintiffs or defendants, as the case may be

**Ground common to all defendants**—This rule provides that where there are more defendants than one and the decree appealed from proceeds on any ground common to all the defendants any one of the defendants may appeal from the whole decree and thereupon the appellate Court may reverse or vary the decree in favour of all the defendants (m). The rule will not apply to different appeals on a common ground unless they have been consolidated (n). It is not necessary for the application of this rule that the decree should proceed on every ground common to all the plaintiffs or to all the defendants it is quite sufficient if it proceeds on any ground common to all the plaintiffs or to all the defendants. *A* sues *B C* and *D* for recovering possession of certain lands on declaration of title thereto alleging that he was dispossessed by all the defendants together in pursuance of a conspiracy between them. *B C* and *D* file separate written statements denying *A* a title and also denying dispossession and each claiming to hold separate parcels of land from third parties. The Court of first instance finds in favour of the title and the possession of *A* and that *A* was dispossessed by *B C* and *D*. *B* alone appeals from the decree. The appellate Court finds that *A* had failed to prove the title set up by him or that he was in possession of the land. Should the appellate Court reverse the decree of the lower Court in favour of *B* alone who appealed from the decree or should it reverse the decree of the lower Court in favour also of *C* and *D* though they did not join in the appeal? The answer is that if the decree of the lower Court proceeded on a ground common to all the three defendants the decree should be reversed under this rule not only in favour of *B* but also in favour of *C* and *D*. Now the ground of defence common to all the defendants was that *A* had no title to the lands and the decree of the lower Court proceeded on the ground that *A* had a title to the lands. The decree therefore proceeded on a ground common to all the defendants. The appellate Court should therefore reverse the decree not only in favour of *B* but also in favour of *C* and *D*. It is quite immaterial that the defendants claimed to be interested by different titles in separate portions of lands. It is enough if any one ground on which the decree appealed from proceeds is common to all the defendants (o). But the provisions of this rule do not apply unless the lower Court whose decree is appealed from has proceeded upon some ground common to all the plaintiff or all the defendants. If the lower Court has not proceeded upon any such ground it is not competent to the appellate Court to reverse the decree as to all the plaintiffs or all the defendants upon a ground which the appellate Court considers to be common to all the plaintiffs or all the defendants (p).

If in the case put above the appellate Court while reversing the decree in favour of *B* refuses to reverse it in favour also of *C* and *D* on the ground that it has no power to do so the decree of the appellate Court will be subject to revision for failure of exercise of jurisdiction (q). See s. 115 cl (b). If the decree appealed from proceeds on a ground common to all the defendants the appellate Court may reverse the decree in favour of all the defendants even if some of the defendants suffered the decree to be passed *ex parte* against them (r).

(m) See *Somasundaram v. Parthasarathy* (1917) 40 Mad 836 867 41 I C 516 [R. v. Allen (from willow)]  
(n) *Amarsingh v. D. S. (1905)* 1 Bom L R 91 881 C 31 (25) A B 30  
(o) *Farm Kamal v. Ahmad Ali* (1903) 30 C 1 49  
*Dattalal v. Pand. pr. tom* (1907) 30 Mad 470  
*Annamalai v. Pitchay* (1905) 24 Mad 122  
*Ambika Prasad v. Sardar Singh*

(1914) 4 Cal 451 24 I C 416  
*Salafudi v. Aft. E. Begum* (1904) 39 Cal L J 520  
84 I C 64 (25) A C 23  
(p) *Puran Mal v. Karam Singh* (1894) 20 All. 6  
*Chajin v. Umrao* (1900) 24 All 356  
(q) *Seshadri v. Krishnan* (1895) 8 Mad 19  
(r) *Ram Tahai v. Sulzwar* (1916) 1 I C L J 213 33 I C 347

Ground common to all the plaintiffs—*A* and his son *B* jointly sue *C* to recover Rs. 2 000. A decree is passed for the plaintiffs for Rs. 500 only. *A* alone appeals from the decree. *C* files cross objections under r. 22 below. The appellate Court rejects the plaintiff's claim *in toto* and reverses the decree of the lower Court. Subsequently *B*, who did not join in the appeal, applies for execution of the original decree against *C*. *B* is not entitled to take out execution for although he was not a party to the appeal, he is bound under this rule by the decree of the appellate Court (s).

See notes to r. 22 below. A respondent may urge cross objections against the appellant but not as a rule against a co-respondent.

May reverse decree in favour of all plaintiffs or defendants—The word *may* shows that the appellate Court is given a discretion in the matter. It may therefore reverse the decree in favour of *some* only of the plaintiffs or defendants. It is not bound to do so in favour of *all* of them (t).

Death of one of several appellants in cases where the decree appealed from proceeds on a ground common to all of them—See notes to O. 22 r. 3. This rule applies to appeals.

### *Stay of proceedings and of execution*

**5 [S. 545]** (1) An appeal shall not operate as a stay of proceedings under a decree or order appealed from except so far as the appellate Court may order, nor shall execution of a decree be stayed by reason only of an appeal having been preferred from the decree, but the appellate Court may for sufficient cause order stay of execution of such decree.

(2) Where an application is made for stay of execution of an appealable decree before the expiration of the time allowed for appealing therefrom, the Court which passed the decree may on sufficient cause being shown order the execution to be stayed.

(3) No order for stay of execution shall be made under sub-rule (1) or sub-rule (2) unless the Court making it is satisfied—

- (a) that substantial loss may result to the party applying for stay of execution unless the order is made,
- (b) that the application has been made without unreasonable delay, and
- (c) that security has been given by the applicant for the due performance of such decree or order as may ultimately be binding upon him.

- 5 (4) Notwithstanding anything contained in sub rule (3), the Court may make an *ex parte* order for stay of execution pending the hearing of the application

Alterations in the rule—

- 1 The first part of sub r (1) namely "An appeal shall not operate as a stay of proceedings under a decree or order appealed from except so far as the appellate Court may order" is new. The object is to make express provision for a stay of proceedings from a decree pending an appeal from the decree. Thus if a preliminary decree is passed in a suit for accounts between a principal and an agent (O 20 r 16) and an appeal is preferred from the decree the appellate Court may under this rule stay the inquiry into the accounts pending the appeal from the decree. Under the Code of 1857 the Court directed a stay in cases like these in the exercise of its *inherent power* as there was no express provision in the Code in that behalf (u).
- 2 Sub r (4) is new. It authorizes an *ex parte* stay. The need for such an order constantly arises in practice.

**Stay of proceedings**—Under this part of the rule the Bombay High Court in appeal suspended a sentence of imprisonment for an offence under s 43 of the Provincial Insolvency Act 1907 now Provincial Insolvency Act 1908 s 69 the provisions of the Code being applicable to such appeal (v). See notes above. Alterations in the rule.

**Stay of execution**—Once an appeal is preferred from a decree it is the appellate Court alone that is seized of the matter and an application for a stay of execution should be made to that Court. Where no appeal is preferred the appellate Court has no jurisdiction not being seized of the case and cannot stay execution even on the assurance of a pleader that an appeal will be filed (w). The application for a stay in that case should be made to the Court which passed the decree but the application must not be entertained unless the decree is one from which an appeal lies and the application is made before the expiry of the time allowed by law for appealing therefrom (x). The application should be made to the Judge who decided the case and without unreasonable delay (y).

Though the appellate Court may under this rule stay proceedings in execution when an appeal is preferred from a decree it has no power to stay execution of a decree when an appeal is preferred from an order appealable under s 101. It obtains a decree *ex parte* against B. B applies under O 9 r 13 to have the decree set aside but the application is rejected. B appeals from the order rejecting the application under O 43 r 1 cl. (d) and applies to the appellate Court to stay execution of the *ex parte* decree against him. But as no appeal has been preferred from the decree the appellate Court is not competent to stay execution (z). Contrast r 8 below.

**Where decree has been executed**—An order for a stay of execution implies that the decree has not been executed. Therefore where a decree has been executed no order can be made under this rule (a). See r 6 below.

**Circumstances under which stay of execution may be granted**—The Court has power under this rule to make an order for a stay of execution for sufficient cause. But no order should be made for a stay of execution unless the Court is satis-

(u) *Balkishan Singh v Khanna* (1901) 31 Cal 100.  
 (v) *Nagindas v Chhabhai* (1900) 41 Bom 63.  
 (w) *Peshkaram v Haryu* (1911) 43 All 199.  
 (x) *Peshkaram v Haryu* (1911) 43 All 199.  
 (y) *Peshkaram v Haryu* (1911) 43 All 199.  
 (z) *Peshkaram v Haryu* (1911) 43 All 199.

(a) *Im Hoon v Ahmad Ali* (1947) 9 All 38.  
*Ismail Khan v Ahamad Ali* (1947) 10 Cal 817.  
 (b) *Chait Singh v Easwar Das* (1911) 45 Cal 104.  
 (c) *Bhagwat v Shree Golem* (1901) 31 Cal 1041.  
 (d) *Dharam Singh v Kishan Singh* (1947) 12 C.L.R. 53.

fied that substantial loss may result to the party applying for a stay of execution if the execution is not stayed (b) And even if the Court is satisfied that substantial loss may result no order should be made unless the application has been made without unreasonable delay and further unless the Court is satisfied that security has been given by the applicant for the due performance of such decree as may ultimately be binding upon him [sub r (3)] The Court should not accept a security the validity of which is not free from reasonable doubt and the enforcement of which may lead to protracted litigation (c) It has been held by the High Court of Bombay that where the decree appealed from is for the payment of money execution should be stayed unless the respondent gives security for the repayment of the money in the event of the decree being reversed (d)

Notice to decree holder—It has been held by the High Court of Bombay that a final order staying execution should not be made without notice to the decree holder if it is made without notice it is illegal and it may be set aside under s 115 above (e) The High Court of Patna however differs (f) An interim stay however may be granted *ex parte* [see sub r (4)]

Application of the rule—A obtains a decree against B for the recovery of certain immovable property and applies for execution of the decree If B has preferred an appeal from the decree B may apply to the appellate Court for a stay of execution on the ground that if execution is not stayed and the property is delivered to A A may do away with the property which may result in substantial loss to him If the appellate Court is satisfied the substantial loss may result if the execution is not stayed and if the application has been made without unreasonable delay the appellate Court may order execution to be stayed under this rule upon security being given by B that if the decree of the lower Court is confirmed he will deliver possession of the property to A If the decree of the lower Court is confirmed and if B fails to deliver possession of the property to A A may proceed against the surety

Security for performance of decree—The nature and extent of the liability of a surety under this rule depends on the words of the security bond (g) Thus where the bond was to perform all orders and decrees passed in appeal it was held that the obligation under the bond extended to the final decree passed in second appeal (h) When immovable property is given by a judgment debtor as security for the due performance of a decree under sub r (3) (c) it can be realized in execution without attachment The provisions of O 34 r 14 do not apply to such a case and the matter being one relating to execution s 47 bars a separate suit (i) As to the mode of enforcing a security bond given under this rule see notes to s 145 Security for the performance of any decree

There is a conflict of opinion whether a security bond given under this rule mortgaging immovable property exceeding Rs 100 in value requires registration under the Transfer of Property Act s 59 and the Registration Act s 17 it being held in some cases that it does (j) and in some that it does not (k)

- (b) *G kv S Iar v Ghandi* (1901) 5 Bom 413
- Dhera Mal v H dar Shah* (1911) 1 Lah 61 81 I C 77, (21) A L 4
- (c) *Srin b h Prasad v Kesh Prasad* (1911) 38 Cal 754 759 I C 86
- (d) *Dha jibhoy v Luboa* (1889) 13 Bom 241
- (e) *Mullanchand v Kha redy* (1891) 15 Bom 536
- (f) *M l l nd v Tarn Prasad* (1919) 4 P t L J 64 54 I C —
- (g) *Ameer Ali In the matter of* (1870) 13 W R 403
- (h) *Shi lal v Apaji* (1878) 2 Bom 654 3 Bom 201
- (i) *Subrama ian v Raja of Ramnad* (1918) 41

- Mad 3 7 43 I C 187 *Sh m Sundar v Bajp* (1903) 30 Cal 1060 *Multa Prasad v Al hale* (1916) 39 AU 3 7 33 I C 98
- Jaghubar S gh Javindra* (1919) 48 I A 84 All 158 55 I C 550 *Jyoti Prala h v Musht P l A* (19 4) 51 Cal 150 81 I C 734 ( 4) A C 485 The custom in *Tokhan v gh v Girwar S gh* (1905) 32 C 1 491 is no longer law in vi w of the alteration in the law of s 99 of the Transfer of Property Act 185\* now O 34 r 18
- (j) *Nagaruru v Tangatur* (1908) 31 Mad 330
- (k) *J appa v She j da* (19 8) 5 Bom 7 10 I C 10 ( 8) A B 4

security for the restitution of the property to him (B) or for the payment of the value thereof if the appeal is decided in his favour. The application may be made to the Court which passed the decree or to the appellate Court (a). If the application is made to the Court which passed the decree such Court shall on sufficient cause being shown by B for requiring the security direct A to give the security. But if the application is made to the appellate Court that Court may in its discretion require security to be given.

Enforcement of security bond given under this rule—See notes to sec. 145. Security for restitution of property taken in execution of a decree.

Appeal—No appeal lies from an order under this rule.

Form—For form of security bond see App G form no 3.

7 [S 547] No such security as is mentioned in rules 5 and 6 shall be required from the Secretary of State for India in Council or, where the Government has undertaken the defence of the suit, from any public officer sued in respect of an act alleged to be done by him in his official capacity.

8 [New] The powers conferred by rules 5 and 6 shall be exercisable where an appeal may be or has been preferred not from the decree but from an order made in execution of such decree.

Exercise of powers in appeal from order made in execution of decree.

Scope and object of the rule—This rule is new. It has been added to meet particularly the case where the litigant does not quarrel with the decree but appeals from an order passed in execution of that decree. In such a case the rule provides that the appellant may apply for a stay of execution of the decree under r 5 or for security for restitution under r 6. A obtains a decree against B and applies for execution. B objects to the execution but the objection is disallowed. B prefers an appeal from the order disallowing his objection. B may apply for a stay of execution of the decree under r 5 pending the disposal of the appeal from the order. This is in accordance with the undermentioned decision under the Code of 1862 (b).

### *Procedure on admission of appeal*

9 [S 548] (1) Where a memorandum of appeal is admitted, the appellate Court or the proper officer of that Court shall endorse thereon the date of presentation, and shall register the appeal in a book to be kept for the purpose.

Register of Appeals

(2) Such book shall be called the Register of Appeals.

(a) *Lal Amaran v Pals Lappa* (1918) 41 Mad 133. (b) *Parupia v N. de Lal* (1901) 25 Cal 774.

10 [s 549] (1) The appellate Court may in its discretion, either before the respondent is called upon to appear and answer or afterwards on the application of the respondent, demand from the appellant security for the costs of the appeal, or of the original suit, or of both

Appellate Court may require appellant to furnish security for costs

for the costs of the appeal, or of the original suit, or of both

Provided that the Court shall demand such security in all cases in which the appellant is residing out of British India, and is not possessed of any sufficient immovable property within British India other than the property (if any) to which the appeal relates

Where an appellant resides out of British India

(2) Where such security is not furnished within such time as the Court orders, the Court shall reject the appeal

Scope and object of the rule—The object of the rule is to secure the respondent in an appeal from the risk of having to incur further costs which he might never recover from the appellant. Under sub r (1) the appellate Court may in its discretion require security for costs. Under the proviso to that sub rule the Court shall demand security for costs. If no security is furnished the Court should reject the appeal whether the order for security is made under the sub rule or the proviso (c)

To what appeals the rule applies—This rule applies not only to appeals from substantive decree but also to appeals from interlocutory orders under sec 104 and to appeals from orders in execution under sec 47 (d). The Privy Council have recently decided that it applies also to appeals under cl. 15 of the Letters Patent (e). The Madras High Court has held that it was not so applicable because the Code dealt with appeals from one Court to another of higher grade while cl. 15 of the Letters Patent dealt with a different class of appeals (f). This was a good reason for holding that the right of appeal under the Letters Patent was not excluded by the words and from no other orders occurring in sec 588 of the Code of 1882 corresponding to sec 104 of the present Code (g) but it does not follow that the procedure of the Court in dealing with an appeal under the Letters Patent (now expressly saved by the words save as otherwise provided by any law inserted in sec 104) is not regulated by the Code. Where any part of the Code does not apply to High Courts specific provision is made to that effect. There is no such provision in respect of this rule. However a Chartered High Court is competent under sec 129 to make a rule inconsistent with O 41 r 10 and if it does the Code rule would not apply (h). Bombay High Court rule 736 prescribes a deposit of Rs 500 as security for respondent's costs as a condition of filing the appeal but this is not inconsistent with the present rule (i). Nor is rule 301 of the Madras High Court rules inconsistent (j).

(c) *Lekha v Bhauna* (1896) 18 All 101

(d) *Dagdu v Chandradhan* (1900) 4 Bom 314

(e) *S b tra Thak r ni v Sarf* (1911) 48 I A 76

48 Cal 481 60 I C 274 (1) A.P.C 80

(f) *Sasha Ayya v Naga et alna* (1904) 7 Mad

121 See also *Sabhap et al v Varay nasami*

(1907) 33 Mad 555 558

(g) *Chappan v Moudinkutis* (1899) 31 Mad 68

*Toolsee Mo ey Dassas v Suders Dassas* (1899) 25 Cal 361

(h) *Nawab Behram Jung v Haji Sultanali* (1913) 37 Bom 57 17 I C 39

(i) *Ratanchand v Damji* (1913) 25 Bom L R 468 73 I C 44 (1913) A B 399

(j) *Vrupaksha v Panganayak* (1925) 87 I C 346 (1925) A B 113



10

**Appeals in forma pauperis**—It has been held by the High Court of Madras (i) that this rule applies to pauper appeals, thus an appellant who has presented his appeal in forma pauperis may be called upon to give security for costs under this rule but very special grounds must be shown to support such an application. On the other hand it has been held by the High Courts of Calcutta (l) Bombay (m) and Lahore ( ) that this rule does not apply to appeals preferred in forma pauperis.

**In its discretion**—Except in the case referred to in the proviso to sub-r (l) the power of the appellate Court to require security for costs is discretionary. The mere fact that the appellant is poor or insolvent is no ground for demanding security for costs (o). Similarly mere non payment of the costs of the original suit is no ground for calling upon the appellant to furnish security under this rule unless his conduct be shown to be vexatious that is such as indicates a wilful determination on his part not to obey the order of the Court in respect of costs (p). On the other hand when the respondent had failed to recover his costs in the lower Court Macleod C.J. made an order for security observing that the Court's discretion was absolute and could not be fettered by cases (q). It is submitted that this was a misuse of the word absolute for the discretion is a judicial discretion to be exercised in accordance with legal principles expounded in the cases. But the Court will as a general rule demand security for costs from a poor or insolvent appellant if it is proved to the satisfaction of the Court that the appellant is not the real litigant but a mere puppet in the hands of others who are well able to furnish security (r) or if the merits of the case are plainly in favour of the respondent (s). See notes to O 20 r 1 Poverty of plaintiff.

**At what stage respondent should apply for security**—The respondent should apply promptly or else it might be urged that he had waived his right (t).

**Order for security**—When an order is made under this rule for security for costs, it is not necessary that any specific sum should be named in the order. It is sufficient if the order directs the appellant to furnish security for the costs of the original suit or for the costs of the appeal or for the costs of the appeal and the original suit (u). A surety for the costs of the appeal is discharged if the appeal is decided in favour of the appellant even if the appellate decree is reversed on second appeal (v). The taxing officer's decision as to the amount of the security is subject to revision by the High Court (w).

**Extension of time for furnishing security**—The appellate Court may under exceptional circumstances extend the time for furnishing security [see s 148]. Thus where the appellant alleged that he was unable on account of plague in Bombay to raise the money required for security within the time fixed by the Court the Court extended the time for giving security. The time for giving security may be extended either before or after its expiry (x).

- (b) *Se hayya v Jai vlargden* (1840) 3 M 1  
86 Jra l sa v v *brumania* (1907) 17  
M 1 I J 545 *Said hna v Hart* (1900)  
43 Mal 90—33 C 794
- (i) *Nas erood n v Ujj* (1871) 17 W R 82  
*Beecher v Jaganmal H Hasan v Abdul K rim*  
(1904) 1 C W 163 cited in the notes to  
O 5 r 1
- (m) *Khanra v Kishanala* (1918) 4 Bom 5  
4 I C 6
- ( ) *Narim v Abdul H m d* (1922) 3 Lah 39  
87 I C 2-6 (—) A L 187
- (e) *Jivan Al v F na Mal* (1946) 8 All 702  
*Hewetson v Das* (1894) 21 Cal 56  
*Manetji v Goodal* (1879) 3 Bom 241
- (p) *Ahmed v Shakti F na* (1891) 13 Bom 434  
*J mal p v Bel hial* (1903) 5 Bom L  
R 661

- (q) ( *labre v tinavet* (1931) 3 Bom L R  
18 7 I C 25 (23) A R 254  
(r) *Kharish v 9 jannon* (185 ) 14 Cal 453  
( ) *M A v Jena B da* (186 ) 100rk 119  
(t) *Bhobo la v Radha Prasad* (1900) 2 C 1  
W 109 *Wise v Japhundoo* (1819) 7  
M 1 A 431 *Thak r Da v Kishori Lal*  
(1847) 9 All 181  
( ) *Lehna v Pharna* (1906) 14 All 101  
( ) *Keda v Chandi* (1923) 34 Cal 2 J 19 6  
I C 810 (—) A C 5 4  
(w) *I wale Anwarul Alam v Surpramanth the*  
(1921) 20 Bom L R 1031 1031 C 61  
( ) A R 492  
(x) *L. d. v. rai v. Anu Kari* (1921) 17 Cal. 512.  
37 I A 1 *Fajal Al Am Hamee*  
(1921) 17 Cal 1 *Jumabai v Fumabai*  
(189 ) 21 Bom 5 6 5 *ada v Haid*  
*Crack* (1900) 47 AU 4 6 6 I C 81

Court shall reject the appeal —The appeal should not be rejected if the order for security has been made without notice to the appellant (y)

Restoring of appeal—An appeal although it may have been rejected by the appellate Court under this rule upon failure of the appellant to furnish security may be restored on sufficient grounds at the Court's discretion ( ) It is no excuse for not furnishing security in time that the appellant is a wandering fakir for it is the duty of every litigant to keep in touch with his case (a) Where the applicant applies for extension of time and the Court after hearing him on the application refuses to extend the time and rejects the appeal the appeal should not subsequently be restored (b) No appeal lies from an order refusing to restore an appeal (c)

Appeal from order rejecting appeal under sub rule (2)—An order rejecting an appeal under this rule is not appealable as an order under O 43 for it is not one of the orders specified therein. Nor is it appealable as a decree for it does not conclusively determine the rights of the parties with regard to any of the matters in controversy in the appeal within the meaning of the definition of decree [s 2 cl (2)] (d)

Appeal from order dismissing application to receive security for costs—An order is made under sub rule (1) directing an appellant to furnish security for costs. The order is indefinite in that it does not fix the exact date on or before which security is to be given. The appellant believing that the time for giving security has expired, applies to the Court to receive the amount fixed by the order as security. The Court hold that the time for furnishing security has expired and refuses the application. The appellant is entitled to appeal from the order under cl 15 of the Letters Patent as the effect of the order would be to finally deprive the appellant of his right of prosecuting his appeal (e)

Insolvency appeal—There is a conflict of decisions as to whether this rule applies to the case of an appeal from an order passed by a Judge of the High Court exercising jurisdiction in insolvency under the Presidency towns Insolvency Act 1909 the High Court of Madras holding that it does not (f) while the High Court of Calcutta holds that it does (g)

Form—For form of security for costs of appeal see App G form No 4

11 [S 551] (1) The appellate Court, after sending for the record if it thinks fit so to do, and after fixing a day for hearing the appellant or his pleader and hearing him accordingly if he appears on that day, may dismiss

Power to dismiss appeal without sending notice to lower Court

the appeal without sending notice to the Court from whose decree the appeal is preferred and without serving notice on the respondent or his pleader

(2) If on the day fixed or any other day to which the hearing may be adjourned the appellant does not appear

(y) *S. Rajulu v. Khadum* (1883) 5 All 380

*T. Munu v. Dero* (1882) 5 Mad 265

(z) *Balant S. Gh v. Da-lai Singh* (1886) 8 All 315 13 1 A 57 *Sunda v. Habib Chark* (1900) 4 All 6 6 60 I C 81 *Srinivasam v. Pukmani* (1905) 5 Mad L J 430 (28) A M 964

(a) *P. Ram v. P. Ram P. Kash* (1900) 2 Lah I J 391 68 I C 306

(b) *L. To v. S. A. R. J. F. Ram* (1909) 7 Rang 41 (9) A R 80

(c) *F. o. Begam v. Abdul Latif* (1908) 30 All 143

(d) *Lekh v. Bha-na* (1896) 18 All 101 *Rames v. Monna* (1911) 49 Cal 355 42 I C 751 ( ) A C 246

( ) *Vidhyayya v. Vidyanidhi* (190 ) 25 Mad. 64

(f) *Sesha Ayyar v. Nagarathna* (1904) 97 Mad 121

(g) *Lakshmi v. Kankishori* (1916) 43 Cal 413 3. I C 3

11 when the appeal is called on for hearing, the Court may make an order that the appeal be dismissed

(3) The dismissal of an appeal under this rule shall be notified to the Court from whose decree the appeal is preferred

#### Alteration in the rule —

- 1 In sub r (1) the words after sending for the record if it thinks fit to do so are new These words have been added to empower the Court to send for the record if it thinks fit to do so before summarily dismissing an appeal without giving notice to the respondent
- 2 The words the Court may make an order that the appeal be dismissed have been substituted for the words the appeal shall be dismissed / e default to make it clear that no appeal lies from an order of dismissal for default See s 2 cl (2) sub cl (b) Under the old section it was held that a decision dismissing an appeal for default was a decree and was therefore appealable (A)

Dismissal of appeal under sub rule (1) whether judgment necessary—Under the corresponding section of the Code of 1882 it was held by the High Court of Calcutta that the dismissal of an appeal under sub r (1) did not relieve the lower appellate Court from the necessity of writing a judgment in the manner prescribed by s. 574 of that Code [now r 31 of this Order] (i) A different view however was taken by the High Court of Allahabad (j) The present Order is divided into distinct parts under appropriate headings an arrangement which did not appear in the corresponding Chapter of the Code of 1882 Rule 11 comes under the heading Procedure on admission of appeal The next heading of the Order is Procedure on hearing and r 31 comes under the next following heading Judgment in appeal Relying upon this classification it was held by the High Court of Bombay in *Tanaji v Shanlar* (k) that under the present Code it is not obligatory upon the lower appellate Court in dismissing an appeal under this rule to write a judgment as required by r 31 But this decision has since been overruled by a Full Bench of the same Court on the ground that it was in conflict with the previous practice of that Court which was based on a Civil Circular being Circular 51 published in 1890 under the provisions of the High Courts Act 1861 by which it is provided that when an appellate Court dismisses an appeal under s. 501 (now r 11 of this Order) a judgment should be written and a formal decree drawn up In the course of the judgment Sir Basil Scott C.J. said There is nothing in the new Code of Civil Procedure which introduces any change in the law except in so far as the rules commencing with rule 9 of Order XXI are headed Procedure on admission of appeal That change is not sufficient to abrogate the rule published under the High Courts Act which is quite consistent with the provisions of the Code (l) The result is that according to the Bombay High Court when an appeal is dismissed under this rule a judgment should be written and a formal decree drawn up The High Courts of Calcutta and Rangoon have given the same decision under the present Code (m). Even if the judgment is not pronounced in the form prescribed by rule 31 the decision is a decree (n)

- (A) *Uma Chakraborty v Bhatia* (1937) 21 Cal 79  
 (i) *Pamela Devi v Broja Nath* (1929) 23 Cal 9  
 (j) *Sami Hassan v Feroz* (1909) 30 All 319  
 (k) (1911) 34 Loco 116 1 I C 566  
 (l) *Hemant v Anand* (1913) 37 Bom 610 20 I C 906 (V 11)

- (m) *S. S. Chandra v. S. S. Chandra* (1937) 21 Cal 79  
 C.W.N. 501 78 I C 10 (23) A C L J  
 H. of D. v. Chakraborty (1906) 43 I L J  
 492 98 I C 135 (1906) A C 92 318  
 S. v. M. v. M. (1906) 43 I L J 46  
 9 I C 841 (1906) A C 17  
 (n) *Aditya v. S. S. Chandra* (1906) 43 I L J 234, 93 I C 909 (1906) A C 634

Dismissal of appeal for default under sub rule (2) —Where an appeal is dismissed for default it is the decree of the lower Court alone that can be enforced in execution (o) See notes to s 36 What decrees may be executed

Review —Dismissal of an appeal under this rule bars a review of the judgment appealed against see notes under O 47 r 1 The order under this rule dismissing the appeal is itself subject to review and the practice of the Calcutta High Court is to grant a review and order the rehearing of the appeal *ex parte* (p) When a second appeal is dismissed under this rule the High Court has no power to review its judgment on the ground of the discovery of new and important matter (q) See notes to O 47 r 1 No review allowed on a question of fact after decision of second appeal

Re admission of appeal dismissed for default under sub rule (2) —An appeal dismissed under sub r (2) may be re admitted under r 19

**12 [S 552]** (1) Unless the appellate Court dismisses the appeal under rule 11, it shall fix a day for hearing the appeal

Day for hearing appeal

(2) Such day shall be fixed with reference to the current business of the Court, the place of residence of the respondent, and the time necessary for the service of the notice of appeal, so as to allow the respondent sufficient time to appear and answer the appeal on such day

**13 [S 552]** (1) Where the appeal is not dismissed under rule 11, the appellate Court shall send notice of the appeal to the Court from whose decree the appeal is preferred

Appellate Court to give notice to Court whose decree appealed from

(2) Where the appeal is from the decree of a Court, the records of which are not deposited in the appellate Court, the Court receiving such notice shall send with all practicable despatch all material papers in the suit, or such papers as may be specially called for by the appellate Court

Transmission of papers to appellate Court

(3) Either party may apply in writing to the Court from whose decree the appeal is preferred, specifying any of the papers in such Court of which he requires copies to be made, and copies of such papers shall be made at the expense of, and given to, the applicant

Copies of exhibits in Court whose decree appealed from

Alteration in the rule —In sub rule (1) the words where the appeal is not dismissed under r 11 have been substituted for the words when the memorandum of appeal is registered

(a) *Savam M. dal v Satinath* (1917) 44 Cal 91

38 I C 493

(p) *Off. and Trust v Fenold* (1914) 51 Cal 953

81 I C 147 (5) A C 114

(q) *Papa v Kals* (1914) 41

81 S. 146

1 J 76 70 I C 408

1, 16 Form—For form of intimation to lower Court of admission of appeal see Appendix G form no 5

**14 [S 553]** (1) Notice of the day fixed under rule 12 shall be affixed in the appellate Court house, and a like notice shall be sent by the appellate Court to the Court from whose decree the appeal is preferred, and shall be served on the respondent or on his pleader in the appellate Court in the manner provided for the service of a defendant of a summons to appear and answer, and all the provisions applicable to such summons, and to proceedings with reference to the service thereof, shall apply to the service of such notice

Publication and service of notice of day for hearing of appeal

(2) Instead of sending the notice to the Court from whose decree the appeal is preferred, the appellate Court may itself cause the notice to be served on the respondent or his pleader under the provisions above referred to

Appellate Court may itself cause notice to be served

Form—For form of notice to respondent see Appendix G form no 6

**15 [S 554]** The notice to the respondent shall declare that, if he does not appear in the appellate Court on the day so fixed, the appeal will be heard *ex parte*

Contents of notice

### *Procedure on hearing*

**16 [S 555]** (1) On the day fixed, or on any other day to which the hearing may be adjourned, the appellant shall be heard in support of the appeal

Right to begin

(2) The Court shall then, if it does not dismiss the appeal at once hear the respondent against the appeal, and in such case the appellant shall be entitled to reply

Right to begin—The mere fact that the respondent calls in question the right of the appellant to appeal does not give the respondent the right to begin (r)

It is the duty of the appellant to satisfy the Court of appeal that the decision of the trial Court is erroneous (s) In every appeal it is incumbent upon the appellant to show some reason why the judgment appealed from should be disturbed There must be some balance in his favour to justify the alteration of the judgment as it stands (t)

(r) *Pustomyi v Kessowys* (1884) 8 Bom 87  
(s) *Secretary of State v B Joy Kumar* (1921) 40 Cal L J 303 84 I C 73 (25) A C 224

(t) *Musat Falariss v Moula Isarus* (1911) 5 CWN 886 63 I C 893 (1) A PC 55 (PC)

**17 [S 556]** (1) Where on the day fixed, or on any other day to which the hearing may be adjourned, the appellant does not appear when the appeal is called on for hearing, the Court may make an order that the appeal be dismissed

Dismissal of appeal for appellant's default

(2) Where the appellant appears and the respondent does not appear, the appeal shall be heard *ex parte*

Hearing appeal *ex parte*

Alterations in the rule—The words the Court may make an order that the appeal be dismissed have been substituted for the words the appeal shall be dismissed for default to make it clear that no appeal lies from the order of dismissal for default (u) See sec 3 cl (2) sub cl. (b) and notes Order of dismissal for default p 11 above

Does not appear —See notes to O 9 r 9 Appearance

Dismissal of appeal on merits illegal —If the appellant does not appear the Court may if it thinks fit dismiss the appeal for default of appearance but it has no power to dismiss the appeal on the merits (v)

Re admission of appeal dismissed under this rule —See r 19 below

Order that the appeal be dismissed —See notes above Alteration in the rule

**18 [S 557]** Where on the day fixed, or on any other day to which the hearing may be adjourned, it is found that the notice to the respondent has not been served in consequence of the failure of the appellant to deposit, within the period fixed, the sum required to defray the cost of serving the notice, the Court may make an order that the appeal be dismissed

Dismissal of appeal where notice not served in consequence of appellant's failure to deposit costs

Provided that no such order shall be made although the notice has not been served upon the respondent, if on any such day the respondent appears when the appeal is called on for hearing

The Court may make an order that the appeal be dismissed —The language of the rule clearly shows that the order of dismissal should not be made before the day fixed for the hearing of the appeal (w)

Re admission of appeal dismissed under the rule —See r 19 below

Appeal —An order under this rule is not open to appeal The proper remedy is an application under r 19 below for re admission (x)

Effect of dismissal of appeal against one or several respondents for non service of notice —A B and C obtain a decree for joint possession against D

(u) *Pukmin aji v Paron Ch idra* (191) 33 C 1 311 14 IC 83

(v) *Muhamma'i v Mana idrama* (19) 45 M d. 88 *Har l v Bedesh* (13) 86 Rang 61 114 IC 30 (9) A K 11

(w) *Cha d a Vakh v Kalipras nna* (1908) 35 Cal 535

(x) *Affar Singh v Karm Chand* (1912) Punj Rec no 169 p 442 50 IC 179

1, 19 *D* appeals from the decree *A* and *B* are served with the notice of appeal but *C* is not. The appeal is thereupon dismissed as against *C*. Is *D* entitled to proceed with the appeal as against *A* and *B*? No for even if the appellate Court heard the appeal and reversed the decree of the lower Court as regards *A* and *B* the decree of the lower Court not being reversed as regards *C* *C* could execute the entire decree (the decree being a joint decree) so as to nullify the decree of the appellate Court (y) See notes to O 22 r 4 Cases in which suit or appeal held to abate as a whole

19 [S 553] Where an appeal is dismissed under rule 11, sub rule (2), or rule 17 or rule 18, the appellant may apply to the appellate Court for the re admission of the appeal,

Re admission of appeal dismissed for default

and, where it is proved that he was prevented by any sufficient cause from appearing when the appeal was called on for hearing or from depositing the sum so required, the Court shall re admit the appeal on such terms as to costs or otherwise as it thinks fit

Shall re admit the appeal —These words have been substituted for the words may re admit the appeal The word may in the old section was construed by the High Court of Madras to mean shall ( )

Sufficient cause —The carelessness of an advocates clerk does not constitute sufficient cause (a) But where the appellants pleader appeared soon after the appeal was dismissed it was restored on the ground that the failure to appear was unintentional (b) The absence of appellants pleader owing to an engagement in another Court has been held to be sufficient cause (c)

Appeal —An appeal lies from an order of refusal to re admit an appeal [O 23 r 1 cl (t)] But no appeal lies from an order re admitting an appeal (d)

Dismissal of appeal for failure to deposit costs of paper book or to pay court fees —Where an appeal is dismissed under the rules of a High Court for failure to deposit the costs of preparation of the paper book as required by the rules the decree may be set aside not by an order under this rule but by an order on an application for a review (e) So also if it is dismissed for failure to pay Court fees (f)

Inherent power to restore appeal dismissed for default —Although a cause may not amount to a sufficient cause within the meaning of this rule the Court has inherent power to pass an order of restoration if it considers that a case for restoration has been made out (g) According to the Bombay High Court (h) the Court has inherent power to admit an application for re admission that is time barred under Art 163 of the Limitation Act but the Lahore (i) and Madras (j) High Courts differ following *Acharya v Narayana* (k) See note under O 9 r 9 Inherent power to restore suit dismissed for default

(y) *Baner v Fils* (1914) 19 C W N 90  
24 I C 703

(z) *S mayya v S b mma* (1903) 6 Mad 599  
601

(a) *M ung Than v Zinat Bibi* (19 5) 3 Rang  
488 92 I C 208 ( ) 6) A H 90 See also  
*Ram S khat v Maharajah Kesho Prasad*  
(1918) 3 Pat L J 18 43 I C 9

(b) *Balmukund v Harir* (1923) 5 Lah L J 89  
79 I C 79

(c) *Mrgendra v Dib la* (1926) 44 Cal L J  
16 97 I C 573 ( ) 6) A C 1 31

(d) *Gulab Kunwar v Ah kur Das* (190 ) 24 All  
464

(e) *Fat munniss v Deols* (1897) 4 Cal 3 0

*A ant Joldar v M ngal Potdar* (19 5)  
4 Pat 704 91 I C 483 (26) A P 7

(f) *Su appal Pandey v Gtm Pandey* (19 1)  
6 Pat L J 6 5 63 I C 99 (2 ) A P 231

*Anant v Mangal* (1925) 4 P C 704 91  
I C 483 (26) A P 27

(g) *Gaurav v Brij Raj* (1919) Punj Rec no 53  
p 13 51 I C 607

(h) *Conubai v Shurafur o* (1921) 45 Bom 618  
60 I C 919 (21) A B 20

(i) *Bustamat v Kesar Si gh* (19 0) 1 Lab 363  
58 I C 789

(j) *Krishnas m v Chengalray* (19 4) 47 Mad  
171 74 I C 836 ( ) 4) A M 114

(k) (19 0) 43 Mad 94 53 I C 847

0 4  
π 19.

Power to adjourn hearing  
and direct persons appear  
ing interested to be made  
respondents

Limitation — A person who was a party to the proceeding in the Court below may be added as a respondent though the time to appeal against him has expired (u) But this cannot be done if the misjoinder has rendered the appeal incompetent as when an appeal is filed against some only of several joint decree holders (o)

The Court will not under this rule add representatives of a deceased party to save an appeal that has abated (u) Nor will it add a respondent after the appeal against him is time barred (t)

**Adding of parties in second appeal**—Has the High Court power in second appeal to add a party who was a party to the suit but not a party in the first appeal? No according to the Allahabad High Court (w) Yes according to the Madras (x) Calcutta (y) and Patna (z) High Courts

- (H) *S. aydeo* 14 a s v *Partap Ras* (19 3) - Pat  
739 7 I C 234 (23) A P 213
- (m) *Chok Lmpan* v 9 *thai* (10 8) 5 I A 6  
Ran 9 10 I C 237 (7) A P C
- ( ) *G wih C?* der v *Sati Sekha* e (1906) 33  
Cal 3 9 *Shahab D n v Mir n B ksh*  
(1914) Punj Rec no 79 p 27 25 I C 549  
*D u n Sh b ath v Al nce B kof S mila*  
*Ltd* (1915) Punj Rec no 3 p 10 25 I C  
4 0
- (o) *B drs Va v n v East Indian R luc*  
(19 6) 5 P t 755 98 I C 1003 (7)  
A P 23
- (p) *Amlook Cha d v Saras Chunder* (1911) 38  
Cal 913 919 11 I C 943 *Mindnapur*  
*Zamindary C v Amulya ath* (19 6)  
53 Cal 752 95 I C 619 (26) A C 893
- (q) *Gayendra th v M h Lala* (19 6) 53 Cal  
270 91 I C 649 (27) A C 633
- (r) *Bai s cam Ayar v Lakshmana Ayar*  
(19 1) 44 Mad 605 63 I C 374 (1) A M
- 17 [F B]
- (s) *Sh m Lal v Dhanpat Rai* (19 5) 47 All 8 3  
88 I C 493 (2) A A 768
- (t) *Sh m Lal v Dha p t* (19 5) 47 All 8 3  
V j m v *Sheth Ma eekal* (19 J) 53  
Pom 598
- (u) *K h D y l v Gayendra* (1919) 24 C W N  
44 54 I C 8 *Mani d a v Bhag dat*  
(19 ) 30 C W N 4 90 I C 946 (6)  
A C 335
- (v) *Ch h l g m v Seethai* (19 ) 2 Rang 541  
84 I C 5 (25) A R 108
- (w) *Chun v Lal P m* (1894) 16 All 5 *Pach*  
*Ka r v l m Khilawan* (1915) 37 All 57  
26 I C 25
- (x) *Paya v Ko m l* (1896) 19 Mad 151
- (y) *D ga Ch n v Lalit Narain* (1918)  
I C 91
- (z) *F d th Maklon v Hutan Si gh* (19 4)  
8 I C 600 (4) A P 773



Form —For form of notice to a party to a suit not made a party to the appeal see Appendix G form no 7

**21 [S 560]** Where an appeal is heard *ex parte* and judgment is pronounced against the respondent, he may apply to the appellate Court to re hear the appeal, and, if he satisfies the Court that the notice was not duly served or that he was prevented by sufficient cause from appearing when the appeal was called on for hearing, the Court shall re hear the appeal on such terms as to costs or otherwise as it thinks fit to impose upon him

See O 9 r 13 and notes thereto

**Sufficient cause** —Where counsel for respondent was unable to appear at the hearing as the respondent's agent had taken away the papers it was held that it was not sufficient cause for re hearing the appeal (a) But when the party's agent could not appear to instruct the pleader because of his daughter's illness this was considered sufficient cause (b)

**Appeal** —An appeal lies from an order of refusal to re hear an appeal [O 43 r 1 cl (t)]

**22 [S 561]** (1) Any respondent, though he may not have appealed from any part of the decree, may not only support the decree on any of the grounds decided against him in the Court below, but take any cross objection to the decree which he could have taken by way of appeal, provided he has filed such objection in the appellate Court within one month from the date of service on him or his pleader of notice of the day fixed for hearing the appeal, or within such further time as the appellate Court may see fit to allow

(2) Such cross objection shall be in the form of a memorandum, and the provisions of rule 1, so far as they relate to the form and contents of the memorandum of appeal, shall apply thereto

(3) Unless the respondent files with the objection a written acknowledgment from the party who may be affected by such objection or his pleader of having received a copy thereof, the appellate Court shall cause a copy to be served, as soon as may be after the filing of the objection on such party or his pleader at the expense of the respondent

(a) *Baji Lal v Nasool Singh* (1917) 39 All 388 39 I C 636 | (b) *Godhani v Shyam* (1911) 19 All L J 517 63 I C 727 (1) A A 264

(4) Where, in any case in which any respondent has O 41, r under this rule filed a memorandum of objection the original appeal is withdrawn or is dismissed for default, the objection so filed may nevertheless be heard and determined after such notice to the other parties as the Court thinks fit

(5) The provisions relating to pauper appeals shall, so far as they can be made applicable, apply to an objection under this rule

Alterations in the rule—The words upon the hearing which occurred in the first paragraph of s 561 of the Code of 1882 [now sub r 1] between the words may and not only support have been omitted and sub rule (4) has been added See notes below under the head Sub rule (4) where the appeal is withdrawn or dismissed for default The words the party who may be affected by such objection in sub r (3) have been substituted for the words the appellant which occurred in s 561

Cross objections—If in a suit brought by A against B B sets up two defences and the Court of first instance decides both in B's favour and A appeals there is no scope for cross objections for cross objections cannot be filed as criticisms of a judgment (c) but if the Court decides in B's favour as to one and against him as to the other then if A appeals B may support the decree at the hearing of the appeal not only on the ground decided in his favour but also on the ground decided against him without filing any cross objections (d) In the case put above the decree was entirely in B's (respondent's) favour But if A's claim is decreed in part A may appeal from the decree alleging that the decree ought to have been for the full amount claimed by him And B also may appeal from the decree alleging that the suit ought to have been dismissed altogether If A appeals from the decree and B also appeals B's appeal is called a cross appeal But instead of filing a cross appeal B may file cross objections under this rule In cross objections B may take any objection to the decree which he could have taken by way of appeal (e) If no cross objections are filed by a respondent the appellate Court has no power to grant any relief to him in a case where the granting of such relief is not necessarily incidental to the relief granted to the appellant (f) nor has it the power in the absence of cross objections to disturb so much of the original decree as is favourable to the appellant so as to place the appellant in a worse position (g) Appellate Court should not proceed to decide on a point not raised either by the appellant or respondent (h)

Support the decree—The respondent without filing cross objections may support the decree on grounds decided against him by the lower Court But this does not authorize the respondent to make out a case for a decree for the same amount by questioning some adjudication as to right found against him and as to which no appeal or objection has been filed The expression support the decree means support the decision and does not refer to the quantum of the decree (i)

(c) *Sahdeo v Kusum* (19) 1 Pat 258 (2) A P 423

(d) *L Ja Gauri Sanker v Janti Pr shad* (1890) 17 Cal 809 813-814 17 I A 57 *Bhagoji v B puji* (1899) 13 Bom 75 *Ram P 1 d v Musti Aj nana* (19) 44 All 577 68 I C 861 (2) A A 280

(e) *Balak v Kaus* (1882) 4 All 491

(f) *Kul kada v Viswanatha* (1905) 33 Mad

9 Cal p 2 v *Kush ri Lal* (1896) 23 Cal 9 9 9

(g) *Chada Lal v B d Hah* (1899) 11 All 35 *Aqil v Din Anah* (1907) 31 Cal 996 *Sh les Jandra v Echa* (19 4) 40 Cal L J 67 84 I C 1 4 ( ) A C 91

(h) *Sir P edy t Kumar v Bal Gorinda* (19-5) 41 Cal L J 31 89 I C 6 (2) A C 518

(i) *Sri Ranga v Srinanasa* (18 7) 50 Mad 866 104 I C 47 ( 7) A M 801

22 Sub rule (4) where the appeal is withdrawn or has abated or is dismissed for default—The old section commenced with the words any respondent may upon the hearing not only support the decree etc It was accordingly held that a respondent can be heard in support of his cross objections only upon the hearing of the appeal. If the appeal was withdrawn before the hearing the respondent it was held, had no right to be heard in support of his cross objections (j) though the Court might in such a case allow him to prefer a regular appeal from the decree (k) But if the hearing had once commenced the appeal it was held could not be withdrawn so as to prevent the cross objections being heard and determined (l) This distinction has now been done away with by the omission of the words upon the hearing in sub r (1) and by the addition of sub r (4) Under the present rule the withdrawal of an appeal is no bar to the hearing of cross objection filed by a respondent whether the appeal is withdrawn before or after the hearing Similarly the dismissal of an appeal for default is no bar to the hearing of cross objections Thus was correctly admitted in *Bhimasena v Venugopal* (m) a Letters Patent appeal but the reasoning so far as it proceeds on the assumption that O 41 does not apply to Letters Patent appeals seems opposed to the Privy Council decision in *Savtri v Sav* (n) The dismissal of an appeal upon the appellant's failure to give security for costs is a dismissal for default within the meaning of sub r (4) (o) But if the appeal has abated the respondent is not entitled to have his cross objections heard (p)

Under the old section the High Court of Allahabad held that the dismissal of an appeal as filed out of time was a bar to the hearing of cross objections (q) A Full Bench of the Madras High Court holds that the law is the same under the present rule (r) The Lahore High Court has held that an appeal must be properly filed before the Court in order that cross objections may be heard (s) and it has been held that where an appeal is dismissed on the ground of insufficiency of Court fee stamp the Court has no power to hear cross objections (t) The last mentioned decision is based on the ground that except in the case of the original appeal being withdrawn or dismissed for default as expressly provided for in sub r (4) the general rule that cross objections cannot be heard unless the appeal is decided on the merits is still in force But the dismissal of an appeal on the ground of non joinder of a party in a mortgage suit has been held not to be a bar to the hearing of cross objections the reason given being that in such a case the appeal is heard the question of non joinder being one that arises in the appeal itself and is not extraneous to it as would be a question as to whether it was presented in proper time or not (u)

Who may file cross objections—Cross objections under this rule can only be filed by a party who might have appealed from the decree of the Court below but has not done so It is not open to the party who has appealed and whose appeal has been dismissed subsequently to prefer cross objections under this rule A sues B for damages A's claim is decreed in part A appeals from that part of the decree which is against him B also appeals from that part of the decree which is against him A's appeal is heard and dismissed Before B's appeal is heard A files cross objections in B's appeal setting up the same grounds upon which in his own appeal he had asked

- (j) *Jafar v Ranjit Singh* (1895) 17 All 518  
*Ramji n v Chand Mal* (1888) 10 All 537  
*Maktab Bey v Hasanah* (1886) 8 All 551  
 (l) *Harjyandas v Jadatadas* (1899) 23 Bom 607  
 (m) *Dhond v The Collector of Salt Revenue* (1885) 9 Bom 28  
 (n) (19 5) 48 Mad 631 88 I C 413 (25) A M 7 5  
 (o) (1921) 48 I A 76 48 Cal 481 60 I C 974  
 (21) A PC 80  
 (p) *Mova Sheobaksh v M war Th k Deyal* (1919) 4 Pat L J 164 50 I C 7-9

- (q) *Murugappa Chittur v Ponnus mi Pillai* (19 1) 44 M d 828 6 I C 757 (1) A M 40  
*Mukha d v Dornai & Co Ltd* (19 9) 10 Lah. 98 110 I C 910 (8) A L 596  
 (r) *Famjwan v Chand Mal* (1888) 10 All 567  
*Alagappa v Chockal ngam* (1918) 41 Mad 904 917 920 48 I C 203  
 (s) *Jai Gopal v M na Lal* (19 3) 4 Lah 140  
 "3 I C 65 (4) A L 43  
 (t) *Dumcha d v Ans Khan* (1912) Punj Rec no 11 p 38 10 I C 207  
 (u) *Komdi Achen v Kochunni* (1898) 21 Mad 35

for relief. A's cross objections should not be heard (v). Again A obtains a decree in a partnership suit which is against B one of the defendants as *ex parte*. B does not apply under O 9 r 13 to set aside the *ex parte* decree. B cannot therefore file cross objections in A's appeal that he should have been given a hearing (w). But in a case where B before the *ex parte* decree was passed presented a petition asking to be heard under the erroneous impression that the *ex parte* decree had already been passed it was held that he was not barred from filing cross objections on the ground that he was not heard (x). Cross objections as to costs in the Courts below will not be entertained in second appeal (v).

A respondent may urge cross objections against the appellant but not as a rule against a co respondent.—It has been held by the High Courts of Calcutta Bombay and Allahabad that as a general rule the right of a respondent to urge cross objections should be limited to his urging them only against the appellant and that it is only by way of exception to this general rule that one respondent may urge cross objections as against other respondents the exception holding good in those cases in which the appeal opens up questions which cannot be disposed of completely without matters being allowed to be opened up as between co respondents (z). Thus in suits for dissolution of partnership and for accounts it is open to any respondent to prefer cross objections against a co respondent on any item in dispute between them. The reason is that in such suits accounts are taken not between the plaintiff on the one hand and the defendants on the other but between all the partners. A, B and C constitute a partnership firm. A sues B and C for dissolution of partnership and for accounts. A decree is passed in the suit declaring the amount coming to the share of each partner on the taking of accounts. A appeals from the decree. B and C are joined as respondents to the appeal. In such a case it is open to B to prefer cross objections against C in respect of an item in dispute between B and C (a). Similarly when the decree appealed from proceeds on a ground common to all the parties against whom it is passed and the appeal is preferred by some only of such parties e.g. where the suit is—A v B and C and a decree is passed both against B and C and the appeal is—B v A and C. A who is the plaintiff respondent may prefer cross objections not only against B the appellant but against C the co respondent. A sues B and C to recover Rs 5 000 alleged to be his share of the profits of certain lands. A decree is passed for A for Rs 3 000 against B and C. B appeals from the decree. C does not join B in the appeal and he is therefore made a party respondent. The appeal thus is—B v A and C. In such a case it is open to A to prefer cross objections not only against B but also against C in respect of that portion of his claim that was disallowed by the Court of first instance namely Rs 2 000 (b). According to the Madras (c) and Lahore (d) High Courts a respondent may urge cross objections against a co respondent in any and every case. Note in this connection the substitution in sub r (3) of the words "the party who may be affected by such objection" for the words "the appellant" which occurred in sec 561 of the Code of 1882.

- (r) *Pamji Das v Aj dhia* (1903) 25 All 68  
*Parbh v Muli* (1911) All L J 365  
 78 I C 667 (4) A A 867 *Souris d a*  
*v Nirm l* (1918) 3 C W N 863 (8)  
 A C 882  
 (w) See Note on O 9 r 13  
 (x) *Ba a Leria v Ammeenammal* (1913) 45  
 Mad L J 805 79 I C 968 (4) A M  
 107  
 (y) *Madho v Aishan* (1913) 5 Lah L J 108  
 79 I C 977  
 (z) *Bishun CA rn v Jogend a* (1899) 6 Cal 111  
*Sh bi ddin v Deomoor t* (1903) 30 C 1  
 655 *Kallu v Ma as* (1901) 3 All 93  
*Nu sey v Harrison* (1913) 17 Bom 511  
 21 I C 7 *Jad n dan v Deo Narain*  
 (1911) 16 C W N 61 614 13 I C 653  
*Abdul Ghani v Muhammad* (1906) 8

- AB 95 *M l a ra v Nam Kum* (1916)  
 43 Cal 790 88 35 I C 305 *M elcha*  
*v Nam Kar in* (1918) 40 All 536 51  
 I C 616 *Official Trustee of Bengal v*  
*Smith* (1920) 5 Pat L J 38 56 I C 6  
 See also *Bh dan v Co-operati e Bank*  
 (1915) 9 C W N 781 88 I C 866 (3)  
 A C 973  
 (a) *Balgob d v Pam Sarup* (1914) 36 All 50  
 61 I C 83  
 (b) *Abdul Gh v Muhammad* (1906) 3 All 9  
 (c) *Awala d v Faru zha* (1905) 33 Mad  
 9 *Munusamy v Idhu* (1915) 38 Mad  
 6 7 I C 33 *F B l Alagappa v*  
*Chockal ay m* (1918) 41 Mad 604 917 48  
 I C 63  
 (d) *Chh jru v Qui b Din* (1913) 5 Lah L J 9  
 69 I C 330 (3) A L 59

Application for leave to file cross objections in forma pauperis—An application for leave to file cross objections in forma pauperis may be received by the Court at any time (e)

Or within such further time —This rule requires that cross objections should be filed by the respondent within one month from the date of the service of notice of the appeal. But the time may be extended if sufficient cause is shown (f)

Application of the rule—Cross objections may be filed not only in first appeal but also in second appeal (O 42). They may also be filed in appeals from orders preferred under sec 104 and O 43 [See O 43 r 2]

Second appeal—A second appeal will lie from a decree of the first appellate Court disallowing the cross objections of a respondent (g)

Letters Patent appeal—The Allahabad and Calcutta High Courts have held that the provision for respondents filing cross objections does not apply to Letters Patent appeals (h) but it is doubtful if this is correct in view of the Privy Council decision in *Sabitri v Sati* (i)

Form—As to form of memorandum of cross objections see App G form no 8

**23 [S 562]** Where the Court from whose decree an appeal is preferred has disposed of the suit upon a preliminary point and the decree is reversed in appeal, the appellate Court may, if it thinks fit, by order remand the case, and may further direct what issue or issues shall be tried in the cases so remanded, and shall send a copy of its judgment and order to the Court from whose decree the appeal is preferred, with directions to re-admit the suit under its original number in the register of civil suits, and proceed to determine the suit and the evidence (if any) recorded during the original trial shall, subject to all just exceptions, be evidence during the trial after remand

Alterations in the rule—The words and the evidence (if any) recorded during the original trial shall subject to all just exceptions be evidence during the trial after remand at the end of the rule are new

Scope of the rule—It is not competent to the appellate Court under this rule to remand the case for further evidence to the lower Court and to require that Court to pass another decree. All that the appellate Court is empowered to do is to frame an issue and to send down that issue to the Court below for the return of a finding and it is the duty of the appellate Court after receiving that finding to dispose of the appeal upon the evidence before it (j). The appellate Court cannot after finding on facts remand the case to the lower Court to pass a decree in accordance with that finding (k)

Preliminary point—This rule enables the appellate Court to remand a case to the lower Court for determination on the merits if the lower Court has disposed of the suit upon a preliminary point and the decree of that Court is reversed in appeal. The

- (e) *Gobinda v Radha* (1910) 12 C 1 L J 13  
*Musammam Chander v Musammam Duhin* (19 S) 7 P t 82 (28) 4 P 31  
 (f) *Sullesman v J sub* (1890) 14 Lom 111  
 (g) *Ganapats v Suth ma* (1887) 10 Mad 29  
 (h) *Re Mirza Hummat* (1866) B L R F B 429  
*Kaurika v Gulab* (1899) 21 All 97  
*Brojendra v Prossanna* (19 0) 4

- C W N 1016 59 I C 489  
 (i) (19 1) 43 I A 76 43 C 1 481 60 I C 271  
 (1) A 14 80  
 (j) *Haradhan v Iswar Das* (1917) Pat L J 81 64 28 I C 797  
*Hari Ram v Buta* (19 5) 7 Lah L J 351 (25) A L 480  
 (k) *Sham v Bana s* (19 ) 9 All L J 258  
 66 I C 886 (2) A A 19

expression preliminary point is not confined to such legal points only as may be pleaded in bar of a suit but comprehends all points or issues whether of fact or of law the determination of which has precluded the necessity for determining other points or issues which have therefore been left undetermined (h) A Full Bench of the Madras High Court defined it as any point whether of fact or of law the decision of which avoids the necessity for a full hearing of the suit (m) Thus where the lower Court dismisses the plaintiff's suit on the ground that it is barred by limitation or that the Court has no jurisdiction to hear the suit or that the necessary leave has not been obtained or that the plaintiff does not on the face of it disclose any cause of action (n) or that it is barred by the events in an earlier suit (o) and the appellate Court reverses the decree of the lower Court on those grounds it may remand the case to the lower Court to be proceeded with on the merits Where several issues are raised in a suit one of which is that of undue influence and the Court dismisses the suit on a finding that there was undue influence without a finding on the other issues the decision amounts to a disposal of the suit upon a preliminary point within the meaning of this rule (p) Similarly if A sues B to recover a sum of money on the basis of an award and four issues are framed one of which is whether the award is valid and binding and the Court after recording evidence on all the issues dismisses the suit on the ground that the award is invalid leaving the other issues undecided the appellate Court may if it finds that the decision of the lower Court on the issue as to the validity of the award is wrong remand the case to the lower Court to be disposed of on the merits It does not matter that evidence has been recorded on all the issues (q) But where the first Court has decided a suit on the merits of the whole case as where the suit is decided on all the evidence and on all the issues the appellate Court cannot remand the case under this rule (r) Where the first Court heard the entire suit and found all issues in favour of the plaintiff except one namely whether the suit was maintainable having regard to the provisions of O 21 r 92 and dismissed the suit on the finding that the suit was not maintainable it was held by the Patna High Court that the suit was disposed of on a preliminary point within the meaning of this rule (s) This decision is in conflict with the decisions referred to above and it is submitted, is not good law To pass a decree in favour of the plaintiff on the strength of a plan put in by the plaintiff in a suit for possession of land is not a decision of the suit on a preliminary point and no remand can be made in such a case under this rule (t) In a Bombay case the appellate Court was of opinion that certain findings of facts were necessary for the disposal of the appeal and that evidence should be taken on those points and it made an order of remand under this rule It was held that the Court had no power to make the order under this rule though such an order could be made under Rule 25 below (u)

No order of remand can be made under this rule unless the lower Court has disposed of the whole suit upon a preliminary point This rule authorises a remand only where

- (i) *Sheoambar v Lall* (1887) 9 All 6 note at pp 20 37 *Mukhamat i Aladad v Jhu hammad* (1888) 10 All 289 *Ramachand a v Hazi A am* (1893) 16 M d 07  
(m) *Raman Day r v Krishna* (19 ) 45 Mad 900 89 I C 8 8 (2 ) A M 505 [F B]  
(n) *Kanakammal v Panga hornar* (1897) 0 Mad  
(o) *Pamasami v Na yanasami* (19 5) 48 Mad L J 100 86 I C 548 ( 5 ) A M 483  
(p) *Mahant Ra hu v M hant Ragh nath* (1917) 2 Pat L J 398 41 I C 20  
(q) *Mata Din v Jamna D s* (1905) 27 All 691 *Meghan D be v J am S ngh* (1908) 30 All 63 A m d v P dhru (1916) 39 All 16 37 I C 383  
(r) *R m A S gh Sheod n* (1890) 1 All 510 *M U I r v P th ems* (1896) 19 Mad 4 9 *Abd lla Khan v M hammad* (19 3) 45 All 565 74 I C 8 ( 3 ) A A

- 603 *Radha v K m l* (19 ) 3 Cal L J 345 0 I C 547 (2 ) A C 456 *Injad 44 v Mohin* (19 3) 27 C W N 10 5 80 I C 8 3 ( -4 ) A C 148 *Lekhan Si gh v B hu Pam* (19 5) 3 All L J 880 84 I C 10 1 ( 6 ) A A 65 *Ganpat v Raj Kumar* (19 ) 1 Pat 839 67 I C 494 ( 2 ) A P 57 *Kolu Dalpat v a a n* (19 7) 9 Bom L R 56 100 I C 574 (7) A B 111 *Chaudhary v Mith Jan* (19 7) 6 Pat 30 103 I C (2 ) A I 96 *B ka B h r v B r nd a v th* (19 8) 3 Cal. 19 103 I C 864 ( ) A C 860  
(s) *Thad v Sa ka Mfan war* (1919) 4 Pat L J 64 5 I C 15  
(t) *Palani v P gnadas* (1909) 3 Mad 83 11 I C 716  
(u) *Anu ji v Thakubai* (19 9) 53 Bom. 33 118 I C 90 ( -9 ) A B 175

r 23 the entire suit and not only a portion of it has been disposed of by the Court below on a preliminary point (v) Assuming that the entire suit is decided on a preliminary point it is further necessary before an order of remand can be made under this rule that the appellate Court should also find that the decision on the preliminary point is wrong It is not a good ground therefore for making an order under this rule that the preliminary issue e.g. an issue of limitation has been decided by the Court of first instance on a wrong view of the burden of proof unless the appellate Court finds that the issue itself has been *wrongly decided* (w) Again if the lower Court decides the suit on several preliminary points the appellate Court should not remand the suit without deciding all those preliminary points (x)

**Inherent power of remand** Remand in case of error omission or irregularity—No order of remand can be made under the present rule except when the suit has been disposed of on a *preliminary point* There are however cases in which suits have not been disposed of on a *preliminary point* and yet the Courts have claimed the power to remand the case professing to do so in the exercise of their *inherent power* [see s 151] These are cases in which the lower Court has committed any error omission or irregularity by reason of which there has not been a proper trial or an effectual or complete adjudication of the suit and the party complaining of such error omission or irregularity has been materially prejudiced thereby Thus if a suit is defective for misjoinder of plaintiffs and causes of action the proper course is to return the plaint to the plaintiff for amendment and not to dismiss the suit (see notes to O 2 r 3 on p 441 above) If the lower Court dismisses the suit instead of returning the plaint for amendment the appellate Court may set aside the decree and remand the suit with a direction to the lower Court to return the plaint to the plaintiff for amendment and to proceed with the suit after the plaint is amended (y) Similarly where a suit is brought in the name of a wrong person as plaintiff the appellate Court may direct the plaint to be amended and remand the case for re-trial (z) Where time was granted to the plaintiff to produce his evidence—but neither he nor his pleader appeared on the day to which the hearing was adjourned and the lower Court instead of proceeding to dispose of the suit under O 17 r 3 dismissed the suit for default under O 17 r 2 it was held that the appellate Court had power to remand the case to be disposed of in the manner prescribed by O 17 r 3 (a) A case may also be remanded where the decision of the lower Court is given without taking the defendant's evidence (b) In a Bombay case (c) the lower Court had erroneously presumed the death of the mortgagor and decreed redemption by a person claiming to be his heir and the High Court reversed the decree and remanded the case for re-trial after joining the mortgagor as a party

Sections 562 and 566 of the Code of 1882 [now rr 23 and 25 of this Order] were the only sections that provided for a remand The cases cited in the preceding paragraph did not fall under either of those sections Moreover the Code of 1882 contained a section (s 564) which prohibited the appellate Court from remanding a case except as provided by s 562 This section was found in its working to be embarrassing and to get over the difficulty presented by cases of the kind cited in the preceding paragraph the Courts resorted to their *inherent jurisdiction* That section has been omitted in this Code on the ground that it was unduly restrictive The absolute prohibition of s 564 having been removed the Court it is said is free under s 151 to make an order

- (v) *Ba wari v Samman* (1889) 11 All 488  
*Mayurba v Maga Lal* (1895) 19 Bom 303  
*Kanchan v B J Nath* (189) 19 C 1 338  
 (w) *Habibullah v Lalla Prasad* (1912) 34 All 612 17 I C 94  
 (x) *Agent Bengal Nagpur Railway v Beha Lal* (19 5) 52 C 1 783 90 I C 4 6  
 ( 5) A C 716  
 (y) *Silma Bibi v Sheikh Muhammad* (1896)

- 18 All 151  
 (1896) 18 All 396  
 (z) *Habib Baksh v B Ideo Prasad* (1901) 23 All 167  
*Jadab v Anath* (1910) 37 Cal 171 6 I C 908  
 (a) *Badam v Nath* (1903) 25 All 194  
 (b) *Perumbra v Subramanian* (1898) 23 Mad 445  
 (c) *Je hanker v Bai D rali* (19 0) 22 Bom L R 771 67 I C 5

of remand though the case may not fall either under this rule or rule 25 (d) It has accordingly been held that as under the old Code so under the new Code an order of remand can be made though the suit was not disposed of on a point which can be called a preliminary point within the meaning of this rule provided such an order is necessary for the ends of justice (e) In *Vabin Chandrav Prankrishna* (f) however Stephen and Mullick JJ expressed the opinion that if the appellate Court had at all any inherent power to remand that power was taken away by s 107 read with O 41 rr 23 and 25 and that under s 107 an appellate Court can only remand a case subject to such limitations as may be prescribed that is prescribed by rules 23 and 25 of O 41 The view so expressed ignores entirely the specific provisions of s 151 of the Code In *Mans Mohan v Ramtaran* (g) Jenkins CJ after observing that the combined effect of s 107 and O 41 r 23 was to limit the power of remand to the position described in O 41 r 23 said And this is the general rule except under special conditions which have no application in the circumstances of this case The view taken by Stephen and Mullick JJ was dissented from by a Full Bench of the Calcutta High Court in *Ghuzna: v The Allahabad Bank Ltd* (h) where it was held that the powers of the appellate Court as regards remand are not restricted to the case specified in O 41 r 23 but that the Court by reason of its inherent jurisdiction recognized and preserved in the Code [s 151] may order a remand in cases other than the case specified in O 41 r 23 if it be necessary for the ends of justice It has thus been held that an appellate Court may direct a plaint to be amended by adding parties and remand the whole case to the Court below (i) The High Court of Patna has followed the Full Bench ruling in *Ghuzna: s* case (j) So also the High Courts of Bombay (k) Madras (l) and Lahore (m) The Allahabad High Court treats the question as unsettled but puts a very wide construction on rule 23 (n) See notes to r 33 below Remand

Remand in appeal from ex parte decree—See notes to s 96 Appeal from ex parte decree

Remand in appeal from an order refusing to set aside an ex parte decree—In an appeal from an order refusing to set aside an ex parte decree the only case which can be remanded is the application under O 9 r 13 and not the original suit A obtains a decree ex parte against B B applies under O 9 r 13 for an order to set aside the decree on the ground that he was prevented by sufficient cause from appearing at the hearing but the application is refused B appeals from the order rejecting the application [O 43 r 1 cl (d)] If the order is reversed by the appellate Court the proper course for that Court is to remand the application to the lower Court to dispose of that application with due regard to the conditions of O 9 r 13 but not to remand the original suit for re trial (o)

(d) See Report of Select Committee 1<sup>st</sup> Feb 1908 *Narottam v M hanlal* (1913) 37 Bom 299 293 171 C 891

(e) *Jambulayya v Rajamma* (1913) 36 Mad 49 151 C 859 *Zohra Bibi v Zohab* (1910) 12 C 1 C J 364 71 C 75

(f) (1911) 41 Cal 108 61 C 39

(g) (1916) 43 Cal 148 531 C 39

(h) (1917) 44 Cal 99 41 C 598 See also *Bray Ida v Kanah I m* (1911) 44 Cal 218 26 45 C 191 107 4<sup>th</sup> C 43 *Muri S hu v Bushi* (1919) 9 Cal L J 419 51 C 94 *Bhairab v Aai* (1931) 37 Cal L J 491 74 C 1038 (23) A C 606 *J a e d a v J rofullananda* (1938) 3 C W N 101 106 C 54 (5) A C 81

(i) *Al v Sara* (1916) 43 Cal 938 31 C 91 *I dhakruih a v I enk ta* (1914) 48 Mad 713 84 C 965 ( ) A M 29

(j) *Pash na d m v Jad na dan* (1918) 3 Pat L J 53 43 C 99 *Birjmohan v Das*

*dh jon* (1910) 5 Pat L J 146 58 C 661 *West S mitra A er v Bam Eair* (1910) 5 Pat L J 410 57 C 561

(k) *Jett lai v F jai* (1914) 45 Bom 184 63 C 478 ( ) A B 267

(l) *A th ppa Chetty v R manathan Chetty* (1919) 37 Mad L J 536 53 C 401, criticized in *Jaman A gar v Krishna* (1914) 45 Mad 900 69 C 83 ( ) A M 50 *S bba v Krishnam chari* (1914) 45 Mad 449 69 C 869 (2 ) A M 11

(m) *Hus la Jam v Al l* (1914) 6 Lah L J 153 8 C 403 (21) A L 487 *Bhups v Premraj* (1914) 6 Lah L J 384 76 C 496 ( ) A L 36 *Lmra v Shah Mohammed* (1911) 5 Lah L J 969 74 C 47 ( ) A L 36

(n) *Gopal Prasad v Jamkumar* (1922) 44 All 176 61 C 88 ( ) A A 54

(o) *Radha Kshan v Collecto of Jau pur* (1901) 3 A R 90 31 A 3



r 23

**Appeal**—An appeal lies under O 43 r 1 cl (u) from an order remanding a case where an appeal would lie from the decree of the appellate Court (p). This means that the order of remand is appealable only in cases in which an appeal would lie from the decree which would have been passed by the appellate Court had that Court decided the case without a remand (q). No appeal lies from a remand order in an appeal from an execution proceeding if the suit is of such a nature that by reason of s 102 no second appeal lies (r). If no appeal is preferred from the order of remand the party aggrieved by the order cannot afterwards dispute its correctness in an appeal from the final decree s 100 sub s (2) and notes thereto. But though an appeal lies from an order of remand it must be preferred according to the Calcutta High Court before the final disposal of the remanded suit otherwise it cannot be entertained. The reason given is that the right of appeal given by s 104 and O 43 from orders specified therein ceases with the disposal of the suit (s). On the other hand it has been held by the High Court of Allahabad that the appeal may be preferred even after the decision of the remanded suit provided it is within the period of limitation. The Allahabad Court proceeds on the ground that there is no provision in the Code imposing any such restriction on the right of appeal (t). The period of limitation for an appeal from an order of remand is 90 days from the date of the order [Limitation Act art 156].

Though an appeal lies under rule 1 of Order 43 from an order of remand no appeal will lie from the order when the order is itself made in an appeal preferred under any other clause of that rule. Thus if an appeal is preferred under O 43 r 1 cl (a) from an order under O 7 r 10 or under O 43 r 1 cl (j) from an order under O 21 r 22 or under O 43 r 1 cl (q) from an order under O 38 r 6 or under any other clause of Order 43 r 1 and the appellate Court allows the appeal and makes an order of remand no appeal will lie from the order of remand under O 43 r 1 cl (u). The reason is that cl (u) of O 43 is subject to s 104 sub s (2) which provides that no appeal shall lie from any order passed in appeal [it may be an order of remand] under that section (u).

**Appeal from remand under the inherent power**—When the order of remand is made under the inherent jurisdiction recognized in *Ghazna v The Allahabad Bank* (v) is it appealable? There are several decisions against such an appeal (u). Mukerji J says an appeal lies because the order of remand is itself a decree (z) but if that were so the provisions of O 43 r 1 cl (u) would be superfluous. The correct answer seems to be that rule 23 should be construed as widely as possible and that the right of appeal should not be curtailed except on very clear proof of circumstances justifying such curtailment. Therefore even if the order of remand cannot be justified under the rule yet if it is in substance an order under that rule an appeal will lie (y). This

(p) *Mia Me Mia v Mia Mia Zan* (19 5) 3 Rang 490 9 L C 368 ( ) A R O

(q) *Fat. Alm d v B da D n* (1911) Punj R c no 50 p 191 11 I C 315 S w S Ngh v *Makhu* (1914) Punj Rec no 85 p 290 23 I C 817 *Malep Kaur v Hak m S Ngh* (1915) Punj Rec no 8 p 58 23 I C 441 *Waryam Singh v Harnam Singh* (1918) Punj Rec no 109 p 354 48 I C 379

(r) *Amra Prasad v Mu Nag Hussain* (19 0) 42 All 09 54 I C 432 *Cm v Sh h Mu hammad* (1922) 3 Lab 218 68 I C 849 ( ) A L 18

(s) *M dhu S dan v Gamini Ka ta* (1905) 3 Cal 10 3

(t) *Um n Junnari v Jarb ndh n* (1908) 30 All 479

(u) *V ubat St gh v B lde S ngh* (1911) 93 All 4 9 I C 666 *M thurav Nobin Chand a* (1897) 24 Cal 774 *Jhanday Lal v S rm n Lal* (1893) 1 All 291 *Chhrua Mian v Harcharon Das* (191 ) P R no 119 p 406 18 I C 529

(v) (1917) 44 Cal 9 9 41 I C 598

(w) *Fagh a d n v Jadunandan* (1918) 3 Pat

L J 253 43 I C 9 9 *Shank Muhammad*

*M a a jar v Ra pasani* (192 ) 41 Msd

L J 18 69 I C 8 6 ( ) 4 V 716

*Wasekh Pam v Ahsoal* (19 4) 8 Lab L J

153 78 I C 408 ( ) 4 A L 437 *Jadha*

*Krishna v Veni ta* (19 4) 48 M d 719 84

I C 965 ( ) A M v *Mia e Miam a*

(1925) 3 Ran 490 92 I C 366 ( ) 5 A R

3 0 *Cha dhary v Mit'u Pa* (19 7) 6

Pat 380 103 I C 2 ( ) 27 A P 36

(x) *B m ab Chah d v Lal R mar* (19 3) 37

Cal L J 491 4 I C 1038 ( ) 3 A L 806

(y) *B s m t v T r i ann* (19 0) 31 Cal L J

354 44 I C 416 *Prosan o v Budy*

(19 0) 1 C W N 02 55 I C 516

*R dkr sh a v As i m* ( ) A C

35 I L J 31 01 C 54 ( ) A C

4 6 *Gol i Prasad v i i K mar* (19 )

44 All 1 6 64 I C 8 8 ( ) 21 A A 54

*Hu a lauma usa v I am Prasad* (19 )

44 All 49 67 I C 713 ( ) 2 A 4 6

*I aym Biscua v B had r Ah n* (19 )

30 C W N 41 89 I C 44 ( ) A C

2268 *Jattari v Afed* (192 ) 31 C

W N 8 8 104 I C 4 ( ) A C 64

13, of course subject to the same condition that an appeal would lie from the decree of the appellate Court. The Madras High Court has held that an order of remand in the inherent jurisdiction is not subject to revision (2). The Calcutta High Court says that if the order cannot be justified either under rule 23 or the inherent jurisdiction the proper remedy is to challenge its validity by revision (a).

**Powers of High Court in appeal from order of remand**—In an appeal from an order of remand preferred under O 43 r 1 cl. (u) the High Court is not confined to the question whether the order satisfies the requirements of the present rule but may also determine the correctness of the lower appellate Court's decision on the preliminary point on which the Court of first instance disposed of the case. Thus if the Court of first instance dismisses a suit as barred by limitation and the appellate Court reverses the decree and remands the case under this rule and an appeal is preferred to the High Court from the order of remand the High Court has the power to determine whether the point of limitation was correctly decided by the lower appellate Court (b).

Letters Patent appeal—In order of remand made by a single Judge of the High Court in second appeal is a judgment within the meaning of cl. 15 of the Letters Patent and is appealable as such (c)

**Privy Council appeal**—See notes to s. 109

Improper order of remand.—Under the Code of 1852 an order under s 562 was appealable and a party might impeach the order of remand on appeal from the final decree. When no appeal was preferred from the order of remand but the order was impeached on appeal from the final decree and the Court found that the order was improperly made the question arose as to whether the order should be treated as illegal or merely irregular. The High Court of Allahabad held that if a remand was ordered in a case in which it ought not to have been ordered both the order of remand and all the proceedings subsequent thereto are void and illegal (d). On the other hand the Calcutta High Court held that the remand order and the subsequent proceedings are not illegal but merely irregular and the subsequent proceedings should not be set aside unless the remand had substantially affected the decision of the remanded suit on the merits and the party complaining of the irregularity was materially prejudiced thereby (e) [see s 99]. The Madras High Court held that though an order of remand made in contravention of the provisions of s 562 is illegal yet the error may be cured by the consent of parties or by waiver (f). The whole difficulty has been got over in the present Code by enacting that a party who does not appeal from an order of remand in the first instance cannot afterwards dispute the correctness of the order on appeal from the final decree (g) [see s 105 sub s (2)].

Remand of case by consent for trial on issues not raised in appeal — The effect of an appeal is to re open the decrees of the lower Court and it is competent to the appellate Court on the agreement of parties to remand the case to the lower Court for trial on issues not raised in the memorandum of appeal (h)

Trial Court — Jurisdiction to try the case remanded depends entirely upon the order of the appellate Court (1)

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| (a) <i>Mall v. ...</i> (19) 5 Mad 14 J 90 100 I C 13 ( ) A M 135   | (f) <i>Krishna</i> (1914) 41 Cal 108 20 I C 39   |
| (a) <i>E. ...</i> (19) 55 Cal 219 103 I C 864 ( ) A C 90   | (f) <i>Manager of the Court of Wards v. P. ...</i> (1905) 28 Mad 437 See also <i>E. ...</i> (1908) 1 C W N 590               |
| (b) <i>E. ...</i> (1881) 3 All 675 <i>Bhau v. L. ...</i> (1901) 14 B M 14 <i>48 v. ...</i> (1904) 17 C 1 168 <i>Deokashen v. ...</i> (1905) 4 All 1 2 <i>S. ...</i> (1894) 21 N 1 34 | (g) <i>M. ...</i> (19) 1 Pat 246 65 I C 175 ( ) A P 384 <i>M. ...</i> (1912) 43 All 377 60 I C 975 ( ) A A 26                |
| (c) <i>Gopi ...</i> (1908) 35 Cal 1096 <i>Laddu Singh v. Sarwal ...</i> (19) 3 Lah 188 67 I C 36 ( ) A L 80  | (h) <i>Atessa v. Venkatarama</i> (1907) 30 Mad 510   |
| (d) <i>Rameshwar v. Sheodin</i> (1890) 12 All 510  | (i) <i>Uth ...</i> (19) 44 Mad 14 J 33 7 I C 314 (23) A M 351 <i>Lutsee Raj ...</i> (1900) 44 All 11 165 I C 813 ( ) A A 200 |
| (e) <i>Mohesh Chandr v. J. ...</i> (1901) 28 Cal 24 followed in <i>... v. ...</i>  |  |

1,  
25

**24 [S 565]** Where the evidence upon the record is sufficient to enable the appellate Court to pronounce judgment, the appellate Court may, after re settling the issues, if necessary, finally determine the suit, notwithstanding that the judgment of the Court from whose decree the appeal is preferred has proceeded wholly upon some ground other than that on which the appellate Court proceeds

Where evidence on  
record sufficient ap  
ellate Court may de  
termine case finally

**Scope of the rule**—The scope of this rule is limited to cases in which the evidence upon the record is *sufficient* to enable the appellate Court to determine the suit (j)

This rule does not enable an appellate Court to declare a right in favour of one of the parties where no issue has been framed on the point and the right has not been set up in the lower Court (k)

**Second appeal**—See s 103 and notes thereto

**25 [S 566]** Where the Court from whose decree the appeal is preferred has omitted to frame or try any issue, or to determine any question of fact, which appears to the appellate Court essential to the right decision of the suit upon the merits, the appellate Court may, if necessary, frame issues, and refer the same for trial to the Court from whose decree the appeal is preferred and in such case shall direct such Court to take the additional evidence required

Where appellate Court  
may frame issues and  
refer them for trial to  
Court whose decree ap  
pealed from

and such Court shall proceed to try such issues, and shall return the evidence to the appellate Court, together with its findings thereon and the reasons therefor

The words and the reasons therefor in paragraph 2 are new

**Scope of the rule**—This rule refers to cases in which the evidence upon the record is *not sufficient* to enable the appellate Court to determine the suit

**May if necessary frame issues**—In framing issues under this rule the appellate Court should have regard to the provisions of O 14 r 3 which indicate the materials from which issues are to be framed. The issues may be on points not taken in the grounds of appeal (l). See notes to O 14 rr 1 to 5

**Power of Court to which issues are referred for trial under this rule**—The Court to which issues are referred for trial under this rule has no power to try and decide the case but to try issues only. It should then return the evidence to the appellate Court together with its findings thereon and the reasons therefor (m)

(j) *Bandi v Madalapati* (1880) 3 M d 96  
(k) *Officiating v Prashna* (1888) 12 Cal 239  
1 A 166  
(l) *Chandulal v Lakshmi Chand* (19 3) 5 Lah

L J 49 83 I C 9 (1) A L 6  
(m) *Doulat v Bissessar* (1874) W R 207  
*Hobbs v B Ideo* (1901) 23 All. 16 11

Nor has it the power to make an order of reference under schedule II para 3 of the Code (n)

Court by which issues should be tried —Where issues are referred for trial under this rule they are triable only by the Court which was originally seized of the case and by no other Court (o)

New issue raised before High Court — Even if it be competent to the High Court [in second appeal] to remit a case for re-hearing on an issue not raised in the pleadings nor even suggested in the Courts below this ought only to be done in exceptional cases for good cause shown and on payment of all cost thrown away (p)

Appeal —No appeal lies under the Code from an order referring issues for trial under this rule (q) Nor does an appeal lie under the Letters Patent (r)

**26 [S 567]** (1) Such evidence and findings shall form part of the record in the suit, and either party may, within a time to be fixed by the appellate Court, present a memorandum of objections to any finding

Findings and evidence to be put on record. Objections to finding

(2) After the expiration of the period so fixed for presenting such memorandum the appellate Court shall proceed to determine the appeal

Determination of appeal

Where no memorandum of objection is filed—This rule provides that either party may file a memorandum of objection to the findings by the lower Court on the issues referred to it by the appellate Court. It is not to be supposed however that if no objections are filed by either party the appellate Court is absolved from hearing the appeal (s). But the Lahore High Court has held that the Court may in its discretion decline to hear objections if none have been filed (t). Sub r (2) clearly indicates that even if no objections are filed the appellate Court shall proceed to determine the appeal. That is to say even if no objections are filed to the findings the appellate Court is bound to examine the correctness of the findings and to state in its judgment the reasons (r 31) for which it either accepts or rejects the findings (u). It should not accept the findings blindly without examining the evidence on which they are based (v). See notes to r 31. Shall state the reasons for the decision.

Where the appellate Court has heard arguments on some of the issues and has expressed its views thereon and remitted other issues under r 25 it is not bound on the return of findings to hear the case *de novo* but may confine counsel to argument upon the findings (w).

The appellate Court shall proceed to determine the appeal—When an appellate Court has made an order referring issues for trial under r 25 the return to

- (n) *And Ram v Fakir Chand* (1885) 7 All 53  
 (o) *Ali v Khan v Ahmad* (1907) 29 All 690  
*Lahore Bank Limit v Lakhmi Ram* (1913)  
 Punj Rec no 105 p 39 10 I C 970  
 [no power to delegate]  
 (p) *Ram Chandra v Secretary of State for India*  
 (1916) 43 I A 17 178 43 Cal 1191 1116  
 37 I C 3  
 (q) *Kali Krato v Ram Chunder* (1891) 9 CL R 461  
 (r) *Bora Estate Ltd v Anup Chandra* (1917) 2  
 Pat L J 663 41 I C 337

- (s) *Subbaya v Ram* (1899) Mad 311  
 (t) *Pratap Singh v Acharya Singh* (1911) 3 Lah  
 L J 30 67 I C 846 (11) A L J  
 (u) *Ku v Kutt* (1897) 20 Mad 496  
 (v) *Alber v Wray & Al* (1880) 9 All 908  
*United Ala v Srima B* (1881) 6 All 383  
*Munna Bejam v Fat Ali* (1884)  
 6 All 391 *Bhagwan v Kesu* (1893) 17  
 Bom 43 *P. Mehand & v Sono* (189)  
 19 Bom 551  
 (w) *Lachman v Jamma* (1888) 10 All 16

1, 27 such order must be made to the same Court and such Court is not competent to transfer the appeal for disposal to another Court (x)

**Unnecessary reference**—In the case of a unnecessary reference under r 95 can the Court disregard the findings returned? It can if the reference order is of a single Judge and the appeal is heard ultimately by a Bench of two Judges (y) But not otherwise for it is an interlocutory order made with jurisdiction and operative in law until set aside in review (z) If the findings conflict with other findings of fact in the judgment this will not embarrass a Court of first appeal where the entire evidence is examined A Court of second appeal may however be embarrassed and it is therefore preferable not to resort to the rule in second appeal (a) but to remand under the inherent jurisdiction (b)

**Second appeal**—The provisions of this and the preceding rule apply so far as may be by virtue of O 42 to second appeals Hence the High Court may in second appeal refer issues of fact for trial to the lower appellate Court but when the finding and evidence upon such issues are returned to the High Court the finding is conclusive and it cannot be challenged upon the evidence before the High Court as in first appeal The reason is that second appeals are not allowed on questions of fact The only grounds on which a second appeal is allowed are those mentioned in s 100 and these relate to errors of law or usage having the force of law or a substantial error or defect in procedure which may possibly have produced error or defect in the decision of the case on the merits The objections to the findings must therefore be restricted to the limits within which the original pleas in second appeal are confined (c)

**Sending back case for revised finding**—An appellate Court has no power to send back a case to the lower Court to submit a revised finding on the fact on evidence already recorded Such a course is not warranted by any one of the rules 23 to 26 of this Order (d) But if it does so it is mere irregularity within the meaning of s 99 and if the appellate Court on the revised finding returned to it itself considers the evidence on which it is based the decree will not be set aside in appeal (e).

27 [s 598] (1) The parties to an appeal shall not be entitled to produce additional evidence, whether oral or documentary, in the appellate Court But if—

Production of additional evidence in appellate Court

- (a) the Court from whose decree the appeal is preferred has refused to admit evidence which ought to have been admitted, or
- (b) the appellate Court requires any document to be produced or any witness to be examined to enable it to pronounce judgment, or for any other substantial cause

- (x) *Udit Nara n v Jhanda* (1893) 15 All 315  
*Kuma tam v Subb aya* (1900) 23 Mad 314
- (y) *Mubarak v Bihari* (1891) 18 All 306  
*Jnanendra Nath v Surjya Kant* (1912) 17 C W N 46 15 IC 39 *East Indian Railway Co v Changan Khan* (1915) 4 Cal 888 8 IC 215
- (z) *Hook v Adm nat alor General of Bengal* (19 1) 48 J.A 187 48 Cal 499 60 IC 631 (21) A 1 C 11 *Kam n Kuma Deb v Du ga Cha n* (19 3) 37 Cal L J 1 74 I C 39- (23) A C 5 1

- (a) *Kamini Kuma Deb v Durga Charan, supra*  
 (b) *Ghazner v Allahabad Bank* (1917) 44 Cal 9 9 41 I C 593
- (c) *Bai Asken v Jasoda Kuar* (1885) 7 All 765  
*Ram Mehr v P ti I m* (19 4) 5 Lab 263, 78 I C 404 (25) A L 455 See also *Gopal Singh v Jhakri Rai* (1886) 1 Cal 47  
*Bens Prasad v Nand Lal* (1897) 24 Cal 98 both cases under r 27 below
- (d) *Vankala v Anantha Charan* (1893) 16 Mad 99 (P C)
- (e) *Mallikarjuna v Patha ent* (1896) 19 M d 479

the appellate Court may allow such evidence or document to be produced, or witness to be examined

(2) Wherever additional evidence is allowed to be produced by an appellate Court, the Courts shall record the reason for its admission

When additional evidence may be admitted—Under this rule the admissibility of additional evidence is made to depend not upon the relevancy or materiality to the issue before the Court of the evidence sought to be admitted or upon the fact whether or not the applicants had an opportunity of adducing evidence at some earlier stage but upon whether or not the appellate Court requires the evidence to enable it to pronounce judgment or for any other substantial cause (f) Additional evidence under this rule should not be taken until the appellate Court has examined the evidence on the record and has after such examination come to the conclusion that the evidence as it stands is inherently defective as for instance when the lower Court has omitted to take the evidence of an attesting witness to a mortgage deed (g) Until this is done the appellate Court has no power to admit additional evidence not even if the evidence offered be the evidence of new matter discovered after the Court of first instance had pronounced its judgment As observed by their Lordships of the Privy Council in *Kesowji's Issur v G I P Ry* (h) the legitimate occasion [for the application of the present rule] is when on examining the evidence as it stands some inherent lacuna or defect becomes apparent not where a discovery is made outside the Court of fresh evidence and the application is made to import it This decision seemed to lend support to the view taken in the Calcutta case last quoted that the test of admissibility is the requirement of the Court itself and this construction has often been put upon this rule (i) But in truth sub rule (b) falls into two parts (1) the requirement of the Court and (2) any other substantial cause *Kesowji's* case dealt with (1) only because (2) was barred by an unsuccessful application for review to the lower Court However a recent decision of the Privy Council makes it clear that the appellate Court has a discretion to admit additional evidence for substantial cause (j)

The power given under this rule should be exercised very sparingly by the Courts and great caution should be exercised in admitting new evidence (k) Additional evidence must not be admitted to enable a plaintiff to make out a fresh case in appeal If cases were remanded for the purposes of allowing parties to make out a new case or to improve their case by calling further evidence there would be no end to litigation (l) An appellant who has ample opportunity of giving evidence in the lower Court and elects not to do so but rests his case on the evidence as it stood ought not to be allowed to give evidence which he could have given below (m) Similarly the appellate Court should not take evidence which the lower Court refused to take as it was tendered after the case was closed (n) or admit a document tendered by a party if having the opportunity of tendering it in the Court below he omitted to do so (o) though as in *Sreenani v Secretary of State* (p) this may sometimes be permitted on terms as to costs Nor should it allow

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>(f) <i>In the goods of Premchand</i> (1894) 21 Cal 484 486</p> <p>(g) <i>Ba k of Bengal v Lucas</i> (19 4) 54 Cal 185 81 I C 471 ( 4) A C 578</p> <p>(h) (1907) 31 Bom 331 34 I A 115 <i>Krushnamma v Narasimha</i> (1908) 31 Mad 114 <i>Garden Feach Spy &amp; Wg Co v Secret y of State</i> (1915) 4 Cal 675 28 I C 885</p> <p>(i) <i>Bombay Srs &amp; Co v Kurrupur</i> (19 3) 47 Bom 674 84 I C 74 (24) A B 2 7</p> <p>(j) <i>J drajit v Am si gah</i> (19 3) 50 I A 183 21 t 676 74 I C 747 ( 3) A PC 1 3 <i>Indrabhusan v Ja a dhan</i> (19 4) 5 C</p> | <p>W N 945 82 I C 104 ( 4) A C 1071</p> <p>(k) <i>Sceemanchinder v Cop l A nder</i> (1866) 11 M I A 37 W R 10 F m Pershad v R j der (1866) 6 W R 26</p> <p>(l) <i>Harp shed v Shes Dyal</i> (1876) 6 W R 3 31 A 259</p> <p>(m) <i>Ramdas v Official L g udator</i> (1887) 9 All 366</p> <p>(n) <i>Vaishno v Hemraj</i> (19 3) 4 Lah L J 371 (1911) A L 9</p> <p>(o) <i>Z a ah Bhugwan</i> (1871) 16 W P 711</p> <p>(p) <i>5 e dra Vaita v Radha Charam</i> (1918) 46 Cal 119 128 48 I C 314</p> <p>(q) (19 3) 50 Cal 276 70 I C 510 ( 3) A C 33</p> |
|---|---|

r 27 additional evidence to prove the genuineness of a document held by the lower Court to be a fabrication (g) It must however be noted that where additional evidence is taken by the High Court with the assent of both sides it is not open to either party to complain of it (r)

Where the lower Court has refused to admit evidence—An appellate Court should not reverse the decree of the first Court without allowing the decree holder to give evidence which he offered in the first Court and which that Court declined to take (s) The improper rejection of evidence does not justify the reversal of the decree and the appellate Court should in that case act under this rule (t)

Where the appellate Court requires any document to be produced—An appellate Court has no power under this rule to require a document to be produced unless it is required to enable it to pronounce judgment Where judgment could be pronounced in the absence of the document the appellate Court should not allow the document to be produced (u) The word requires means nothing more than needs or finds needful (v)

Where the appellate Court requires a witness to be examined—The appellate Court should not under cl (b) of this rule take additional evidence which impeaches the testimony of a witness called in the Court below unless that witness is also called and given an opportunity to contradict or explain the additional evidence so given otherwise no witness whatever his standing would be safe from adverse judicial comment (w) Where a witness was examined and cross examined in the Court of first instance and there was no gap in the evidence nor any new matter about which it was necessary to examine him and the appellate Judge merely cross examined him on his previous evidence in order to enable him to pronounce judgment it was held that the examination of the witness by the Court was not warranted by the provisions of this rule (x)

Or for any other substantial cause —The cause referred to here need not be *ejusdem generis* with the causes stated in the earlier part of the rule (y) The expression any other substantial cause confers a wide discretion on the appellate Court to admit additional evidence when the ends of justice require it ( ) It has accordingly been held that the discovery after the filing of the appeal of fresh evidence not known to and available to the appellant after due diligence during the pendency of the proceedings in the first Court is a substantial cause within the meaning of this rule justifying the admission of such evidence in appeal (a) The Privy Council have made this clear in the case of *Indrajit v Amar Singh* (b) The sole issue in that case was whether a grant comprised certain villages The grantor had leased them prior to the grant and claimed that they were not included in the grant The first Court decided in favour of the grantor as there was no evidence to show that any arrangement had been made by the grantor with reference to the rent payable by the lessee The grantee appealed and during the appeal discovered documents contemporaneously executed by the grantor directing the lessee to pay rents to the grantee and an under lessee to pay his rents to

- (g) *Yadav Chand v Chunder* (1888) 15 Cal 765  
 ( ) *Jagannath v H numan* (1909) 36 I A 2 1  
 36 Cal 833 3 IC 465  
 (s) *A jun v Sh nka* (1898) 22 Bom 553 *Appa v Vithob* (1889) 6 B.H.C.A. 88 *Pabitra Kunwar v The Maharajah of Benares* (1908) 30 All 387  
 (t) *Raja Joyt v Jadu* (1921) 34 Cal I.J. 180 64 IC 293 (21) A.C. 12 *Gokul Pande v Baldeo* (1928) 7 Pat 90 105 IC 28 (23) A.P. 113  
 (u) *Kal ka v Tul* (1916) 1 Pat I.J. 435 37 IC 1008  
 (v) *Kessey Isar v G I P Ry* (1907) 31 Bom 381 34 I.A. 115

- (w) *Jagran v Kuar Durga* (1914) 41 I.A. 74 36 All 93 22 IC 103  
 (x) *Muhammad v Mahmud un-Nuss* (1928) 35 All 191 193 194 33 IC 334  
 (y) *Andiappa v Muthukumara* (1915) 36 Mad 477 479-480 14 IC 140  
 ( ) *Ambaya v Appadur* (191 ) 33 Mad 814 30 IC 40 *Bhaurab v Kals* (19 3) 37 Cal I.J. 491 74 IC 1038 ( 3) A.C. 608  
 (a) *Venkatatella v Panga* (1915) 3 Mad I.J. 334 24 IC 694  
 (b) (18 3) 50 I.A. 183 Pat 676 74 IC 747 (23) A.P.C. 1 8

the lessee These documents the High Court of Calcutta on its construction of *Kessouj's case* held they had no jurisdiction to admit as additional evidence But as to this the Privy Council said —

Both in the case of *Sree Manchunder Rey v Gopalchunder Chuckerbutty* (c) and *Kessouj's Issur v Great Indian Peninsula Railway* (d) their Lordships were dealing with the power of the appellate Court to require evidence to be produced for the purpose of enabling the Court to pronounce judgment Those cases did not refer to the right of one or other of the parties to produce evidence which he considered essential to the right determination of the action Under Order 47 rule 1 which reproduces section 623 of the Code of Civil Procedure Act 14 of 1882 a party has a right to apply for a review of judgment to the Court that has decided the case before an appeal has been preferred. The grounds on which such an application may be made are specifically set forth in rule 1 In the present case an appeal has been preferred and a review was therefore out of the question and the respondents took the only and proper course to apply to the High Court which was in possession of the case to admit the additional evidence either under general principles of law or under the specific provisions of rule 27

The reference to the general principles of law somewhat weakens the judgment but it does appear that the grounds stated in O 47 r 1 do constitute other substantial cause (e) In another case Privy Council said that the power to take additional evidence is a power which should be exercised by a Court of Appeal with much caution and only in suits where it is satisfied that in the interests of justice it should be exercised and that such additional evidence when admitted will be evidence which if produced at the trial would have been admissible (f)

Inability to understand the legal issues involved is not substantial cause (g) nor the slackness of the party or his legal advisers (h) The Privy Council refused to allow a party an adjournment to produce the record of a former suit when the absence of this evidence was due to his own remissness (i) If the appellate Court does require a witness not called by inadvertence in the lower Court it is an error of law but one which does not justify interference in revision (j) Again if the party could have applied to the lower Court for an adjournment to call further evidence but does not do so and takes the chance of a judgment in his favour on the evidence at his disposal he will not be allowed to call it in the appellate Court (k)

Recording of reason for admission of additional evidence—The provision requiring an appellate Court to record its reason for admitting additional evidence is merely directory and not imperative Hence the omission to record the reason does not render the evidence inadmissible (l) But if one party is allowed to adduce additional evidence the opposite party should be allowed to call rebutting evidence (m) and when additional evidence was recorded and no reason stated for its admission the suit was remanded with a direction to allow the opposite party to adduce rebutting evidence (n) When the Court after the suit was adjourned for judgment recalled and examined the plaintiff without recording reasons and without giving notice to the other side it was held that it had acted without jurisdiction (o)

- (c) (1866) 11 M.L.A. 28 7 W.R. 10
- (d) (1907) 33 I.A. 116 31 Bom. 386
- (e) *Subbaya v Rang* (19 5) 48 Mad. L.J. 3  
85 I.C. 585 (5) A.J. 181 *Badri Das*  
*v Hochar* (19 5) 47 All. 412, 66 I.C. 761  
(5) A.A. 288
- (f) *Mahomed Khaleel v Les Tanneries Lyonnaises*  
(19 0) 53 I.A. 84 49 Mad. 435 94 I.C.  
67 (0) A.M. 34
- (g) *Tamela v Kaip* (19 4) 46 All. 64  
84 I.C. 84 (24) A.A. 558
- (h) *Wali Muhammad v Muhammad Bakh*  
(1921) 5 Lah. 84, 80 I.C. 998 (24) A.L.  
444

- (i) *Radhakrishnan v Akursh d Hussan* (19 0) 47  
Cal. 66 47 I.A. 11 55 I.C. 939 *Muham-*  
*med Bakh v Shad Muhammad* (1927)  
8 Lah. 1 3 100 I.C. 60 (27) A.L. 272
- (j) *Gaya v Vams* (19 0) 5 Pat. L.J. 263 56 I.C.  
983
- (k) *Jeans v Hobhouse* (1910) 1 K.B. 598
- (l) *Gopal v Ch. Sri* (1886) 1 Cal. 37
- (m) *Ramzan v Vade Bux* (19 4) 6 Lah. L.J. 234  
80 I.C. 530 (24) A.L. 638
- (n) *Kodai v Jaya* (19 4) 39 Cal. L.J. 261 81 I.C.  
999 (2) A.C. 98
- (o) *Hemraj v Shiam S. der* (19 1) 19 All. L.J.  
407 83 I.C. 4 3 (21) A.A. 408.



1, 30 Second appeal—Except in the case provided in s 103 the High Court is precluded in second appeal, by virtue of the provisions of s 100 from entering into questions of fact. Therefore if the Court of first appeal has admitted additional evidence under this rule the hearing in the Court of second appeal will not for that reason be treated as a first appeal so as to entitle the parties to go into questions of fact (p)

No appeal lies from a refusal by the lower appellate Court to admit fresh evidence under this rule (q). Hence if the lower appellate Court refuses to admit a document as additional evidence in appeal under this rule the High Court cannot interfere in second appeal and hold that such additional evidence ought to have been admitted by the lower appellate Court (r). But in *Jetalal v Varayal* (s) a case was remanded under the inherent jurisdiction to the first appellate Court with a direction to admit additional evidence.

Privy Council appeal—The rejection of an application under this rule does not give a right of appeal to the Privy Council (t).

28 [S 560] Wherever additional evidence is allowed to be produced, the appellate Court may either take such evidence, or direct the Court from whose decree the appeal is preferred, or any other subordinate Court, to take such evidence and to send it when taken to the appellate Court.

It need hardly be stated that where the additional evidence taken by the Court consists of documents they should be exhibited in the case (u). The lower appellate Court resumes its functions as a Court of first appeal and can appoint under s 75 a commissioner for the examination of witnesses (v).

29 [S 570] Where additional evidence is directed or allowed to be taken, the appellate Court shall specify the points to which the evidence is to be confined, and record on its proceedings the points so specified.

### Judgment in Appeal

30 [S 571] The appellate Court, after hearing the parties or their pleaders and referring to any part of the proceedings, whether on appeal or in the Court from whose decree the appeal is preferred, to which reference may be considered necessary, shall pronounce judgment in open Court, either at once or on some future day, of which notice shall be given to the parties or their pleaders.

(p) *Ben Pershad v Vand Lal* (1897) 24 Cal 98  
*Gop v Jhakra* (1886) 12 Cal 37  
 (q) *Premchand n the goods of* (1894) 21 Cal 484  
*Ram Puri v Kallu* (1901) 23 All 121  
*Durga Prasad v Ja v rain* (1911) 33 All 379 9 IC 85  
 (r) *Vaithianatha v Kuppu* (1919) 42 Mad 737  
 53 IC 274 [F B]

(s) (192) 145 Bom 184 63 IC 478 (11) A.B. 24  
 (t) *Premchand n the goods of* (1894) 21 Cal 484  
 (u) *DeK v Saktharam* (1914) 38 Bom 665 2 1  
 C 53  
 (v) *Ladd S nph v Ram Lal* (19 4) 5 Lah 25-18  
 I C 389 ( 5) A L 39

After hearing the parties or their pleaders—This rule authorizes the Court to pronounce judgment after hearing the parties or their pleaders. Hence a judgment pronounced without hearing the parties or their representatives if they are dead is unauthorized by the Code. Thus where an appellate Court heard and decided an appeal without being aware of the death of the appellant the decree was held to be a nullity (w).

Contents, date and signature of judgment

**31 [S 574]** The judgment of the appellate Court shall be in writing and shall state—

- (a) the points for determination
- (b) the decision thereon
- (c) the reasons for the decision, and,
- (d) where the decree appealed from is reversed or varied, the relief to which the appellant is entitled,

and shall at the time that it is pronounced be signed and dated by the Judge or by the Judges concurring therein

Shall state the reasons for the decision—The judgment of the appellate Court should state the reasons for the decision. The reason of the rule has been stated to be to afford the litigant parties an opportunity of knowing and understanding the grounds upon which the decision proceeds with a view to enable them to exercise if they see fit and are so advised the right of second appeal conferred by s 100. If an appellate Court could dispose of appeals coming before it in a judgment which does not state the reasons for the decisions the right of second appeal might altogether be neutralized (x). The reason for the decision should be stated not only when the decree of the first Court is varied or set aside but also when it is confirmed (y). If this rule is not observed the proper form of the order to be made by the High Court in second appeal is to set aside the decree of the lower appellate Court and send back the case to that Court in order that the appeal may be disposed of according to law (z). This course was adopted where the judgment was appeal dismissed with costs (a) and in another case where the judgment was appeal rejected under s 551 [now O 41 r 11] of the Civil Procedure Code (b). Where the decree of the first Court is confirmed in appeal the Judge of the appellate Court should state his own reasons and should not confine himself to approving of the reasons of the Court of first instance (c). This is because the judgment should show on the face of it that the points in dispute were clearly before the mind of the Judge and that he exercised his own discrimination in deciding them (d). Thus where the judgment was ~ To deal with the grounds of appeal would be simply to repeat the judgment of the District Munsif. I concur with the decision the District Munsif has given on each point. The judgment of the lower Court is confirmed for the reasons therein set forth and this appeal is dismissed with costs the judgment was set aside (e). In the last mentioned case the Court observed. Such a general and wholesale

(w) *Jenardhan v Pamchand* (190 ) 6 Bom 31  
*Narain v Adu* (19 0) 2 Lah L J 144  
 (x) *Assan ullah v Hafiz* (1884) 10 Cal 922 915  
 (y) *Lams Deka v Brojo* 1 ib (1898) 5 Cal 97  
*Babu Mahda v Venkatesh* (189 ) 16 Bom 540  
 (z) *Sarasana Pillai v Sista Reddhi* (1908) 31 Mad 469  
 (a) *Srikant v Huri Dass* (1882) 11 C.L.R. 131

(b) *Rama Deka v Brojo Nath* (1893) 25 Cal 97  
*Suani v J. G. A.* (19 3) 7 C.W.N. 501 6 I.C. 103 (3) A.C. 558  
 (c) *Pahi ni v Zamrudin* (1881) 8 C.L.R. 597  
*K. v S. babhat* (1884) 8 Bom 28  
 (d) *Gupta v Richari* (19 3) 1 All L.J. 567 74 L.C. 7 (4) A.A. 100  
 (e) *Sudra v S. Dey* (1899) Mad L. Solan n  
*v Babu De* (1887) 9 All 6

- 31 adoption of the judgment of the Court of first instance cannot be considered as a sufficient compliance with the law. The same was held where the judgment was there is no satisfactory evidence that plaintiff was ever in possession of the land in dispute and the evidence was not discussed in the judgment (f)

If the reasons for the decision are not stated by the appellate Court as fully as they ought to have been but the High Court is satisfied upon the judgment that the Judge of the lower Court had read the evidence and meant to find upon that evidence as a whole the decree of the lower Court will not be interfered with in second appeal. The proper course to be followed in such a case is to require the Judge if still holding office to supplement his judgment by giving in greater details the reasons on which it is based (g)

Shall state the points for determination—The object of the legislature in making it incumbent by this rule on the appellate Court to raise points for determination is to clear up the pleading and focus the attention of the Court and of the parties on the specific and rival contentions of the latter (h). The exact questions which arise in the appeal and require determination must be stated in the judgment. It is not sufficient to state the point to be determined on appeal is whether or not the decision is consistent with the merits of the case. A proposition so roundly worded is no point at all (i).

Form of order—Where there has been a failure by the first appellate Court to comply with the requirements of this rule the proper form of the order to be made by the second appellate Court is to set aside the decree and remand the case to the first appellate Court for disposal according to law. If the Judge of the Court to which the case is remanded is the Judge who heard the appeal in the first instance he need not rehear the appeal unless he is of opinion that he cannot properly dispose of the remanded case without a rehearing. But where the Judge of the Court to which the case is remanded is not the Judge who heard the appeal in the first instance a rehearing is always necessary in order that there may be a compliance with the order of the second appellate Court that the case be disposed of according to law (j). See notes above. Shall state the reasons for the decision.

High Court—Where a suit was decided by a District Court and the decree was confirmed in appeal by the High Court and the High Court did not state in its judgment the reason for its decision. Edge C J on an application for leave to appeal to the Privy Council on the ground that the requirements of this rule were not complied with said that the present rule was not intended to apply to cases where the High Court after hearing the judgment of the lower Court and arguments thereon comes to the conclusion that both the judgment and the reasons given by the Court below for its decision are completely satisfactory (k). And the opinion has been expressed by Mahmood J that this rule does not apply at all to judgments of High Courts in second appeal (l). See sec 122.

Appeal under sec 476 Criminal Procedure Code—Appeals under sec 476 of the Criminal Procedure Code are regulated by O 41 and the judgment must comply with this rule (m).

Privy Council appeal—Non compliance with the requirements of this rule is not a ground of appeal to the Privy Council (n).

- (f) *Vingappa v Shappa* (1895) 19 Bom 33  
*Ananda Pal v Masha Bai* (19 6) 1 Luck  
 458 9 I C 95 (27) A O 95  
 (g) *Banath v Bandjanath* (1886) 10 Cal 199  
 C 03  
 (h) *Mhasi Bhai v Darulot* (1901) 17 Bom L R  
 174  
 (i) *Sohasani v Babu v nd* (1887) 9 All 630 31  
 (j) *Sarna Pullai v Seara Reddi* (1903) 31 Mad  
 469

- (k) *Sundar Bhai v Nishanhar Nath* (1887) 9 All  
 93  
 (l) *Sohasani v Babu v nd* (1887) 9 All 630 31  
 8 also *Paradag v Ka hi Lam* (1903) 5  
 All 109 30 I A 35  
 (m) *Himad Ali v Madh* (19 7) 54 Cal 355  
 100 I C 31 (7) A C 281  
 (n) *Sunder Bhai v B. A. Nar Nath* (1887) 9 All  
 93

**32** [S 577] The judgment may be for confirming, varying or reversing the decree from which the appeal is preferred, or if the parties to the appeal agree as to the form which the decree in appeal shall take, or as to the order to be made in appeal, the appellate Court may pass a decree or make an order accordingly

O 4  
rr 32,

**33** [Nou] The appellate Court shall have power to pass any decree and make any order which ought to have been passed or made and to pass or make such further or other decree or order as the case may require, and this power may be exercised by the Court notwithstanding that the appeal is as to part only of the decree and may be exercised in favour of all or any of the respondents or parties, although such respondents or parties may not have filed any appeal or objection

Power of Court of Appeal

Provided that the appellate Court shall not make any order under sec 35 A in pursuance of any objection on which the Court from whose decree the appeal is preferred has omitted or refused to make such order (o)

#### Illustration

A claims a sum of money as due to him from X or Y and in a suit against both obtains a decree against X Y appeals and A and Y are respondents The appellate Court decides in favour of X It has power to pass a decree against Y

Cases to which rule applies—This rule is new It is taken for the most part from O 58 r 4 of the Rules of the Supreme Court of Judicature in England The object of the rule is to empower the appellate Court to do complete justice between the parties O 41 r 4 and this rule gives the Court ample power to make the order appropriate to the ends of justice Under the former rule upon an appeal by one of the parties on a ground common to all the decree may be varied in favour of all under the latter rule the Court has power to make the proper decree notwithstanding that the appeal is as to part only of the decree and such power may be exercised in favour of all or any of the parties even though they may not have filed an appeal or objection (p) The illustration to the rule indicates a type of case for which provision is intended to be made The following are further instances —

(1) A sues B and C for contribution A decree is passed against B but as against C the suit is dismissed B appeals making A alone respondent to the appeal A does not appeal from the decree dismissing the suit as against C If the appellate Court is of opinion that C is liable and not B it may under r 20 direct that C be added as a respondent as being a person interested in the result of the appeal and may under the present rule alter the decree so as to make C liable though no appeal was preferred by A from the dismissal of the suit against C This is in accordance

(o) The proviso was added by Act 9 of 19

(p) *Dhyand v Nandras* (1919) 4 Cal W N 97 54 I C 636

31 adoption of the judgment of the Court of first instance cannot be considered as a sufficient compliance with the law. The same was held where the judgment was there is no satisfactory evidence that plaintiff was ever in possession of the land in dispute and the evidence was not discussed in the judgment (f)

If the reasons for the decision are not stated by the appellate Court as fully as they ought to have been but the High Court is satisfied upon the judgment that the Judge of the lower Court had read the evidence and meant to find upon that evidence as a whole the decree of the lower Court will not be interfered with in second appeal. The proper course to be followed in such a case is to require the Judge if still holding office to supplement his judgment by giving in greater details the reasons on which it is based (g)

Shall state the points for determination.—The object of the legislature in making it incumbent by this rule on the appellate Court to raise points for determination is to clear up the pleading and focus the attention of the Court and of the parties on the specific and rival contentions of the latter (h). The exact questions which arise in the appeal and require determination must be stated in the judgment. It is not sufficient to state the point to be determined on appeal is whether or not the decision is consistent with the merits of the case. A proposition so roundly worded is no point at all (i)

Form of order.—Where there has been a failure by the first appellate Court to comply with the requirements of this rule the proper form of the order to be made by the second appellate Court is to set aside the decree and remand the case to the first appellate Court for disposal according to law. If the Judge of the Court to which the case is remanded is the Judge who heard the appeal in the first instance he need not rehear the appeal unless he is of opinion that he cannot properly dispose of the remanded case without a rehearing. But where the Judge of the Court to which the case is remanded is not the Judge who heard the appeal in the first instance a rehearing is always necessary in order that there may be a compliance with the order of the second appellate Court that the case be disposed of according to law (j). See notes above. Shall state the reasons for the decision.

High Court.—Where a suit was decided by a District Court and the decree was confirmed in appeal by the High Court and the High Court did not state in its judgment the reason for its decision. *Edge C J* on an application for leave to appeal to the Privy Council on the ground that the requirements of this rule were not complied with said that the present rule was not intended to apply to cases where the High Court after hearing the judgment of the lower Court and arguments thereon comes to the conclusion that both the judgment and the reasons given by the Court below for its decision are completely satisfactory (k). And the opinion has been expressed by Mahmood J that this rule does not apply at all to judgments of High Courts in second appeal (l). See sec 122.

Appeal under sec 476 Criminal Procedure Code.—Appeals under sec 476 of the Criminal Procedure Code are regulated by O 41 and the judgment must comply with this rule (m).

Privy Council appeal.—Non compliance with the requirements of this rule is not a ground of appeal to the Privy Council (n).

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| (f) <i>Vingappa v Shappa</i> (189) 19 Bom 33<br><i>Ananda Pal v Maha Bai</i> (19 6) 1 Luck<br>4 9 I C 95 (27) A O 95 | (l) <i>Sindar Bhai v Bheeshar Nath</i> (1887) 9 All<br>93  |
| (g) <i>Biswanath v Baidyanath</i> (1886) 12 Cal 199<br>9 03  | (i) <i>Sohawan v Babu Nand</i> (1887) 9 All 5 30-31<br>B also <i>Taradig v Kasbi Parn</i> (1903) 5<br>All 109 30 I.A. 35 |
| (h) <i>Mha v Bhayji v Dattal</i> (1900) 7 Bom L R<br>174   | (m) <i>Hamid Ali v Ali</i> (19 ) 54 Cal 55<br>100 I C 31 (7) A C 231   |
| (i) <i>Shan v Babu Nand</i> (1897) 9 All 6 30 31   | (n) <i>Sindar Bhai v Bheeshar Nath</i> (1887) 9 All<br>93  |
| (j) <i>Sahana Pillai v Seetha Idd</i> (1908) 31 Mad<br>449   |  |

**32** [s 577] The judgment may be for confirming, varying or reversing the decree from which the appeal is preferred, or if the parties to the appeal agree as to the form which the decree in appeal shall take, or as to the order to be made in appeal, the appellate Court may pass a decree or make an order accordingly

**33** [Act] The appellate Court shall have power to pass any decree and make any order which ought to have been passed or made and to pass or make such further or other decree or order as the case may require, and this power may be exercised by the Court notwithstanding that the appeal is as to part only of the decree and may be exercised in favour of all or any of the respondents or parties, although such respondents or parties may not have filed any appeal or objection

Provided that the appellate Court shall not make any order under sec 35 A in pursuance of any objection on which the Court from whose decree the appeal is preferred has omitted or refused to make such order (o)

#### Illustration

A claims a sum of money as due to him from X or Y and in a suit against both obtains a decree against X. X appeals and A and Y are respondents. The appellate Court decides in favour of X. It has power to pass a decree against Y.

**Cases to which rule applies**—This rule is new. It is taken for the most part from O 58 r 4 of the Rules of the Supreme Court of Judicature in England. The object of the rule is to empower the appellate Court to do complete justice between the parties. O 41 r 4 and this rule gives the Court ample power to make the order appropriate to the ends of justice. Under the former rule upon an appeal by one of the parties on a ground common to all the decrees may be varied in favour of all under the latter rule the Court has power to make the proper decree notwithstanding that the appeal is as to part only of the decree and such power may be exercised in favour of all or any of the parties even though they may not have filed an appeal or objection (p). The illustration to the rule indicates a type of case for which provision is intended to be made. The following are further instances —

(1) A sues B and C for contribution. A decree is passed against B but as against C the suit is dismissed. B appeals making A alone respondent to the appeal. A does not appeal from the decree dismissing the suit as against C. If the appellate Court is of opinion that C is liable and not B it may under r 20 direct that C be added as a respondent as being a person interested in the result of the appeal and may under the present rule alter the decree so as to make C liable though no appeal was preferred by A from the dismissal of the suit against C. This is in accordance

(o) The proviso was added by Act 9 of 19

(p) *Dehendra v. V. endra* (1919) 4 Cal W N 27 54 1 C 636

33 with the Calcutta ruling under the Code of 1882 (g) According to the Allahabad rulings under that Code *C* could neither be added as a respondent nor even if he were joined as a respondent from the first could any decree be passed against him no appeal having been preferred against him (r) The Allahabad ruling that *C* could not be added as a respondent (under r 20) was followed by the Madras High Court (s) The present rule gives effect to the Calcutta rulings and supersedes the Allahabad and Madras rulings But *C* cannot be added as a respondent if limitation for filing an appeal against him has expired (t)

(2) A suit is brought on behalf of the public for (1) a declaration that the public are entitled to use certain locks on a certain river without payment of tolls and (?) a declaration that the defendant is under an obligation to keep the locks in repair A decree is passed for the plaintiff awarding the relief as to the use of the locks without payment of tolls but declaring that the defendant is under no obligation to repair the locks The defendant appeals The plaintiff neither files a cross appeal nor objections The appellate Court finds that the public are not entitled to use the locks without payment of tolls to the defendant At the same time it finds that the defendant is under an obligation to keep the locks in repair The appellate Court has power while declaring by its decree that the public are liable to pay tolls also to declare that the defendant is liable to keep the locks in repair notwithstanding that no appeal or objection was taken to that part of the decree by the plaintiff (i)

(3) Plaintiff sued for ejectment of tenants in possession of land that he had purchased and in the alternative for compensation against his vendor The first Court dismissed the suit against the tenants and awarded compensation against the vendor The plaintiff did not appeal but the vendor appealed and established that he had conveyed a good title to the plaintiff The Court of appeal reversed the decree for compensation and gave the plaintiff a decree for possession and mesne profits against the tenants (v)

It does constantly occur where some persons appeal and others do not that the Court is put in a position of having to make impossible or contradictory or unworkable orders Accordingly it has been given power to make a decree in favour of persons who have not even approached it This power may be exercised by the Court in favour of any of the parties who may not have filed any appeal or objection (u) The appellate Court may under this rule to vary the decree of the lower Court though the variation may benefit a defendant who has not appealed from the decree (x) Thus when plaintiff's claim was decreed partly against *A* and partly against *B* and *A* appealed and *B* did not the appellate Court under this rule made a decree exempting *B* and making *A* liable for the whole amount (y) The power is however discretionary In a recent Allahabad case (z) a mother and son sued as legal representatives of a reversionary heir to recover property and the suit was decreed in favour of the son but dismissed as regards the mother The mother did not appeal as she was satisfied

- (g) *Upendra Lal v. Chandra Nath* (1898) 25 Cal 58  
*Hudson v. Basdeo* (1899) 26 Cal 109  
*Rup Jaun Bibee v. Abdul Rader* (1904) 31 Cal 643  
 (r) *Alta Ram v. Balkishen* (1883) 5 All 266  
*Fazal Ali v. Bismillah Begum* (1905) 27 All 23  
*Lohre v. Deo Hans* (1908) 30 All 48  
*Amuddin v. Abdul Aziz* (1909) 31 All 51  
 (s) *Subramanyam v. Veerabhadra* (1908) 31 Mad 447  
 (t) *Chokalingam v. S. goram* (192) 3 Ra g 546  
 84 IC 84 (25) A R 155  
 (u) *Attorney General v. Simpson* (1901) 2 Ch 671  
 (v) *Charu Bala v. Nihar Kumar* (197) 46 Cal L J 47  
 105 IC 600 (27) A C 831

- (w) *Abnash Chandra Das v. Daser* (1909) 8 Cal 589  
 600 605 114 IC 84 (9) A C 13  
 (x) *Troomdas v. Gopinath* (1917) 44 LA 65  
 71 44 Cal 759 769 39 IC 156 (no reference was made in the judgment to the present rule)  
*M. N. Han v. R. M. A. L. Firm* (1906) 4 Rang 110  
 97 IC 186 (104)  
*A. R. 172, Maksud Ali v. Firm Shakti Abd. Rah* (1908) 50 All 218  
 106 IC 723 (8) A A 77  
 (y) *Jauhar v. Bano v. Shujat Hussain* (1901) 43 AU 80  
 58 IC 114 (1) A A 367  
*U. S. K. N. J. S. Durga Prasad* (1905) 47 All 507  
 88 IC 439 (25) A A 555  
 (z) *Fakir v. Mera Lal* (1908) 21 All 63  
 111 IC 751 (8) A A 46  
*do ibid.*  
*M. S. Lal v. Gajendrapati* (1909) 51 All 675  
 116 IC 436 (9) A A 43

with a decree in favour of the son. On appeal to the High Court the son's suit was dismissed on the ground that he was a son by a former marriage. The effect of the decision was that the mother was entitled but the Court refused to exercise its power under this rule. The Allahabad High Court has held that when there is a common defence a Court of appeal may dismiss a suit as against a defendant who has not appealed (a) but not if there is no common ground of defence (b). In a Patna Case (c) the plaintiff obtained a decree in the first Court against A, B and C for contribution. A alone appealed and the High Court under this rule dismissed the suit not only against A but against B and C as well. The plaintiff appealed and the Privy Council restored the decree of the first Court. In execution proceedings it was contended that this had not the effect of reviving the decree against B and C which had become time barred. But it was held that as O 41 r 33 enables an appellate Court to deal with the entire decree although the appeal may be as to part only, the entire decree becomes the subject matter of the appeal even when the appeal is from part of the decree and by some only of the parties so that the final decree for purposes of limitation under Article 182 (2) was the decree of the Privy Council and that the application for execution was therefore within time. Similarly the appellate Court has power under this rule to make an order for extension of time for making an award in a matter governed by the Indian Arbitration Act 1899 (d).

**Cases to which rule does not apply**—A sues B to recover rent Rs 200. A decree is passed in favour of A for Rs 95 only. A appeals against the disallowance of the balance of the amount claimed. B neither files a cross appeal nor objections against the decree. The appellate Court finds that nothing is due to A from B. The appellate Court has no power to dismiss A's claim in toto. If B was aggrieved by the decree against him for Rs 95 he ought to have appealed or filed objections (e). Again the rule does not apply when the decree is really a combination of several decrees against several defendants (f). Mukerji J on a review of all the cases said the rule should be cautiously applied and only in cases where but for recourse to it the ends of justice would be defeated (g). The High Court of Allahabad has held that the Court has no power under this rule to pass a decree against a person who is not a party to the appeal (h).

**Privy Council appeal**—In an appeal to Privy Council relief will not be given under this rule to a party who has not appealed to the High Court. A sued B and B's agent C for damages for breach of two contracts. The first Court passed a decree against B in respect of both contracts and as against C made an order for costs only. A did not appeal against the dismissal of the suit as against C but both B and C appealed. The High Court modified the decree making B liable only as to one contract and allowed C's appeal. A appealed to Privy Council making both B and C respondents and contended that C was liable as regards the contract as to which the High Court had exonerated B. But their Lordships said that the appeal against C was an appeal direct from the trial Judge which was not allowable (i).

- (a) *Mohdham Ali v. M. H.* (19 6) 48 All 51  
94 I C 347 (27) A A 37  
(b) *M. Awar Ali v. Jagmohan Ram* (19 7) 99  
I C 80 (7) A A 177  
(c) *Som Singh v. Iremd Luer* (19 4) 3 Pat  
37, 91 C 91 (5) A P 47  
(d) *T. P. I. v. Nathmull & Co.* (1919) 46 Cal  
1059 51 I C 668  
(e) *R. G. M. Lal v. Jha &* (191) 34 All 32 11  
I C 619 *Ilahi v. Jauranda* (19 0) 1 Lah  
296 51 I C 971 *K. Sh. Prasad Singh v.*  
*Nar v. Dayal* (19 5) 4 Pat 37 8 I C  
984 (5) A 1 235 S. *Jain v. S. Raja Rao*  
(19 5) 48 Ma 1 I J 577 68 I C 99 (5) A  
M 771 *M. I. N. v. Shanta am* (19 6)  
9 Bom J R 67 98 I C 383 (27) A B  
1 8 *Lam H. gam v. S. D. Ahma ad* (19 7)

- 50 Mad 614 103 I C 394 (27) A M 6 0  
*Punjab National Bank v. Lma D. H.* (1923)  
9 Lah 291 112 I C 4 5 (8) A L 599  
(f) *Gy. n. Singh v. Ala Huzam* (19 1) 43 All 3 0  
60 I C 617 (21) A A 56 *Cl. Ama singh*  
*v. De as. Cm &* (19 5) *Bom L. R.* 91  
86 I C 31 (25) A B 90 *Mahend. Cal*  
*Nath. Kart. A. Moha.* (19 2) A  
1193 159 I C 24 (22) A L 593  
(g) *Sh. deh ndam v. Dulchen* (1914) 8 Cal L J  
123 48 I C 8 *I. I. v. v. Meca Lal* (19 9)  
51 All 63 111 I C 51 (22) A A 46  
(h) *Manda Lal v. C. J. I. pal* (19 9) 51 All 5 3  
116 I C 436 (3) A A 243  
(i) *Mahomed Kh. I. v. Les Tanneries Lyon*  
*masses* (19 6) 53 I A 81 49 Mad 435 94  
I C 787 (6) A PC 34



1,  
35

Such other decree as the case may require.—The power of the appellate Court is not limited to determining the question whether the original Court was right according to the law in force at the date of its judgment: it may pass such decree as it in accordance with any later enactment which came into operation subsequent to such date (j).

**Remand**—A sues B for three sums of money X, Y and Z. A claim is allowed as to items X and Y but disallowed as to item Z. A appeals from the decree as to item Z. B appeals from the decree as to items X and Y. The appellate Court dismisses A's appeal, and allows B's appeal as to item Y only with the result that item Y is decreed in A's favour. A then appeals to the High Court as to items X and Z. The High Court has power under this rule to remand the whole case for determination on the merits. The effect of such an order is to empower the lower Court to reopen the case even as to item Y which was decided by the lower appellate Court in favour of A and from which decision B had not preferred an appeal to the High Court (k).

**Proviso**—The proviso was added by Act 9 of 1922. Its effect is that the appellate Court cannot allow a claim for compensatory costs which has been disallowed by the original Court.

**34 [S 576]** Where the appeal is heard by more Judges than one, any Judge dissenting from the judgment of the Court shall state in writing the decision or order which he thinks should be passed on the appeal, and he may state his reasons for the same.

Di sent to be recorded

### *Decree in Appeal*

**35 [S 579]** (1) The decree of the appellate Court shall bear date the day on which the judgment was pronounced.

D to and contents of decree

(2) The decree shall contain the number of the appeal, the names and descriptions of the appellant and respondent, and a clear specification of the relief granted or other adjudication made.

(3) The decree shall also state the amount of costs incurred in the appeal, and by whom or out of what property, and in what proportions such costs and the costs in the suit are to be paid.

(4) The decree shall be signed and dated by the Judge or Judges who passed it.

Provided that where there are more Judges than one and there is a difference of opinion among them, it shall not be necessary for any Judge dissenting from the judgment of the Court to sign the decree.

Judge dissenting from judgment need not sign decree

(j) *G. r. d. v. D. d. r.* (1910) 3 Mad. L. J. 5-8  
7 I. C. 74. *K. n. k. v. J. a. d. h. a.*  
(1913) 26 Mad. 439-444. 8 I. C. 736 (1 B).  
*M. i. t. h. n. e. m. v. K. a. f. y. o. n. i.* (1911) 40 Mad.

818 8<sup>th</sup> 33 I. C. 22.  
(k) *Sa. a. d. a. S. n. d. a. r. v. G. a. p. a. h. a. r. i.* (1919) 48 Cal.  
785 I. C. 201.

**Costs**—Where a decree is confirmed in appeal upon grounds wholly different from those relied on in the lower Court the proper course is to dismiss the appeal without costs (l)

**Chartered High Courts**—This rule does not apply to Chartered High Courts in the exercise of their appellate jurisdiction [O 49 r 31]

**Form**—For form of decree in appeal see App B form no 9

**36 [S 580]** Certified copies of the judgment and decree in appeal shall be furnished to the parties on application to the appellate Court and at their expense

Copies of judgment and decree to be furnished to parties

**37 [S 581]** A copy of the judgment and of the decree, certified by the appellate Court or such officer as it appoints in this behalf, shall be sent to the Court which passed the decree appealed from and shall be filed with the original proceedings in the suit, and an entry of the judgment of the appellate Court shall be made in the register of civil suits

Certified copy of decree to be sent to Court whose decree appealed from

## ORDER XLII

### *Appeals from Appellate Decrees*

**1 [S 587]** The rules of Order XLI shall apply, so far as may be, to appeals from appellate decrees

Procedure

See s 103 cl (a)

**Rules relating to first appeals to apply so far as may be to second appeals**—The following rules have been applied in the reported decisions Pr 1 and 2 of Order 41 which require a memorandum of appeal in first appeals have been held to apply to second appeals (m) R 22 which relates to cross objections has been held to apply to second appeals (n) Rr 25 and 26 which empower the Court of first appeal to frame and refer issues for trial to the lower Court and to determine the appeal after return of findings on such issues apply to second appeals to the extent indicated in the notes to r 26 under the head Second appeal Rr 27 and 28 which relate to additional evidence in first appeal apply to second appeals to the extent mentioned in the notes to r 27 under the head Second appeal The Allahabad High Court has held that the Court cannot on second appeal dispense with copy of the judgment of the Court of first instance (o) But omission to annex copy of an interlocutory order incorporated by reference in the judgment may be excused (p) As to the applicability to second appeals of r 31 which relates to the contents of judgment of the first appellate Court see notes to that rule under the head High Court

(l) *Fuher v K mala Nicker* (1865) 8 M L A 170  
(m) *Amal Al v Haris Huss* n (1893) 15 All 123 127

(n) *Kaus la v Gulab Kur* (1899) 21 All 297

(o) *Basra v F ma Aul r* (1911) 43 All 600 631 C 334 (v) A 4 23

(p) *Lakshmi v Ishar* (1914) 4 Lab L J 0 (22) A L 93

- r 1 Inherent power of High Court to remand in second appeal—Where the Court of first instance declined to record oral evidence rendered by the plaintiff on the ground that the documentary evidence produced by him was sufficient and the decree in favour of the plaintiff was reversed in appeal but the appellate Court declined to allow the plaintiff respondent to produce oral evidence before it it was held by the High Court in second appeal that though there was no provision in the Code strictly applicable to the case the High Court was warranted *ex debito justitiæ* in setting aside the proceedings of both the Courts below and in directing the first Court to retry the case (g) See notes to r 33 Remand.

## ORDER XLIII

### *Appeals from Orders*

- 1 1 [ S 588 ] An appeal shall lie from the following orders under the provisions of section 104, namely —

Appeal from orders

- (a) an order under rule 10 of Order VII returning a plaint to be presented to the proper Court,
- (b) an order under rule 10 of Order VIII pronouncing judgment against a party,
- (c) an order under rule 9 of Order IX rejecting an application (in a case open to appeal) for an order to set aside the dismissal of a suit,
- (d) an order under rule 13 of Order IX rejecting an application (in a case open to appeal) for an order to set aside a decree passed *ex parte*,
- (e) an order under rule 4 of Order X pronouncing judgment against a party,
- (f) an order under rule 21 of Order XI,
- (g) an order under rule 10 of Order XVI for the attachment of property,
- (h) an order under rule 20 of Order XVI pronouncing judgment against a party,
- (i) an order under rule 34 of Order XXI on an objection to the draft of a document or of an endorsement,

(g) *D. rpa D. hai v. Anoraja* (189) 17 All. 9  
See also *Kelav f. ; ni* (19) 439 Cal. L. J.  
231 81 I C 999 (—) A C 94 *Jeshanker*

*v. Bat Dorell* (1920) 2 Bom. L. R.  
771 87 I C 55

- (j) an order under rule 72 or rule 92 of Order XXI O 4 setting aside or refusing to set aside a sale,
- (k) an order under rule 9 of Order XXII refusing to set aside the abatement or dismissal of a suit,
- (l) an order under rule 10 of Order XXII giving or refusing to give leave,
- (m) an order under rule 3 of Order XXIII recording or refusing to record an agreement, compromise or satisfaction,
- (n) an order under rule 2 of Order XXV rejecting an application (in a case open to appeal) for an order to set aside the dismissal of a suit,
- (o) an order under rule 2, 4 or 7 of Order XXXIV refusing to extend the time for the payment of mortgage money,
- (p) orders in interpleader suits under rule 3, rule 4, or rule 6 of Order XXXV,
- (q) an order under rule 2, rule 3 or rule 6 of Order XXXVIII,
- (r) an order under rule 1, rule 2, rule 4, or rule 10 of Order XXXIX,
- (s) an order under rule 1 or rule 4 of Order XL,
- (t) an order of refusal under rule 19 of Order XLI to re admit, or under rule 21 of Order XLI to re hear an appeal,
- (u) an order under rule 23 of Order XLI remanding a case, where an appeal would lie from the decree of the appellate Court,
- (v) an order made by any Court other than a High Court refusing the grant of a certificate under rule 6 of Order XLV,
- (w) an order under rule 4 of Order XLVII granting an application for review

Section 104—This rule forms part of s. 104 [see s. 104 sub s. (1) cl. (i)]. The result is that no second appeal lies from an order passed in an appeal preferred under this rule (r)

Clause (a) Order returning plaint to be presented to the proper Court—Where an order is made by the first Court of appeal returning a *plaint* under O 7 r 10 by virtue of the powers conferred on it by s 107 the order is appealable under this clause (a) and an appeal will lie to the High Court under s 106 (t). But no appeal lies from an order of an appellate Court returning a *memorandum of appeal* to be presented to the proper Court. The terms of cl (a) of this rule do not cover such a case nor can the reading of O 7 r 10 with s 107 justify the interpolation of the words *memorandum of appeal* after the word *plaint* in cl (a) of the present rule (u).

Clause (c)—This clause is amended by the Transfer of Property (Amendment) Supplementary Act 1930 by substituting the word and figures 2 4 or 7 for 4 or 7.

Clause (u) Order of remand—Under s 104 and O 43 an appeal lies only if an order of remand has been passed under O 41 r 23 above (t).

Other clauses—These have already been considered in their proper places.

2 [S 590] The rules of Order XLI shall apply, so far as may be, to appeals from orders

See s 108 cl. (b).

## ORDER XLIV

### *Pauper Appeals*

1 [S 592] Any person entitled to prefer an appeal who is unable to pay the fee required for the memorandum of appeal, may present an application accompanied by a memorandum of appeal, and may be allowed to appeal as a pauper, subject, in all matters, including the presentation of such application, to the provisions relating to suits by paupers, in so far as those provisions are applicable.

Who may appeal as pauper  
Provided that the Court shall reject the application unless, upon a perusal thereof and of the judgment and decree appealed from, it sees reason to think that the decree is contrary to law or to some usage having the force of law, or is otherwise erroneous or unjust.

Procedure on application for admission of appeal  
Alteration in the rule—The words in all matters including the presentation of such application in the first paragraph are new. See notes below under those words.

Unable to pay the fee.—In a Madras case (w) the petitioner had obtained a decree for maintenance and sought to appeal *in forma pauperis* for higher maintenance but the defendant paid Rs 571 arrears of maintenance into Court to her credit and the

(s) *Venkta Rao v Kolappa* (19 6) 51 Mad L J 119 97 I C 790 (1906) A M 900

(t) See O 7 r 10 Notes Appeal

(u) *P. Phunath v Shama Koori* (1904) 31 Cal 344 *Na ar Hussain v Kesi Mal* (1890)

1<sup>st</sup> AH 581 N. ud D n v. Fran Kulam (1918) 40 AH 639 47 I C 16

(v) *Ba la Bha v. H end a Nath* (1900) 5 Cal 19 103 IC 861 (1900) A M 900

(w) *Mahalak Am J e* (19 6) 50 Mad L J 114 94 I C 337 (1906) A M 367

petition was dismissed on the ground that she had sufficient means to pay the Court fee on the memorandum of appeal. See however note under O 33 r 1. Subject matter of the suit.

In all matters including the presentation of such application — The present rule provides that the provision relating to suits by paupers shall apply so far as may be to appeals by paupers. Therefore the application referred to in this rule for leave to appeal as a pauper must be presented by the applicant in person just as an application for leave to sue as a pauper [See O 33 r 3]. This is now made clear by the addition of the words in all matters including the presentation of such application. In the absence of these words in the old section it was held by the Madras High Court that the rule as to the presentation of a pauper's petition (now contained in O 33 r 3) did not apply to pauper appeals (x). The Madras decision is no longer law.

Subject to the provision relating to suits by paupers — A sues B to recover certain properties as the heir of her deceased husband. The suit is dismissed. A applies for leave to appeal as a pauper. It is found on inquiry that A had before instituting the suit entered into an agreement falling within the terms of O 33 r 3 (d) which would have entitled A to sue as a pauper. The appellate Court should under these circumstances refuse leave to A to appeal as a pauper (y).

Application and memorandum of appeal — This rule requires two separate documents to be presented — a memorandum of appeal and an application for leave to appeal as a pauper. When the Judge disposes of the pauper application he does not thereby necessarily dispose of the appeal. He may still treat it as an existing appeal if the appellant desires to pay the full court fees on the appeal and to continue it as an ordinary appeal. The Judge is under no legal obligation to dismiss the appeal when he refuses the appellant leave to appeal as a pauper (z). Following this reasoning it has been held by the High Court of Madras that where an application for leave to sue as a pauper is rejected owing to the memorandum of appeal which accompanied it being unstamped the rejection of the application does not carry with it the rejection of the memorandum of appeal. The result is that if the pauper applies for time to pay the court fee and time is granted to him [ 149] and the court fee is paid within the time fixed by the Court the appeal must be held to be in time though the court fee may have been paid after the expiration of the period of limitation prescribed for filing the appeal (a).

Proviso to the rule — The proviso is mandatory (b) and is a necessary safeguard introduced by the legislature for the benefit of litigants who find themselves opposed by paupers. To provide a safeguard against the proviso being overlooked the Judge admitting a pauper appeal should express and record briefly the reasons on which the leave proceeds (c). The proviso is of course not applicable unless the appeal is in *forma pauperis* (d). After issue of notice to the respondent and the Government Pleader it is no longer open to the Court to examine the question whether the decree is contrary to law or some usage having the force of law or is otherwise unjust or erroneous (e).

Appeal — No appeal lies under the Code from an order refusing leave to appeal as a pauper. It was held in a Madras case that no appeal lies from such an order under

(x) *M. S. S. v. M. S. S.* (1903) 6 M.L.J. 369  
(y) *H. S. S. v. H. S. S.* (1907) 30 M.L.J. 517  
(z) *B. S. S. v. D. S. S.* (1894) 1 M.L.J. 819  
(a) *H. S. S. v. H. S. S.* (1918) 40 All. 381 45 I.C. 9  
(b) *A. S. S. v. A. S. S.* (1913) 33 M.L.J. 41 1 I.C. 337  
(c) *H. S. S. v. H. S. S.* (1917) 40 M.L.J. 647 34 I.C. 617  
(d) *M. S. S. v. M. S. S.* (1913) 33 Lah. 3 6 I.C. 741  
(e) *A. S. S. v. A. S. S.* (1913) 33 Lah. 3 6 I.C. 741

(b) *A. S. S. v. A. S. S.* (1913) 33 M.L.J. 41 1 I.C. 337  
(c) *H. S. S. v. H. S. S.* (1917) 40 M.L.J. 647 34 I.C. 617  
(d) *M. S. S. v. M. S. S.* (1913) 33 Lah. 3 6 I.C. 741  
(e) *A. S. S. v. A. S. S.* (1913) 33 Lah. 3 6 I.C. 741

44,  
1,2

cl 15 of the Letters Patent (f) but that decision has been dissented from by a Full Bench of the same High Court in a recent case (g) There is an Allahabad case in which it was held that no appeal lies under the Letters Patent from an order refusing leave to appeal as a pauper (h) That decision however proceeded on grounds no longer tenable and it cannot therefore be treated as a precedent See notes to s 104 Letters Patent Appeal p 311 above

**Limitation**—The period of limitation for leave to appeal as a pauper is 30 days from the date of the decree appealed from (i) See Limitation Act 1908 sch I art. 170

**Form**—For form of application to appeal in *forma pauperis* see App G form no 10 For form of notice of appeal in *forma pauperis* see App G form no 11

**2 [S 593]** The inquiry into the pauperism of the applicant may be made either by the appellate Court or under the orders of the appellate Court by the Court from whose decision the appeal is preferred

Provided that, if the applicant was allowed to sue or appeal as a pauper in the Court from whose decree the appeal is preferred, no further inquiry in respect of his pauperism shall be necessary, unless the appellate Court sees cause to direct such inquiry

## ORDER XLV

### *Appeals to the King in Council*

45,  
1,2

**1 [S 594]** In this Order, unless there is something repugnant in the subject or context, the expression "decree" shall include a final order

**Decree defined**

When appeals lie to King in Council—See ss 109 and 110

**2 [S 598]** Whoever desires to appeal to His Majesty in Council shall apply by petition to the Court whose decree is complained of

**Application to Court whose decree complained of**

In *forma pauperis*—When a person applies for leave to appeal to His Majesty in Council in *forma pauperis* he must present an application for that purpose to the High Court and a separate application to His Majesty in Council (j)

(f) *Appasami v Somani & Co* (1903) 6 Mad 437

(g) *Tulja am v Alajappa* (1912) 35 Mad 1 9 17

(h) *Baro v Mehdi Hussain* (1899) 11 All 375

(i) See *Mahadev v Lakshman* (1895) 19 Bom 48

(j) *Munni Ram v Shree Churn* (1916) 4 M L J 114

Power of High Court to grant leave to appeal to His Majesty in Council in forma pauperis.—It has recently been held by the High Courts of Calcutta (l) Patna (l) and Madras (m) that O 41 r 1 does not apply to appeals to His Majesty in Council and that the High Court has no power to grant leave to appeal in forma pauperis to His Majesty in Council. The point arose in an earlier Calcutta case but it was not decided (n). In a still earlier case it was said that the usual security for costs must be given (o).

**Limitation** —See notes to s. 109 above

3 [ S 600 ] (1) Every petition shall state the grounds of appeal and pray for a certificate either that, as regards amount or value and nature, the case fulfils the requirements of section 110, or that it is otherwise a fit one for appeal to His Majesty in Council

(2) Upon receipt of such petition, the Court shall direct notice to be served on the opposite party to show cause why the said certificate should not be granted.

Alteration in the rule—In sub rule (2) the word shall has been substituted for the word may

**Petition**—A petition for a certificate which was dropped when the judgment complained of was reversed on review was treated as revived when the review was held incompetent by the Privy Council (p)

**Certificate**—The certificate of leave to appeal and not the order for such certificate is the document which the Judicial Committee are bound to consider and act upon in determining whether leave to appeal has been properly granted or not and unless the certificate upon which the leave to appeal is based is in such a form as to justify that leave they ought to hold that leave has not properly been given (g) The certificate must make plain upon the face of it that the discretion conferred upon the High Court was invoked and exercised (r) The assent of the respondent to the issue of a certificate will not make it effective if the conditions on which it should be issued are not complied with (s)

**Certificate as to fitness**—Where a case fulfils the requirements of a 110 the petitioner is entitled to a certificate as of right in the ordinary course of procedure. When it does not—that is where the matter is under the appealable value or is not measurable by money—the granting of the certificate is entirely in the discretion of the Court. (1) In the former case the High Court should certify the sufficiency of the amount for appeal to the Privy Council and should also certify when the decision of the lower Court is affirmed that the appeal involves a question of law. The Judicial Committee will not interfere with any question of valuation unless it can be shown that some item has

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| (k) Jagada a iv P ye d a (1913) 17 Cal L J 341 181 C 19        | (p) Vekta v Chhaju (193) 4 Lab 445 77 I C 869 (23) A L 23              |
| (l) Pambhik n Lal v M nna Kumara (1918) 3 Lat L J 19 441 C 731 | (q) P tha Ari A Das v Rai Krishna Ch d (1901) 3 All 415 28 I A 16      |
| (m) Amba v Srin e sa (1919) 4 Mad 3 47 I C 616                 | (r) Pambha K nra s v Sram natha (191) 148 I A 31 44 93 60 I C 6 11 A 1 |
| (n) Tha p n v Cal na Transmisco Co (1891) 1 Cal 5 3 tp 6       | (s) Ba r P re od v Kaula Krishna (1901) 3 All 277 31 A 11              |
| (o) G durn D s e la re (1873) 19 W R 30                        | (t) B n P od v A hi Krishna (1901) 23 All 277 231 31 A 11              |



been improperly valued or excluded or that there is some fundamental principle which renders the valuation unsound. On the mere question of the value of admitted items the Committee will not interfere nor will they allow a party to contend that the valuation has been arrived at on an erroneous principle unless he has raised that contention by his printed case (u). In the latter case it is enough if the certificate states that the case is a fit one for appeal to His Majesty in Council (v). Before coming to the Judicial Committee for special leave to appeal in a matter which is under the appealable value or not measurable by money the party should first apply to the Court below for a certificate under this rule and s 109 cl. (g) that the case is otherwise a fit one for appeal to His Majesty in Council otherwise special leave to appeal will not be granted by the Committee except in special cases (w). See notes to s 109 Certificate as to fitness and not s to s 110 under sub head Where the matter is under the appealable value or is not capable of valuation.

**Procedure**—If the petitioner does not prosecute his petition it may be struck off for non prosecution (x).

**Appeal**—An order granting a certificate that the case is a fit one for appeal to the Privy Council is not a judgment within the meaning of cl. 10 of the Letters Patent and no appeal lies from such an order (y). Nor does an appeal lie under that clause from an order refusing an application for leave to the Privy Council where the refusal is based on the ground that the case did not fulfil the requirements of s 110 above (z).

**Form**—For form of notice under sub r. (-) see App G form no. 1.

**4 [New]** For the purposes of pecuniary valuation, suits involving substantially the same questions for determination and decided by the same judgment may be consolidated, but suits decided by separate judgment shall not be consolidated, notwithstanding that they involve substantially the same question for determination.

Consolidation of suits

**Consolidation of suits**—This rule is new. In the absence of any such rule in the Code of 1852 it was held by the High Court of Allahabad that suits involving substantially the same questions for determination could be consolidated for the purpose of reaching the pecuniary limit necessary for an appeal if the property affected by the suits was the same notwithstanding that the suits were decided by separate judgments (a). According to the Calcutta decisions however such consolidation is not permissible unless the suits besides involving the same question for determination were decided by the same judgment (b). The Bombay High Court has allowed consolidation of suits decided by separate judgments when the point involved was the same and the parties had agreed that the evidence in one suit should be treated as evidence in the others and the reasons in the judgments in the main suit were adopted in the others (c). The present rule gives effect to the Calcutta rulings (d). It need hardly

- (u) *Citril v. Smt. Fha* (1904) 4 I.A. 484 110 57 I.C. 606  
 (v) *H. B. v. M. C. P. n* (1904) 31 Cal. 7 0 I.A. 9 Am. C.J. 1 v. Sh. A. B. (1904) 31 Cal. 11  
 (w) *M. C. v. G. S. J. Road* (1904) 4 All. 174 11 A. 40  
 (x) *Moo. v. S. M. f. e* (1886) 1 C.L. 69  
 (y) *L. f. v. S. M. f. e* (1890) 17 Cal. 1  
 (z) *M. v. S. M. f. e* (1891) 17 Cal. 39

- (a) *J. v. S. M. f. e* (1890) 18 All. 196  
 (b) *P. v. S. M. f. e* (1890) 18 All. 196  
 (c) *J. v. S. M. f. e* (1890) 18 All. 196  
 (d) *J. v. S. M. f. e* (1890) 18 All. 196



45,  
6 7Effect of refusal of  
certificate

**6 [S 691]** Where such certificate is refused, the petition shall be dismissed

**Costs**—Where the petition is made to the High Court and it is dismissed with costs the proper Court to execute the order is the lower Court (1)

**Appeal**—An appeal lies from an order made by any Court other than a High Court refusing the grant of a certificate under this rule [O 43 r 1 cl (v)]

**7 [S 602]** (1) Where the certificate is granted, the applicant shall, within *ninety days or such further period, not exceeding sixty days, as the Court may upon cause shown allow*, from the date of the decree complained of, or within six weeks from the date of the grant of the certificate, whichever is the later date,—

Security and deposit  
required on grant of certifi-  
cate

(a) furnish security *in cash or in Government securities* for the costs of the respondent, and

(b) deposit the amount required to defray the expense of translating, transcribing, indexing and transmitting to His Majesty in Council a correct copy of the whole record of the suit, except—

(1) formal documents directed to be excluded by any order of His Majesty in Council in force for the time being,

(2) papers which the parties agree to exclude,

(3) accounts, or portions of accounts, which the officer empowered by the Court for that purpose considers unnecessary, and which the parties have not specifically asked to be included, and

(4) such other documents as the High Court may direct to be excluded

Provided that the Court at the time granting the certificate may, after hearing any opposite party who appears, order on the ground of special hardship that some other form of security may be furnished

Provided further, that no adjournment shall be granted to an opposite party to contest the nature of such security

(2) Where the applicant prefers to print in India the copy of the record, except as aforesaid, he shall also within the time mentioned in sub rule (1) deposit the amount required to defray the expense of printing such copy

Rule amended—The italicized words were added into this rule by Act 26 of 1920 In sub rule (1) the words originally were within six months The period is now reduced to 90 days See notes below Extension of time The provisions were also added by the same Act

Date of the decree—This means the date on which the decree is pronounced not that on which it is signed (l)

Extension of time—It has been held by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council that the High Court may extend the time allowed for giving the security and making the deposit provided there are cogent reasons for doing so (m) According to the Madras High Court the cogent reasons must be such as would lead the Court to believe that the party was diligent in due time to be prepared to lodge the deposit within the limited period and that he was prevented from doing so not owing to the absence and difficulty of getting funds but owing to some circumstances accidental or otherwise over which he had no control or owing to mistake which the Court would consider not unreasonable or caused by negligence (n) On the other hand it has been held by the Chief Court of the Punjab that poverty is a cogent reason for extending the time if the amount required is large and the applicant has deposited a substantial portion of the amount within the time originally allowed (o) Prior to Act 26 of 1920 it was the uniform practice to extend time on good cause shown But the object of the amending Act was to expedite Privy Council appeals and the restrictive words used limit the Court's discretion so that the Court can in no case grant an extension of more than sixty days (p) The Allahabad High Court has held that the shorter period allowed by the amending Act does not apply when the decree was passed before the Act came into force (q) The Bombay High Court has however held that under rule 9 of the Privy Council Rules 1920 an extension can be granted (r)

Security in case of consolidated appeal—Where two or more appeals are consolidated for purposes of pecuniary valuation the security required by this rule is the whole security which the appellants together have to furnish and not only a part of it. Therefore if two or more appeals are consolidated and some sets of appellants furnish the security required from them but others do not the consolidated appeal cannot be admitted under r 8 below (s)

Records—The Privy Council have strongly condemned the inclusion in the record of unnecessary papers and disallowed the costs occasioned thereby (t)

Delay—If delay in the preparation of the record is due to the inaction of the appellant it seems that the appeal may be certified as not effectually prosecuted (u)

Appeal—No appeal lies under cl 15 of the Charter from an order refusing to extend the time for furnishing security for costs and directing the appeal to be struck off (v)

(l) *Hari Das v Hari Das* (1909) 14 Cal W N 405 I C 844 C O 0 F 7

(m) *Bu j s v Bhag na* (1893) 11 I A 7 10 10 Cal 557 *Fazul un Nissa v Mulo* (1884) 6 All 250

(n) *Pannasayi v Mahalakshamma* (1890) 14 Mad 331

(o) *Bayya v Al Hon* (1910) Punj Rec no 44 p 138 I C 73

(p) *Ram Dhan v Prasad* (1919) 44 All 16 65 I C 40 ( ) A A 43 S C 4 T S ( ) (1919) 19 O 4 Ra g 65 93 I C 417 ( ) A R 0

(q) *Debi Pr v Prahlad Das* (19 ) 44 All 1 65 I C 340 ( ) A A 87

(r) *Aikant v Vidya Narasimha* (19 7) 51 Bom 430 101 I C 655 ( ) A B 17

(s) *B b Naby v Rai Ba f ath* (1919) 4 Pat L J 199 50 I C 511

(t) *G p i Chandra v R yan Ka ta* (1920) 47 Cal 415 46 I A 99 78 I C 737 (I C)

(u) *S Mot v Billa* (19 4) Rang 91 80 I C 744 (24) A R 217

(v) *Kush n Pershad v T Luckdhari* (1891) 13 Cal 18

15,  
9A

**8 [S 603]** Where such security has been furnished and deposit made to the satisfaction of the Court, the Court shall—

Admission of appeal and procedure thereon

- (a) declare the appeal admitted,
- (b) give notice thereof to the respondent,
- (c) transmit to His Majesty in Council under the seal of the Court a correct copy of the sud record, except as aforesaid, and
- (d) give to either party one or more authenticated copies of any of the papers in the suit on his applying therefor and paying the reasonable expenses incurred in preparing them

Such security —See notes to r 7 above Security in case of consolidated appeal

**Notice**—For form of notice under cl (b) of this rule see App G form no 10  
The accidental omission of notice is not a sufficient ground for rehearing provided the respondents knew that the appeal had been admitted (u)

**9 [S 604]** At any time before the admission of the appeal the Court may, upon cause shown, revoke the acceptance of any such security and make further directions thereon

Revocation of acceptance of security

**9-A** Nothing in these rules requiring any notice to be served on or given to an opposite party or respondent shall be deemed to require any notice to be served on or given to the legal representative of any deceased opposite party or deceased respondent in a case, where such opposite party or respondent did not appear either at the hearing in the Court whose decree is complained of or at any proceedings subsequent to the decree of that Court

Power to dispense with notices in case of deceased parties

Provided that notices under sub rule (2) of rule 3 and under rule 8 shall be given by affixing the same in some conspicuous place in the Court house of the Judge of the District in which the suit was originally brought, and by publication in such newspapers as the Court may direct

This rule was added by Act 26 of 19-0

**10 [S 605]** Where at any time after the admission of an appeal but before the transmission of the copy of the record except as aforesaid to His Majesty in Council, such security appears inadequate,

Power to order further security or payment

or further payment is required for the purpose of translating, transcribing, printing, indexing or transmitting the copy of the record, except as aforesaid,

the Court may order the appellant to furnish within a time to be fixed by the Court, other and sufficient security, or to make, within like time the required payment

**11 [S 606]** Where the appellant

Effect of failure to comply with order

fails to comply with such order, the proceedings shall be stayed,

and the appeal shall not proceed without an order in this behalf of His Majesty in Council,

and in the meantime execution of the decree appealed from shall not be stayed

**12 [S 607]** When the copy of the record, except as

Refund of balance deposited

aforesaid, has been transmitted to His Majesty in Council, the appellant may obtain a refund of the balance (if any) of the amount which he has deposited under rule 7

**13 [S 608]** (1) Notwithstanding the grant of a certi-

Powers of Court pending appeal

ficate for the admission of any appeal, the decree appealed from shall be unconditionally executed, unless the Court otherwise directs

(2) The Court may, if it thinks fit on special cause shown by any party interested in the suit, or otherwise appearing to the Court,—

(a) impound any movable property in dispute or any part thereof, or

(b) allow the decree appealed from to be executed, taking such security from the respondent as the Court thinks fit for the due performance of any order which His Majesty in Council may make on the appeal, or

13

- (c) stay the execution of the decree appealed from, taking such security from the appellant as the Court thinks fit for the due performance of the decree appealed from, or of any order which His Majesty in Council may make on the appeal, or
- (d) place any party seeking the assistance of the Court under such conditions or give such other direction respecting the subject-matter of the appeal, as it thinks fit, by the appointment of a receiver or otherwise

#### Alterations in the rule —

1 The words admitting the appeal which occurred in the first paragraph of the old section after the word Court have been omitted. Those words gave rise to a conflict of decisions on the question whether the Court had power under the old section to stay the execution of the decree appealed from after a petition had been presented for leave to appeal but before the appeal was admitted. It was held by the High Court of Bombay that the Court had the power (x). On other hand it was held by the High Court of Calcutta that the Court had no such power the decision being based on the ground that the words *the Court admitting the appeal* indicated that no stay could be granted until the appeal was admitted (y). The words admitting the appeal have been omitted to make it clear that the power conferred by this rule may be exercised at any time after the presenting of the petition and even before the grant of a certificate for the admission of the appeal.

Another result of the omission of the words admitting the appeal after the word Court is to invest the High Court with power to stay execution notwithstanding that an appeal has been admitted by special leave of His Majesty in Council ( ). Under the Code of 1882 it was held that since the powers conferred by the corresponding s 603 could only be exercised by the *Court admitting the appeal* the High Court had no power to stay execution where the appeal was admitted by special leave of His Majesty in Council (a).

It seems unnecessary to add that a District Court cannot stay execution and that O 41 does not apply (b).

2 The words by the appointment of a receiver or otherwise at the end of cl. (d) are new.

The Court —The Court referred to in this rule and r 14 is the High Court (c).

Stay of execution before grant of certificate —See notes above. Alterations in the rule. No 1.

Stay of execution in view of an application for special leave to appeal —The High Court has an inherent power to make an order for stay of execution in view of an application by the judgment debtor to the Judicial Committee for special leave to appeal to His Majesty in Council (d).

(x) *Dame Jo bari v Sals Mahomed* (189 ) 19 Bom 10

(y) *Ja ao Kumari v Gopi CA ad* (1900) 5 C W N 56

(z) *Niyamo i D i v Madhu Sudan* (1911) 39 Cal 335 39 I A 74 11 I B 384

(a) *Mohesh A dra v Satrugan* (1900) 27 Cal

(b) 1 G I A 281

(c) *Mau g Po Chai v Ma g Po K a* (1900) 3 Rang 158 28 I C 99 ( 31 A E 54

(d) *F m B had r v J dha Krishna* (1915) 3 Pat 1 J 40 4 I C 535

(e) *Ve da Aishore v Ram Golan* (1913) 40 Cal 935 18 I C 207

Clause (b) —The respondent decree holder's failure to give security will not deprive him of the benefit of s 15 of the Limitation Act (e)

Clause (c) —If the Court fixes a time for furnishing security as a condition of stay of execution it is advisable that the time for tender of security should be specified with further directions for the inquiry as to its sufficiency (f) Proceedings for final decree for partition after a preliminary decree has been passed are not execution proceedings which can be stayed under this rule (g)

Security after execution —The Court has power to require security to be given under this rule even after the decree has been executed wholly or in part (h) It has also the power to stay further execution after the decree has been partially executed (i)

Stay of execution where appeal admitted by special leave —See notes above Alterations in the rule No 1 second paragraph

Appointment of receiver where appeal admitted by special leave —The High Court has power to appoint a receiver under cl (d) notwithstanding that the appeal was admitted by special leave of His Majesty in Council (j)

Practice —Applications of the character mentioned in this rule ought always to be made in the first instance at any rate to the Court in India which has ample power to deal with the matter according to the circumstances of the peculiar case and has knowledge of details which the Judicial Committee cannot possess on an interlocutory application (k) If the application is refused by the High Court and the Judicial Committee is of opinion that the application ought to have been granted it may grant a stay of execution But more than this it will not do for instance it will not appoint a receiver of the property under attachment nor take the security referred to in cls (b) and (c) of sub rule (2) In such cases the Judicial Committee will grant leave to the applicant to apply to the High Court with an intimation of its opinion As the order is that of the King in Council the High Court is bound to take notice of it and to govern itself accordingly (l)

Appeal —No appeal lies under cl 15 of the Letters Patent from an order refusing to stay execution pending appeal to the Privy Council (m)

**14 [S 609]** Where at any time during the pendency of the appeal the security furnished by either party appears inadequate, the Court may, on the application of the other

Increase of security found inadequate

party, require further security

(e) *Pa da v S Idea v Srimats Padhey* (19 0) 5 Pat L J 39 531 C 9

(f) *Kedarnath v Matil* (19 0) 4 CWN 5 571 C 35

(g) *P m Nara n v Hernam Das* (19 0) 4 AL 1 0 541 C 561

(h) *Jari lool Bitoool v Hoseinee Beg m* (1865) 10 M I A 196 *Jinder K mar v J pal K mar* (1857) 14 Cal 290 295 14 I A 1 *Nara n v Arunachelliam* (1898) 19 Mad 140 14 *Ah shaldas Chum lat* (19 6) 50 Bom 453 98 I C 215 (26) A B 4 5

*Ashanulla v K roonamoy* (1879) 4 C L R 1 5

(i) *P J Hare v Pa Jagadamba* (1910) 4 Pat L J 48 5 1 C 407

(k) *Tasud a v Shadagopa* (1906) 2 Mad 370 33 I A 13

(l) *Ja st lool Bitoool v Hos ee Begum* (186 ) 10 M I A 196 20 (where the application was made by the appellant after execution of the decree requiring the respondent to give security and the Court thought it had no power to demand security after execution of the decree) *Chat ap i S gh v D arkan th* (1895) 2 Cal 1 1 I A 170 (where the application was made by the respondent for a stay of execution and the Judges of the High Court had differed in opinion as to the propriety of staying execution) *I as dera v A dagopa* (1896) 29 Mad 370 33 I A 13\* (where the application was made by the respondent for a stay of execution and the High Court granted a stay for three months only before it had no power to grant a stay until the disposal of the appeal to the Privy Council)

(m) *Yohada Pros v Adhikari* (1891) 1 Cal 473



15 (2) In default of such further security being furnished as required by the Court,—

- (a) if the original security was furnished by the appellant, the Court may, on the application of the respondent execute the decree appealed from as if the appellant had furnished no such security,
- (b) if the original security was furnished by the respondent, the Court shall, so far as may be practicable, stay the further execution of the decree, and restore the parties to the position in which they respectively were when the security which appears inadequate was furnished, or give such direction respecting the subject matter of the appeal as it thinks fit

The Court —See notes under the same head to r 13 above

15 [S 610] (1) Whoever desires to obtain execution of any order of His Majesty in Council shall apply by petition, accompanied by a certified copy of the decree passed or order made in appeal and sought to be executed, to the Court from which the appeal to His Majesty was preferred

Procedure to enforce  
orders of His Majesty  
in Council

(2) Such Court shall transmit the order of His Majesty in Council to the Court which passed the first decree appealed from, or to such other Court as His Majesty in Council by such order may direct, and shall (upon the application of either party) give such directions as may be required for the execution of the same, and the Court to which the said order is so transmitted shall execute it accordingly, in the manner and according to the provisions applicable to the execution of its original decrees

(3) When any monies expressed to be payable in British currency are payable in India under such order, the amount so payable shall be estimated according to the rate of exchange for the time being fixed at the date of the making of the order by the Secretary of State for India in Council with the concurrence of the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury for the adjustment of financial transactions between the Imperial and the Indian Governments

(4) Unless His Majesty in Council is pleased otherwise to direct no order of His Majesty in Council shall be inoperative on the ground that no notice has been served on or given to the legal representative of any deceased opposite party or deceased respondent in a case where such opposite party or respondent did not appear either at the hearing in the Court whose decree was complained of or at any proceedings subsequent to the decree of that Court, but such order shall have the same force and effect as if it had been made before the death took place

**Alterations in the rule**—Paragraphs 3 and 4 of the old section which related to the enforcement of the liability of a surety for the costs of the respondents have been omitted in view of the general rule now laid down in s 140. Para 4 was added by Act 20 of 1900 in order to prevent delays in the disposal of Privy Council appeals

**Jurisdiction of Patna High Court**—The Patna High Court has no jurisdiction to execute an order of His Majesty in Council passed in an appeal from a decree of the Calcutta High Court on appeal from a subordinate Court in Bihar. The application for execution of such an order should be made to the Calcutta High Court (n)

**Whoever desires to obtain execution**—It may be that where a decree has been passed in favour of a number of persons *jointly* an application under this rule by one or more of them would be sufficient to entitle all of them to apply for execution in the Court below. But it is not so where several persons are by a decree declared entitled to *separate specific shares* say of an equal share in which case each person obtains by the decree a right to a separate share. In such a case no single plaintiff is entitled to execute the decree on behalf of all the plaintiffs from which it follows that an application under sub r (1) by some of the plaintiffs does not entitle all of them to apply under sub r (2) for execution to the Court to which the order of His Majesty in Council is sent for execution under that sub rule (o)

**Functions of the High Court under this rule**—The act of the High Court in receiving and filing orders of His Majesty in Council under this rule is a purely ministerial function. The High Court therefore has no power under this rule to discuss the effect of the order of His Majesty in Council on an application to file the order. If the order is impeached as erroneous the proper course for the party aggrieved by the order is to apply to His Majesty in Council to make the necessary alteration or modification in the order (p)

**Execution.**—The word execution includes restitution as described in s 144. A person therefore who desires to obtain execution though it be by way of restitution must apply in the first instance to the Court indicated by this rule (q). The provisions of this rule are mandatory so that if the petition is presented to a different Court the execution application is liable to be dismissed (r)

**Application for execution of order of His Majesty in Council by assignee of order**—Where an order of His Majesty in Council is transmitted by the High Court for execution under sub r (2) to the Court which passed the first decree

(n) *Lalji v E fath* (1911) 1st L J 643 43

1 C 457

(o) *Mafraj f e e hu r v Fa Eajpath* (1917)

1st L J 496 40 I C 508

(p) *Irem Lal v Su Woon atf* (1895) Cal

960 971 9

(q) *D d r D s v Lirj Lal* (1915) 37 All 6

301 C

(r) *Bf r ta v Zan r* (1913) 3 Pat 96 78

1 C 66 (1914) A P 376

15 appealed from the latter Court is not in the position of a Court to which a decree is transferred for execution and it is not therefore precluded from entertaining an application for execution of the order by an assignee of the order (s) See O 21 r 16 and notes thereto Application for execution by a transferee should be made to the Court which passed the decree

**Enforcement of liability of surety**—*A* obtains a decree against *B* in a High Court for possession of certain immovable property *B* appeals to the Privy Council and *C* stands surety for *A* as costs of the appeal [r 7 sub r 1 cl (a)] If the appeal is dismissed with costs *A* may proceed against *C* for costs by an application for execution [s 145]

Assuming in the case put above that *A* applies for execution of the decree and that possession of the property is delivered to him on *D* standing surety for re delivery of the property to *B* and for the payment of mesne profits in the event of *B*'s appeal being successful [r 13 sub r (2) cl (b)] and that the Privy Council allows *B*'s appeal and reverses the decree of the High Court in that event if *A* fails to re deliver the property or to pay the mesne profits to *B* *B* may proceed against *D* by an application for execution [s 145] (t)

**Restitution**—*A* obtains a decree against *B* for possession of certain immovable property Possession of the property is delivered to him in execution The decree is then set aside in appeal to the Privy Council Pending the appeal to the Privy Council the property is sold in execution of a decree obtained by *C* against *A* and it is purchased by *P* *B* is entitled on reversal of the decree by the Privy Council to restitution of the property as against *P* the latter being a representative of *A* within the meaning of s 47 (u) The Patna High Court considers that proceedings for restitution are not proceedings in execution and so in Patna applications for restitution consequent on a Privy Council decree are not made under this rule to the High Court but to the trial Court (v) The Allahabad High Court treats such an application as one to enforce an Order in Council and as subject as regards limitation to art 143 of the Limitation Act (w) See note under s 144 Against whom restitution may be claimed and whether a proceeding under this section is a proceeding in execution

**Mesne profits**—Where a party is dispossessed of land in pursuance of a decree of the High Court and the decree is reversed in appeal to the Privy Council he is entitled not only to restoration of the land, but to mesne profits during the period of dispossession though the order of His Majesty in Council may be silent as to such profits (x) See s 144

**Rate of exchange**—The Court have differed on the question whether the words for the time being refer to the rate of exchange at the date of the passing of the order or to that current when the amount is realised The former view is held by the Calcutta High Court (y) the latter by the Allahabad High Court (z)

**Interest on costs**—Where interest on costs is not allowed in the order of His Majesty in Council such interest cannot be given by any Court in this country (a)

(s) *Krishna Rao v. Pappa* [1915] 34 Mad 83

(t) *Ar. na kham v. A. na kham* (189) 13

(u) *Garuda v. Prasad* (1908) 9

(v) *J. q. l. Akhore v. H. me hwar* (19) 61

(w) *Saban v. Baisnath* (19) 40

(x) *Saban v. Baisnath* (19) 40

(y) *Ar. achellam v. Arunachellam* (197) 15

(z) *Datta v. Saroda* (1906) 93 Cal. 33

(a) *Pa. an S. R. v. F. m. Day* (1906) 8 J.L.

(b) *Datta v. Saroda* (1906) 93 Cal. 33

(c) *Forster v. Secretary of State* (19) 74 J.L.

(d) *Forster v. Secretary of State* (19) 74 J.L.

**Letters Patent appeal**—An appeal lies under cl 1 of the Letters Patent from an order of a single Judge of a High Court *refusing* to transmit for execution the order of His Majesty in Council as provided by sub rule (2) of this rule (b)

**Limitation**—An application for execution under this rule is governed by Art 183 of the Limitation Act 1908 (c)

**Dismissal of appeal for want of prosecution**—Where an appeal is preferred to the Privy Council from the decree of a High Court but the appeal is *dismissed for want of prosecution* the order of His Majesty in Council does not amount to a decree at all for purposes of limitation or for any other purpose. Such an order *does not deal judicially* with the matter of the suit but merely recognizes authoritatively that the appellant had not complied with the conditions under which the appeal was open to him and that therefore he is in the same position as if he had not appealed at all (d)

**16 [S 611]** The orders made by the Court which executes the order of His Majesty in Council, relating to such execution, shall be appealable in the same manner and subject to the same rules as the orders of such Court relating to the execution of its own decrees

**Appeal**—See notes to r 15 above      **Letters Patent appeal**

## ORDER XLVI

### Reference

**1 [S 617]** Where, before or on the hearing of a suit or an appeal in which the decree is not subject to appeal, or where, in the execution of any such decree, any question of law or usage having the force of law arises, on which the Court trying the suit or appeal, or executing the decree, entertains reasonable doubt, the Court may, either of its own motion or on the application of any of the parties, draw up a statement of the facts of the case and the point on which doubt is entertained, and refer such statement with its own opinion on the point for the decision of the High Court

**Alterations in the rule**—

- 1 The words *is not subject to appeal* have been substituted for the word *final* as the expression *final decree* is now used in this Code in contradistinction to a *preliminary decree*

(b) *Hurrah Chander v Kat Sunderi* (188 ) 9 Cal 48 10 I A 4 in appeal from *Kali Soonderi Dabla in re* (1841) 6 Cal 594 See also *Lalanand v Luckimpur* (18 0) 5 Beng L R 605 608 13 M I A 490  
(c) See *Tribukram v Badra* (1916) 1 Pat L J

395 38 I C 633 *Chatterpat Singh v Saini* (1917) 45 Cal 903 36 I C 609  
(d) *Abd i Muz d v Javahir Lal* (1914) 36 All 350 31 C 619 [P C] *Bat & Nath v M v Des* (1914) 36 All 108 31 C 644

- r 1 2 The words or the construction of a document which construction may affect the merits which occurred in the old section after the words having the force of law have been omitted as they are sufficiently covered by the power to refer any question of law

Hearing of a suit or appeal—A reference can be made to the High Court under this rule only in a *suit* or an *appeal in a suit* and not in every matter before the Court in which a point arises on which the Court entertains reasonable doubt (e) Thus where a pleader was fined Rs. 25 by a Subordinate Judge for refusing to act on behalf of his client after receipt of retaining fee and on appeal the District Judge referred the matter to the High Court under this rule it was held that no reference could properly be made under this rule as there was no *suit* or *appeal in a suit* (f) Nor can any reference be made in a proceeding other than a *suit* or an *appeal in a suit* even by virtue of the provisions of s. 141 above (g) See notes to s. 141 The procedure provided in this Code etc

Decree not subject to appeal—This rule does not authorize a reference to the High Court except in a *suit* or *appeal in which the decree is not subject to appeal*. Therefore no reference can be made to the High Court in a matter in which an appeal lies for in appealable cases a remedy to correct possible error is provided by the appeal. It is only when a decree is not subject to appeal that a reference can be made under this rule (h) In *Pamphul v. Durga* (i) a Munsif being of opinion that he had no jurisdiction to entertain a particular suit returned the plaint to be presented to the proper Court. On appeal the District Judge referred the matter to the High Court. The High Court held that the order of the Munsif returning the plaint being an appealable order (O. 43 r. 1 cl. (a)) the High Court had no jurisdiction to entertain the reference. On the same ground it is held that there could be no reference under this rule in a matter of probate and that an order made by a District Judge on an application for probate being appealable it cannot be referred for the opinion of the High Court under this rule though when referred the High Court may deal with the case as a Court of concurrent jurisdiction under s. 204 of the Indian Succession Act (j)

Jurisdiction—A Judge who has no jurisdiction to hear a suit or an appeal has no jurisdiction to make a reference before or at the hearing of such suit or appeal (k)

Reasonable doubt—A reference under this rule can only be made when a Judge entertains a reasonable doubt on a question of law or usage having the force of law. A Judge cannot or lawfully entertain a reasonable doubt on a point clearly decided by the rulings of the High Court to which he is subordinate unless the authority of the decision can be questioned by virtue of anything said or decided in the Privy Council (l). If the Court has no reasonable doubt it should not make a reference merely because it is asked to make one (m)

Reference by Presidency Small Cause Court—See Presidency Small Cause Court 1883 s. 69

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| (e) <i>M. H. d. v. Ahmudha</i> (1901) 5 Bom 3  | <i>M. Jaganmud</i> (1916) Panj Rec no 130<br>1 407 37 I C 7  |
| (f) <i>J. J. v. De S. a</i> (1894) 1 <sup>st</sup> Bom 8   | (i) (1883) 7 All 81  |
| (g) <i>D. m. d. v. I. H. a. s.</i> (1911) 26 All 16<br>191 C 89 <i>T. m. v. M. H. L.</i> (1907) 9<br>C W N 391 84 I C 513 (—) A C 391  | (j) <i>M. H. Moolerjee</i> in the matter of (1890)<br>5 Cal 70   |
| (h) <i>Pangj v. L. a. j.</i> (1897) 11 B m 57 <i>I. R. a. v. I. a. m.</i> (1900) 7 C L R 114<br><i>Y. cret. v. f. l. a. v. P. a. i.</i> (1891) 18 Cal<br>31 <i>O. v. L. a. v. L. H. v. H. a. t. c.</i><br>(1893) 17 Bom 73 <i>M. J. a. v. C. d. a.</i><br><i>a. a. a.</i> 1883) 1 Bom 0 <i>v. a. z. d. i. v.</i> | (k) <i>C. ng. S. a. g. h. v. A. a. h.</i> (1913) Panj<br>1 no 61 p 233 13 I C 314<br>(l) <i>B. h. a. n. a. j. s. D. B. to</i> (1906) 1 Bom 0<br><i>I. H. a. h. v. D. a. n.</i> (1914) Panj Rec no<br>8 p 0 I C 193<br>(m) <i>D. a. o. d. j. e. r. v. M. a. p. i. g. o. f. r. a. p. o. o. n.</i> (1903)<br>11 Aug 20 76 I C 519 (3) A R 123 |

2 [S 618] The Court may either stay the proceedings or proceed in the case notwithstanding such reference and may pass a decree or make an order contingent upon the decision of the High Court on the point referred,

but no decree or order shall be executed in any case in which such reference is made until the receipt of a copy of the judgment of the High Court upon the reference

3 [S 619] The High Court, after hearing the parties if they appear and desire to be heard, shall decide the point so referred, and shall transmit a copy of its judgment with the signature of the Registrar, to the Court by which reference was made, and such Court shall, on the receipt thereof, proceed to dispose of the case in conformity with the decision of the High Court

Such Court shall proceed to dispose of the case in conformity with the decision of the High Court — In *Jule & Co v Mahomed Hossein* (n) the Small Cause Court passed a decree for the plaintiffs contingent on the opinion of the High Court. The High Court held that upon the case presented by the plaintiffs they could not recover. The judgment of the High Court was transmitted to the Small Cause Court and the Small Cause Judge instead of entering judgment for the defendants allowed the suit to be withdrawn by the plaintiffs with liberty to bring a fresh suit [O 23 r 1]. Upon a petition for revision it was held by the High Court that the Small Cause Court was bound on receipt of the decision of the High Court to dispose of the case in conformity with that decision and to enter judgment for the defendants and that the order allowing the plaintiffs to withdraw from the suit was

Costs of reference to High Court

4 [S 620] The costs (if any) incurred on a reference for the decision of the High Court shall be costs in the cause

Power to alter etc decree of Court making reference

5 [S 621] Where a case is referred to the High Court under rule 1, the High Court may return the case for amendment, or may alter, cancel or set aside any order which the Court making the reference has made in the case out of which the reference arose, or may make such orders as it thinks fit

6 [S 646A] (1) Where at any time before a Court in which a suit has been brought there is a doubt whether the suit should be tried by a Court of Small Causes

Power to refer to High Court questions as to jurisdiction in small causes

16,  
5, 7

cognizable, it may submit the record to the High Court with a statement of its reasons for the doubt as to the nature of the suit

(2) On receiving the record and statement, the High Court may order the Court either to proceed with the suit or to return the plaint for presentation to such other Court as it may in its order declare to be competent to take cognizance of the suit

At any time before judgment—A reference under this rule can only be made before judgment (o)

7 [S 646 B] (1) Where it appears to a District Court that a Court subordinate thereto has, by reason of erroneously holding a suit to be cognizable by a Court of Small Causes or not to be so cognizable, failed to exercise

Power to District Court to submit for revision proceedings had under mistake as to jurisdiction in small causes

a jurisdiction vested in it by law, or exercised a jurisdiction not so vested, the District Court may, and if required by a party shall, submit the record to the High Court with a statement of its reasons for considering the opinion of the subordinate Court with respect to the nature of the suit to be erroneous

(2) On receiving the record and statement the High Court may make such order in the case as it thinks fit

(3) With respect to any proceedings subsequent to decree in any case submitted to the High Court under this rule the High Court may make such order as in the circumstance appears to it to be just and proper

(4) A Court subordinate to a District Court shall comply with any requisition which the District Court may make for any record or information for the purposes of this rule

Provincial Small Cause Courts Act 9 of 1837 sec 16—Section 16 of the Provincial Small Cause Courts Act runs as follows Save as expressly provided by this Act or by any other enactment for the time being in force a suit cognizable by a Court of Small Causes shall not be tried by any other Court having jurisdiction within the local limits of the jurisdiction of the Court of Small Causes by which the suit is triable

If required by a party shall—It has been held by the High Courts of Madras and Calcutta that a District Court is bound to make a reference under this rule if one of the parties requires it to do so (p) On the other hand the Allahabad High Court has held that the word shall is not mandatory but merely directory

(o) *Dual ba v Sadashida* (1900) 24 Bom 310  
(p) *Sims n v McMaster* (1890) 13 Mad 344

*S sh Chu der v Kruto Ra ghai* (1894)  
21 Cal 21

and that a District Court should not make a reference under this rule unless it is satisfied that a Court subordinate thereto has come to an erroneous finding on a point of jurisdiction in regard to the particular suit before it (g)

**Statement of reasons**—Where a reference is made to the High Courts under this rule the District Court which makes the reference should state its reasons for considering the opinion of the subordinate Court with respect to the nature of the suit to be erroneous (r)

**Powers of High Court under this rule**—There is a conflict of decisions as to the powers of the High Court under this rule as will be seen from the cases considered below —

### Illustration

A suit cognizable by a Small Cause Court is tried by a District Munsif on the original side without objection to his jurisdiction and a decree is passed for the plaintiff. The defendant appeals to the District Court making no reference to the question of jurisdiction in his grounds of appeal. The District Court reverses the decree passed by the Munsif. The plaintiff applies to the High Court under s. 115 for a revision of the decision of the District Court. It is clear that the suit being one of a nature cognizable by a Small Cause Court the District Munsif had no jurisdiction to entertain it under his ordinary jurisdiction having regard to the provisions of section 16 of the Provincial Small Cause Courts Act set forth above. Nor had the District Court jurisdiction to entertain the appeal from the decree in such a suit. What order should the High Court make assuming of course that the suit was one of a nature cognisable by a Small Cause Court and which of the following courses should it adopt?—

- (1) Should the High Court set aside the decrees of both the Courts below and return the plaint for presentation to the proper Court?
- (2) Or has it power to consider the case on the merits and to decline to interfere in the matter even though in strict law the suit should have been tried under a different procedure?
- (3) Or should it not set aside the decree of the District Court as having been made without jurisdiction and then dispose of the case on its merits leaving the decree passed by the Munsif to stand or not as may in its discretion appear best?

The first course was adopted by White C.J. in a Madras case where the learned Judge observed that there was no alternative but to adopt that course (s).

The second course was adopted by the High Court of Calcutta in the undermentioned cases (t) where the Court declined to interfere on the ground that they had a complete discretion in the matter.

The third course was adopted in a recent case by a Full Bench of the Madras High Court (u). The full Bench held dissenting from the Calcutta decisions cited above and overruling an earlier Madras case (v) in which the Calcutta decision was followed that the decree of the District Judge should be set aside as having been passed without jurisdiction. That decree was accordingly set aside and the decree passed by the Munsif was restored. The same course was adopted in a Bombay case (w).

As regards the Allahabad High Court it declined to interfere in one case on the ground that the present rule did not apply unless there was an *erroneous holding* as to jurisdiction and that could not occur if no objection to jurisdiction was taken by either

(g) *Madan Gopal v Bhagur n. Dass* (1889) 11 All 304.  
 (r) *Chhotu v Jaurahir* (1906) 28 All 293.  
 (s) *Jamasamy v Orr* (1903) 26 Mad 176.  
 (t) *S r sh Ch nnder v Kristo Pa gi t* (1904) 1 Cal 49 [case of second appeal]. *Jarm sh*

*warí v Jay t* (1914) 19 C W.N. 900 27  
 1 C 97.  
 (u) *Kall para v K nkipat* (1910) 33 Mad 3 3  
 1 C 543.  
 (v) *Parameshwarana v Vishnu* (1904) 7 Mad 479.  
 (w) *Shankarshai v Soonabhai* (1901) 5 Bom 417



- 7 party in the Courts below (x) In a later case it followed the Full Bench ruling of the Madras Courts and set aside the decree of the District Court and restored the decree passed by the Munsif (y)

## ORDER XLVII

## Review

1 Application for review of judgment 1 [S 623] (1) Any person considering himself aggrieved—

- (a) by a decree or order from which an appeal is allowed, but from which no appeal has been preferred,
- (b) by a decree or order from which no appeal is allowed, or
- (c) by a decision on a reference from a Court of Small Causes

and who, from the discovery of new and important matter or evidence which after the exercise of due diligence, was not within his knowledge or could not be produced by him at the time when the decree was passed or order made, or on account of some mistake or error apparent on the face of the record, or for any other sufficient reason, desires to obtain a review of the decree passed or order made against him, may apply for a review of judgment to the Court which passed the decree or made the order

(2) A party who is not appealing from a decree or order may apply for a review of judgment notwithstanding the pendency of an appeal by some other party except where the ground of such appeal is common to the applicant and the appellant or when being respondent, he can present to the appellate Court the case on which he applies for the review

Review under the Code of 1859 and the Code of 1877—Under the Code of 1859 s 376 an application for review could be entertained on the ground of discovery of new matter or evidence which was not within his [applicant's] knowledge or could not be adduced by him at the time when such decree was passed or for any other good and sufficient reason Under the Code of 1877, s 623 an application for review could be entertained on the ground of discovery of new and important matter or evidence which after the exercise of due diligence was not within his [applicant's] knowledge or could not be produced by him at the time when the decree was passed or order made or on account of some mistake or error apparent on the face of the record or for any other sufficient reason Sec 603 of the Code of 1882 is in this respect the same as s 623 of the Code of 1877 The present rule is a reproduction of s 623 of the Code of 1892

In what cases a party may apply for a review—A party aggrieved by a decree or a decision specified in clause (a) (b) or (c) of sub rule (1) [see s 114] may apply for a review in any of the following cases—

- I on the ground of the discovery of new and important matter or evidence which after the exercise of due diligence was not within the knowledge of the party or could not be produced by him at the time when the decree was passed or order made or
- II on account of some mistake or error apparent on the face of the record
- III for any other sufficient reason

**Ex parte decree or order**—A party aggrieved may apply for a review of an ex parte decree or order ( ) and if the case falls within this rule it is no objection that an application under O 9 r 13 could have been made and that it is barred by limitation (a) See notes under O 9 r 13 and O 41 r 19 The Court has jurisdiction to review an ex parte order for use of writ for delivery of possession and to recall the writ (b)

**Miscellaneous proceedings**—The provisions of the Code as to review apply to proceedings under the Indian Succession Act and an order granting letters of administration is open to review (c)

**Order on application**—Where a party aggrieved by a decree applies for review the application may either be granted or rejected (r 4 below)

If the application is rejected the case ends there and the parties are relegated to the old decree The order rejecting the application is final and no appeal lies therefrom (r 7) but the party aggrieved may appeal from the old decree

If the application is admitted the case is reheard and it may result in a repetition of the decree or in some variation of it In either case the whole matter having been reopened there is a fresh decree (d) until that fresh decree is passed the old decree remains in suspense (e)

**I Discovery of new and important matter or evidence**—When a review is sought on the ground of the discovery of new evidence the evidence must be (1) relevant and (2) of such a character that if it had been given in the suit it might possibly have altered the judgment (f) As stated by Lord Loreburn LC in *Brown v Dean* (g) It [new evidence] must at least be such as is presumably to be believed and if believed would be conclusive Applications on this ground must be treated with great caution and as required by r 4 (2) (b) the Court must be satisfied that the materials placed before it in accordance with the formalities of the law do prove the existence of the facts alleged (h) It is not only the discovery of new and important evidence that entitles a party to apply for a review but the discovery of any new and important matter which was not within the knowledge of the party when the decree was made A sued B to recover a sum of money alleged to be due under a certain agreement and obtained a decree B appealed to the Privy Council Pending the appeal A brought another suit against B to recover another sum of money alleged to have become due under the same agreement and obtained a decree on the strength of the former decree Their Lordships of the Privy Council reversed the first decree B then applies for a review of the second decree and the application was allowed on the ground that in the circumstances of the

(c) *B b M Ita v Hahs B gam* (1884) 6 All 65  
But see now *Mahad v Lak Am Vayana* n  
(19 ) 49 Bom 839 90 LC 619 ( 5) A B

(a) *Cl Ik I gam Chett J v Lak Am an* (19 0)  
38 M d L J 4 55 LC 444 B t see  
now *M J A I S gh v Hakam H m d*  
(19 3) 1 All L J 416 74 LC 5 8 ( 3)  
A A 570

(b) *Lash Beha v Hem nt* (19 5) 41 Cal L J  
319 88 LC 9 1 ( 5) A C 10 3

(c) *I go ello v Ay t soon* (18 5) 3 All ng 1  
91 LC 509 ( 5) A H 310

(d) *Mad I v Fukha d* (1906) 30 Bom 56

(e) *4 Ay tv Tap ba* (19 4) 48 Bom 210 9  
LC 7 3 ( 4) A B 310

(f) *Appa I In re* (184 ) 10 M d 73 7 13  
A 155 *N v I I v I nchanan* (1918)

45 Cal 60 67 68 A LC 484

(g) (1910) A C at p 374

(h) *Amra j I v Fule am* (1900) 47 Cal 568  
56 LC 744

case the Privy Council decision was new and important matter on which to apply for a review of the second decree (i) This decision stands on the special facts of the case. In *Amrit Lal v. Madho Das* (j) it was held that where a decree is based upon a decision of a Divisional Bench of the High Court and that decision is subsequently overruled by the Full Bench the reversal is no ground for a review of the decree. Nor is the production of a new ruling or authority which if brought to the notice of the Judge at the first hearing might have altered the judgment new and important matter within the meaning of this rule (l) An alteration of the law by subsequent legislation is not discovery of new matter justifying a review (l)

It is not to be supposed that the discovery of new evidence is by itself sufficient to entitle a party to a review of judgment. The provision relating to review contemplates grounds which would *alter or cancel the decree*. Thus if a suit is dismissed on two grounds namely (1) that no notice of suit was given and (2) that the plaintiff was illegitimate and the plaintiff applies for a review on the ground of discovery of new evidence on the question of legitimacy it is a good ground for rejecting the application that even if the Court held on the reception of new evidence that the plaintiff was legitimate it would not lead to the modification or setting aside of the original decree as the want of notice was fatal to the suit (m).

II Mistake or error apparent on the face of the record—A review may be granted whether on any ground urged at the original hearing of the suit or not whenever the Court considers that it is necessary to correct an *evident* error or omission (n). Thus a review was granted where an error on a point of law was apparent on the face of the judgment (o) e.g. failure to apply the law of limitation to the facts found by the Court (p). Similarly a review was granted when the provisions of the second paragraph of s 57o of the Code of 1892 [now s 99 sub s (7)] were wrongly applied (q). A review may also be granted where there is an error of procedure apparent on the face of the record e.g. where judgment is delivered without previous notice to the parties (r). But it is no ground for review that the judgment proceeds on an incorrect exposition of the law (s) or on a ruling which has subsequently been modified (t) or reversed (u). See s 152.

III For any other sufficient reason —These words mean that the reason must be one sufficient to the Court to which the application for review is made and they cannot be held to be limited to the discovery of new and important matter or evidence or the occurring of a mistake or error apparent on the record (v) Thus in *Ghansham v Lal Singh* (w) a reference to a Full Bench was disposed of in the absence of the respondent. The respondent proved that his absence at the hearing was due to the fact that notice of the reference was not served upon him. It was held that this

- (i) *Wagh la v Masi din* (1889) 13 Bom 330  
*Waman v Hari* (1907) 31 Bom 18 *Rem*  
*Lal v Faka P asad* (1911) 33 All 566 10  
 1 C 44 *Blaving Iy v F Ave* (19 )  
 5 Rang 261 103 1 C 8 ( 7) A R 189
- (j) (1884) 6 All 29
- (l) *Ellen v Bashcer* (1876) 1 Cal 184 *Abdul*  
*S diq v Abdul Az* (1899) 1 All 152  
 153
- (i) *Gy aji v Yi g pps* (1908) 5 Bom 431  
 111 1 C 633 ( 8) A B 308
- (m) *V h bi v Collector of Allahabad* (1914) 36  
 All 277 21 1 C 14
- (n) *K lu v Iahr m* (18 7) 1 Bom 543 *CA n*  
*t m v Py ra* (18 0) 6 B L R 126  
*Bute Sheo R t n v Lappu Kwar* (1837  
 5 All 14
- (o) *Sh rup Cha d v Pat Da see* (1887) 14 Cal  
 6 7 *Jat a Moh n v Abki I Chandra*  
 (1897) 24 C 1 334 336 *M r i R o v*  
*B re th D L Ait* (19 3) 46 Mad 9 5  
 761 C 34 (24) A M 83 *Proh K m r*  
*v Nuthar L i* (19 3) 8 C W N 9 8 84
- 1 C 24 ( 4) A C 10 4 (ult di mised  
 though p rt of el im adlitted) *Sury v*  
*F S Chitt jar F* (19 6) 4 Ita 20  
 98 1 C 417 ( ) A R 29 *Ma Rta F v*  
*Ma Pura Ha t* (10 ) 5 Rang 610 105 1 C  
 710 ( 8) A R 1
- (p) *D b Sahas v Basheshar Lal* (19 9) 10 Lah  
 184 11 1 C 340 ( 8) A L 919
- (q) *Mus i R g m v Coll tor of Mus jarn gir*  
 (1 89) 11 All 16
- (r) *Mau g Sein v Ma ng T n* (19 0) 6 Rang  
 794 114 1 C 687 ( 9) A R 0
- (s) *Chh jje R v Vek* (19 0) 49 1 A 144  
 3 Lah 17 721 C 566 ( ) A PC 11
- (t) *G r b d v S rjan Var* (19 4) 3 Pat  
 34 51 C 17 (24) A P 50 Co tra Br  
*dnha v Da od r* (19 ) 9 C W N 143  
 8 1 C 63 ( 5) A C 304
- (u) *Fe lamm v R g no* (19 ) 43 Mad L J  
 33 0 1 C 741 ( ) A M
- (v) *Am r H n* 44 d 14 (188 ) 9 All 36  
*R s r v Hal* e 46001ah (18 6) C 1  
 131 31 A 1
- (w) (1884) 9 All 61



1 or where a suit was dismissed for failure to make up the deficit of Court fee and it was found that the Court fee had been embezzled by a pleader's clerk (k) or where important evidence was produced just after judgment was signed (l) Mukerjee J's anticipation of refined and subtle arguments was realized in a Pangoon case (m) where a Judge held that a reason that was not *ejusdem generis* might still be a reason that was at least analogous

*Chhajju's case* however is the law and has been followed (n). But there are some inconsistencies in the cases which follow it and these serve to illustrate the difficulty of applying the rule. Thus though *Chhajju's case* decided that an incorrect exposition of the law was not a sufficient reason yet in *Murari Rao v. Balwant Dilshit* (o) an error as to the Hindu law of succession was held to be an error patent on the face of the record and again in *Brindaban v. Damodar* (p) the Calcutta High Court reversed its judgment because it construed a leading case in Hindu law in a sense different to that adopted in a subsequent Privy Council decision. Another similar case is *Garibani v. Suraja* (q). In that case a landlord had obtained a decree for rent against tenants of a 12 anna share of a holding and advertised the whole holding for sale. The tenants of the 4 anna share sued to restrain the sale alleging fraud and collusion. The Judge dismissed the suit and then granted a review as a case on which he had relied had been subsequently overruled. In appeal Dawson Miller C.J. admitted that if review was on the ground of error patent on the face of the record no appeal lay under rule 7 but said that in view of *Chhajju's case* it could not be contended that review had proceeded on this ground. He held that the review was on the ground of discovery of new matter and that in this view the condition of rule 4(2)(b) was not fulfilled as the subsequent overruling decision had been published before the trial and accordingly reversed the order for review. Of other cases decided on the rule in *Chhajju's case* to deserve special notice *Bindubashini v. Secretary of State* (r) arose out of a motion by the Collector to hold an inquiry under s. 19 H of the Court Fees Act into the value of an estate. The Government pleader applied for an adjournment to call his evidence but the Judge refused and gave judgment. The Judge then granted a review as the Government pleader was under the impression that the case would not be taken up. This was reversed in revision by Pankin J. as the case was not analogous to excusable failure to bring before the Court new and important matter or evidence and as there was an element of negligence in the case for the Judge had not found that there was any justification for the Government pleader's erroneous impression. The other case *Mahadeo v. Lalshams Narayan* (s) decides that since *Chhajju's case* a plaintiff whose suit has been dismissed under O 9 r 8 has no remedy by way of review.

An execution application that has been dismissed cannot be restored by way of review (t).

When a compromise has been entered into a decree the Court cannot review its order on the sole ground that the compromise has been entered into under undue influence or coercion (u). Nor is review a minor's remedy for setting aside a decree passed through the negligence of his guardian (v). Where a suit is contested by the defendant but on the date fixed for the last hearing his agent admits the plaintiff's claim

(k) *Adi Pr. d. v. Namta* 1A (19) 14 P t 180  
91 I ( 213 ( 2 ) A 1 43

(l) *Rameshwar Dur la P. d* (19 4) 3 P t  
78 84 I ( 320 ( 5 ) A P 36

(m) *F. K. S. A. P. v. Ma. g. Ky* (19 )  
Ra. 1. 675 107 I C 161 (28) A R 31

(n) *P. d. v. M. f. i* (19 3) 2 Pat 6 R I C  
O<sup>o</sup> (25) A I 288 *The application of*  
*Dur la D. A* (19 4) 45 AM 4 8 I. C  
10 ( 4 ) A A 398

(o) (19 3) 46 M d 95 6 I C 34 ( 4 ) A M  
98

(p) (19 ) 90 C W A 118 8 I C 6 ( 2 ) A C  
304

(q) (19 4) 31 at 134 5 I C 1 7 ( 4 ) A P 4  
(r) (19 4) 1 Cal 8 79 I C 745 ( 4 ) A C 7 4

(s) (19 ) 49 Bom 839 90 I C 610 ( 4 )  
A B 1 See 1 as to appeal *Ma. ph. i. r*  
*Hakim* (19 3) 21 All L J 416 4 I C  
528 (23) A A 5 8

(t) *v. n. v. M. the* (19 ) 50 M J 6 9  
I C 1908 ( 6 ) A M 980

(u) *Alam l. v. Ram* (19 ) 43 M d I J 220  
O I C 42 (22) A M 446 1 A L J  
R. ph. d. r. S. ph. (19 6) 48 All 160 89  
I C 946 ( 6 ) A A 50

(v) *Moola v. v. T. Navya* (19 6) 51 Mad L J  
389 98 I C 87 ( 26 ) A M 10 9

in collusion with the plaintiff the case is not one of a review of judgment the remedy of the aggrieved party lies in filing a suit to set aside the decree (w) Where the Court dismissed a suit for default of appearance of the plaintiff on a date which the Court under a mistake supposed to have been fixed for the hearing of the suit and also under a mistake that notice of the hearing on that date was given to the plaintiff it was held by the Pangoon High Court that an application for review would lie (x)

**Review granted on particular ground**—Where a review is granted on a particular ground it is in the discretion of the Court to rehear the whole case or only the particular point on which the review has been granted (y) If the review was granted for additional evidence to be taken that evidence should be taken and any relevant evidence in rebuttal and also any other evidence which the party tendering was prevented from adducing by some cause for which he was not responsible or which it was not reasonable or necessary to call in the absence of that additional evidence Otherwise neither party will be allowed to adduce evidence which was available and which with reasonable diligence could have been produced at the trial (z)

Where an appeal dismissed summarily under O 38 r 11 is admitted on an application for review the appeal is not restricted to the single ground which was made the basis of the application for review (a)

**Order**—An order under O 33 r 7 refusing leave to sue as a pauper is open to review under this rule (b) And so is an order as to costs (c) and an order rejecting an application for leave to appeal to His Majesty in Council (d) But an order under s 39 (h) of the Guardians and Wards Act 1890 is not open to review (e)

Where an appeal has been preferred before application for review—After an appeal has been preferred from a decree no application can be made for a review of that decree This clearly appears from cl (a) of sub r (1) An appeal is not the less preferred within the meaning of this rule though it may be dismissed summarily under O 41 r 11 Hence a party against whom a decree has been passed is precluded after dismissal of his appeal under O 41 r 11 from applying for a review (f) If an appeal is dismissed for default and an application under O 41 r 19 has become time barred review is incompetent (g) So also if an appeal to Privy Council has been dismissed by the High Court for want of prosecution (h) But if the appeal is withdrawn it is as though no appeal had been preferred and hence it is open to the party to apply for a review (i) See notes to O 41 r 27 under the head Or for any other substantial cause

**Filing of appeal pending application for review**—Where an application or review has been presented by a party to the suit and an appeal is afterwards preferred from the same decree whether by the same party or by the other party to the suit the Court to which the application for review is made is not thereby deprived of jurisdiction to entertain the application (j) But that power exists so long as the appeal

- (w) *Bhagwan Dut v Ram Dut* (19 9) 4 Luck 6 (28) A O 418
- (x) *A T K P L M Muthu v Lakshmi naray n* (19 8) 6 Rang 54 111 I C 80 (28) A R 17
- (y) *Hu bans v Thakoor Pr sh d* (1893) 9 Cal 203
- (z) *Bha n am v A. lucia Ch ran* (19 6) 53 Cal 8 6 97 I C 31 (7) A C 31
- (a) *Jannak v th v Pr bhass i* (1916) 43 Cal 178 185 30 I C 398
- (b) *Ada ji v Manakji* (1880) 4 Bom 414
- (c) *Bray v J an n th* (1901) 6 F t L J 84 63 I C 68 (2) A P 1
- (d) *And K hor v J m Gulam* (1912) 39 Cal 1037 17 I C 1
- (e) *Jalla v M gla* (191) Panj Rec No 116 P 400 15 I C 140
- (f) *F mapp v Bharna* (1906) 30 Bom 65
- Hari Ganu v Hari G n* (19 9) 31 Bom

- L.R. 436
- (g) *M phul S gh v Hakim H mid* (19 3) 21 All I C 516 41 C 59 (23) A.A. 576
- (h) *R ta chu d v Damji* (19 7) 29 Bom L P 391 101 I C 766 (7) A B 23
- (i) *P i v Dey* (1883) 7 Bom 37 *Ra n Pra s d v Asa Ram* (19 1) 43 All 288 61 L C 334 (21) A A 197 *Muramun-nusa v Babu R m* (19 3) 45 All 458 73 I C 1016 (3) A A 541 *Ram Baran v Bhagwati* (1905) 47 All 751 89 I C 295 (25) A A 804 *Madhori v Parbati* (19 5) 47 All 831 89 I C 63 (25) A A 55
- (j) *Che n Redd v Peddabo Redd* (1909) 32 Mad 416 21 I C 60 (F B) *Varayan v Laxmibai* (1914) 33 Bom 416 23 I C 513 *Pyari Mohan v Kalu Khan* (1917) 44 Cal 1011 41 I C 497

r 1 or where a suit was dismissed for failure to make up the deficit of Court fee and it was found that the Court fee had been embezzled by a pleader's clerk (l) or where important evidence was produced just after judgment was signed (l) Mukerjee J's anticipation of refined and subtle arguments was realized in a Pangoon case (m) where a Judge held that a reason that was not *ejusdem generis* might still be a reason that was at least analogous.

*Chhajju's case* however is the law and has been followed (n). But there are some inconsistencies in the cases which follow it and these serve to illustrate the difficulty of applying the rule. Thus though *Chhajju's case* decided that an incorrect exposition of the law was not a sufficient reason yet in *Murari Rao v Balwant Dikshit* (o) an error as to the Hindu law of succession was held to be an error patent on the face of the record and again in *Brinlabau v Damodar* (p) the Calcutta High Court reviewed its judgment because it construed a leading case in Hindu law in a sense different to that adopted in a subsequent Privy Council decision. Another similar case is *Guribani v Suraja* (q). In that case a landlord had obtained a decree for rent against tenants of a 12 anna share of a holding and advertised the whole holding for sale. The tenants of the 4 anna share sued to restrain the sale alleging fraud and collusion. The Judge dismissed the suit and then granted a review as a case on which he had relied had been subsequently overruled. In appeal Dawson Miller C.J. admitted that if review was on the ground of error patent on the face of the record no appeal lay under rule 7 but said that in view of *Chhajju's case* it could not be contended that review had proceeded on this ground. He held that the review was on the ground of discovery of new matter and that in this view the condition of rule 4 (2) (b) was not fulfilled as the subsequent overruling decision had been published before the trial and accordingly reversed the order for review. Of other cases decided on the rule in *Chhajju's case* to deserve special notice *Bindubashini v Secretary of State* (r) arose out of a motion by the Collector to hold an inquiry under s. 19 H of the Court Fees Act into the value of an estate. The Government pleader applied for an adjournment to call his evidence but the Judge refused and gave judgment. The Judge then granted a review as the Government pleader was under the impression that the case would not be taken up. This was reversed in revision by Pankin J. as the case was not analogous to excusable failure to bring before the Court new and important matter or evidence and as there was an element of negligence in the case for the Judge had not found that there was any justification for the Government pleader's erroneous impression. The other case *Mahadeo v Lalcham Narayan* (s) decides that since *Chhajju's case* a plaintiff whose suit has been dismissed under O 9 r 8 has no remedy by way of review.

An execution application that has been dismissed cannot be restored by way of review (t).

When a compromise has been entered into a decree the Court cannot review its order on the sole ground that the compromise has been entered into under undue influence or coercion (u). Nor is review a minor's remedy for setting aside a decree passed through the negligence of his guardian (v). Where a suit is contested by the defendant but on the date fixed for the last hearing his agent admits the plaintiff's claim

- (l) *Idut Pr 1 v Ram Narain* (19) 4 P t 180  
91 L C 213 (A) 1 43  
(i) *Ram Narain v Dutt* (19) 4 P t 180  
8 R 41 C 30 (A) 1 43  
(n) *Fri K A v R v V v Kya* (19)  
5 R 10 C 101 (A) 4 R 31  
(n) *Naq v Moh* (19) 3 P t 180  
8 R 41 C 30 (A) 1 43  
(o) *Dworkin D A* (19) 4 A R 245 S I C  
10 (24) A A 34  
(p) (19) 3 A R 45 S I C 34 (24) A M  
94  
(q) (19) 3 A R 45 S I C 34 (2) A C  
304

- (r) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(s) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(t) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(u) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(v) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(w) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(x) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(y) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(z) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(aa) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ab) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ac) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ad) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ae) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(af) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ag) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ah) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ai) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(aj) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ak) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(al) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(am) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(an) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ao) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ap) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(aq) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ar) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(as) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(at) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(au) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(av) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(aw) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ax) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ay) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(az) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ba) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(bb) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(bc) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(bd) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(be) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(bf) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(bg) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(bh) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(bi) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(bj) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(bk) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(bl) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(bm) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(bn) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(bo) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(bp) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(bq) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(br) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(bs) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(bt) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(bu) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(bv) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(bw) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(bx) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(by) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(bz) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ca) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(cb) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(cc) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(cd) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ce) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(cf) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(cg) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ch) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ci) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(cj) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ck) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(cl) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(cm) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(cn) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(co) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(cp) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(cq) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(cr) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(cs) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ct) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(cu) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(cv) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(cw) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(cx) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(cy) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(cz) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(da) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(db) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(dc) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(dd) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(de) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(df) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(dg) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(dh) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(di) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(dj) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(dk) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(dl) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(dm) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(dn) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(do) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(dp) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(dq) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(dr) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ds) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(dt) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(du) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(dv) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(dw) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(dx) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(dy) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(dz) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ea) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(eb) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ec) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ed) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ee) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ef) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(eg) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(eh) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ei) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ej) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ek) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(el) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(em) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(en) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(eo) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ep) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(eq) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(er) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(es) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(et) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(eu) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ev) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ew) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ex) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ey) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ez) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(fa) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(fb) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(fc) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(fd) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(fe) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ff) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(fg) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(fh) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(fi) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(fj) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(fk) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(fl) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(fm) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(fn) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(fo) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(fp) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(fq) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(fr) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(fs) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ft) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(fu) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(fv) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(fw) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(fx) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(fy) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(fz) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ga) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(gb) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(gc) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(gd) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ge) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(gf) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(gg) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(gh) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(gi) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(gj) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(gk) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(gl) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(gm) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(gn) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(go) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(gp) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(gq) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(gr) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(gs) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(gt) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(gu) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(gv) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(gw) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(gx) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(gy) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(gz) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ha) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(hb) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(hc) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(hd) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(he) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(hf) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(hg) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(hh) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(hi) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(hj) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(hk) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(hl) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(hm) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(hn) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ho) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(hp) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(hq) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(hr) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(hs) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ht) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(hu) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(hv) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(hw) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(hx) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(hy) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(hz) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ia) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ib) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ic) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(id) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ie) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(if) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ig) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ih) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ii) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ij) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ik) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(il) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(im) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(in) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(io) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ip) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(iq) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ir) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(is) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(it) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(iu) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(iv) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(iw) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ix) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(iy) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(iz) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ja) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(jb) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(jc) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(jd) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(je) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(jf) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(jg) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(jh) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ji) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(jj) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(jk) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(jl) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(jm) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(jn) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(jo) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(jp) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(jq) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(jr) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(js) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(jt) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ju) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(jv) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(jw) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(jx) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(jy) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(jz) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ka) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(kb) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(kc) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(kd) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ke) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(kf) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(kg) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(kh) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ki) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(kj) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(kk) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(kl) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(km) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(kn) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ko) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(kp) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(kq) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(kr) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ks) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(kt) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ku) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(kv) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(kw) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(kx) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ky) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(kz) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(la) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(lb) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(lc) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ld) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(le) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(lf) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(lg) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(lh) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(li) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(lj) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(lk) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ll) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(lm) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ln) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(lo) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(lp) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(lq) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(lr) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ls) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(lt) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(lu) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(lv) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(lw) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(lx) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ly) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(lz) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ma) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(mb) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(mc) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(md) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(me) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(mf) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(mg) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(mh) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(mi) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(mj) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(mk) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ml) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(mn) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(mo) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(mp) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(mq) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(mr) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ms) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(mt) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(mu) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(mv) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(mw) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(mx) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(my) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(mz) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(na) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(nb) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(nc) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(nd) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ne) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(nf) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ng) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(nh) (19) 4 P t 134 I C 177 (24) A P 2  
(ni) (19) 4 P

in collusion with the plaintiff the case is not one of a review of judgment the remedy of the aggrieved party lies in filing a suit to set aside the decree (u) Where the Court dismissed a suit for default of appearance of the plaintiff on a date which the Court under a mistake supposed to have been fixed for the hearing of the suit and also under a mistake that notice of the hearing on that date was given to the plaintiff it was held by the Rangoon High Court that an application for review could lie (x)

**Review granted on particular ground**—Where a review is granted on a particular ground it is in the discretion of the Court to rehear the whole case or only the particular point on which the review has been granted (y) If the review was granted for additional evidence to be taken that evidence should be taken and any relevant evidence in rebuttal and also any other evidence which the party tendering was prevented from adducing by some cause for which he was not responsible or which it was not reasonable or necessary to call in the absence of that additional evidence Otherwise neither party will be allowed to adduce evidence which was available and which with reasonable diligence could have been produced at the trial ( )

Where an appeal dismissed summarily under O 33 r 11 is admitted on an application for review the appeal is not restricted to the single ground which was made the basis of the application for review (a)

**Order**—An order under O 33 r 7 refusing leave to sue as a pauper is open to review under this rule (b) And so is an order as to costs (c) and an order rejecting an application for leave to appeal to His Majesty in Council (d) But an order under s 39 (h) of the Guardians and Wards Act 1890 is not open to review (e)

Where an appeal has been preferred before application for review—After an appeal has been preferred from a decree no application can be made for a review of that decree This clearly appears from cl (a) of sub r (1) An appeal is not the less preferred within the meaning of this rule though it may be dismissed summarily under O 41 r 11 Hence a party against whom a decree has been passed is precluded after dismissal of his appeal under O 41 r 11 from applying for a review (f) If an appeal is dismissed for default and an application under O 41 r 19 has become time barred review is incompetent (g) So also if an appeal to Privy Council has been dismissed by the High Court for want of prosecution (h) But if the appeal is withdrawn it is as though no appeal had been preferred and hence it is open to the party to apply for a review (i) See notes to O 41 r 27 under the head Or for any other substantial

**Filing of appeal pending application for review**—Where an application or review has been presented by a party to the suit and an appeal is afterwards preferred from the same decree whether by the same party or by the other party to the suit the Court to which the application for review is made is not thereby deprived of jurisdiction to entertain the application (j) But that power exists so long as the appeal

- (w) *Bhagwan Dut v Ram Dut* (19 9) 4 Luck 78 (28) 4 O 418
- (x) *A T K P L M Mathu v Lakshminarayana* (19 8) 6 Rang 254 111 I C 80 (-8) A R 17
- (y) *H rha v Thakoor Pr shad* (1883) 9 Cal 202
- (z) *Bhasi ram v Ambica (har)* (19 6) 53 Cal 856 97 I C 731 ( 7) A C 31
- (a) *J n Li Nath v Pr bhasi* (1916) 43 Cal 178 185 30 I C 398
- (b) *Ida j v M nidya* (1880) 4 Bom 414
- (c) *Braya v J gan* (har) (19 1) 6 Pat L J 284 63 I C 68 (-) A P 1
- (d) *Nand Kisho v Jam Gulam* (1912) 39 Cal 1037 17 I C 21
- (e) *Ralla v Ma glori* (191 ) Punj Rec No 116 p 400 15 I C 140
- (f) *Pamappa v Bharna* (1906) 30 Bom 65
- (g) *Hari Ga m v Hari Ganu* (1909) 31 Bom

- L R 436
- (y) *Ma phul Singh v Hakim Hamid* (19 3) 21 All I J 416 41 C 5-8 ( 3) A A 676
- (h) *Pata chand v Damji* (19 7) 29 Bom L R 391 101 I C 766 ( 7) A B 23
- (i) *Pandu v Durga* (1893) 7 Bom 37 *Ram Prasad v An Ram* (19 1) 43 All 288 61 I C 334 ( 1) A A 197 *Mariamun nissa v Babu R m* (19 3) 45 All 458 73 I C 1016 ( 3) A A 541 *Ram Baran v Bhagwati* (19 5) 47 All 71 89 I C 295 ( 5) A A 804 *Madh ri v Parbati* (19 5) 47 All 881 83 I C 653 (23) A A 55
- (j) *Chen a Reddi v Peddabob Redd* (1909) 32 Mad 416 I C 80 [F B] *Narayan v Lazimban* (1914) 33 Bom 416 3 I C 513 *Pyari Mohan v Katu Khan* (1917) 44 Cal 1021 41 I C 497



7,  
2

is not heard because once the appeal is heard the decree on appeal is the final decree in the case and the application for review of judgment of the Court of first instance can no longer be proceeded with (k) And this is so even if the appeal is dismissed under O 41 r 11 (l) On the other hand, if the application for review is granted and a new decree is passed the appeal cannot be heard and it must be dismissed, for the decree appealed from is superseded by the new decree (m)

No review allowed on a question of fact after decision of second appeal—The High Court cannot in second appeal allow an application for a review of judgment on the ground of discovery of new evidence after the appeal is disposed of by that Court. The reason is that the High Court is bound in second appeal by the findings of fact of the lower appellate Court. But if the application is made before the disposal of the appeal it may be a ground for allowing the appellant to withdraw the appeal to enable him to apply to the lower appellate Court for a review of its judgment on the ground of discovery of new evidence (n)

Application to set aside order made by another Judge—One Judge of a High Court cannot set aside an order made by another Judge of that Court even though the order be wrong. The remedy lies in review on the grounds mentioned in this rule (o)

Review of judgment passed in appeals preferred under cl. 15 of the Letters Patent—It is competent to the High Court to review judgments passed in appeals preferred under cl. 15 of the Letters Patent. The words decree or order include a judgment (p)

Commissioner—A commissioner for taking accounts has no power of review under this order but before his report is submitted he may reopen the inquiry into any item on grounds analogous to those of this rule (q)

## 2 [S 624] An application for review of a decree or order of a Court, not being a High Court, upon some ground other than the discovery of such new and important matter or

To whom applications for review may be made

evidence as is referred to in rule 1 or the existence of a clerical or arithmetical mistake or error apparent on the face of the decree, shall be made only to the Judge who passed the decree or made the order sought to be reviewed, but any such application may, if the Judge who passed the decree or made the order has ordered notice to issue under rule 4, sub rule (2), proviso (a) be disposed of by his successor

- (k) *Pyar Mohan v Kals Khan* (191) 44 Cal 1011 1015 1016 41 I C 497 *Gor v Vud ad b* (19) 6 C I L J 84 31 C 34 (J) A C 113 *Q a e s s to e a s o m i n g u d r o 4 r 1 (2)?*
- (l) *Sh. appa v Ram* (190) 46 Bom I 631 C 910 (2) 4 B 150
- (m) *Kanh v Lal v H d o l a s d* (1906) 8 All 240 *Brijbasi Lal v S I J P m* (191) 34 All 28 141 C 4 *P v M I v A I Aha* (191) 44 Cal 1011 41 I C 49 *Bast sha Vath v Ram Kaul D* (1919) Punj P c No 140 p 361 54 I C 966 *M Iava Pam v Madan Gop I* (1919) Punj Bee No 166 p 445 55 I C 63 *Shudramappa v Gurusantappa* (19 9) 31 Bom L.R. 137 116 L C 27 (9) A B 183
- (n) *V d Krishna v Ue* (Her of the p id of (1910) 32 All I 41 C 809 *Paru A d v U mad* (189) 18 Mad 450 *Panchanan v Radhanath* (18 0) 4 B L R A C 13 *P J v Ea* (1914) 41 Cal 80 61 C 81 *Som Sula Dala v Gafal ar* (1905) 7 C W N 918 01 C 404 (2) A C 165 *Hari Ganu v Na Go u* (1903) 31 Bom L.R. 436
- (o) *Bacanta K m v Kusum K mari* (1917) 44 Cal 28 33 I C 54
- (p) *I e kata Subd r jad* (1917) 40 Mad 651 I C 83 *Ras hand v D J* (19 7) 23 Bom. L. E 371 102 I C 66 (7) A B 3
- (q) *Farna dez v I Iruques* (19 3) 47 Bom 92 8 I C 93 (4) A B 31

To whom application for review may be made —This is s 624 recast with proviso (c) to s 620 superadded to it. The alteration of language does not involve any alteration of law.

Rule 1 sub r (1) provide that the application for review of a decree or order should be made to the Court which passed the decree or order sought to be reviewed. That rule read with the present rule leads to the following propositions —

I Where a decree is passed by a *High Court Judge* the application for review of the decree may be made to that Judge or to his successor in office whatever be the ground on which the review is sought.

II (1) Where a decree is passed by a *Judge other than a High Court Judge* the application for review of the decree may be made to the Judge who delivered the judgment or to his successor in office provided the review is sought on the ground of—

(a) the discovery of new and important matter or evidence or

(b) some clerical or arithmetical mistake or error apparent on the face of the decree.

(2) Where a decree is passed by a *Judge other than a High Court Judge* and the review is sought not upon the grounds mentioned above but upon other grounds the application shall be made to the very Judge who passed the decree. It cannot be made to his successor in office (r). Thus if a review is sought of a decree passed by a Judge other than a High Court Judge on the ground of a supposed error of judgment (a) or if a review is sought of an order made by such a Judge on the ground that the order was made in the absence of the applicant and without giving him notice of the hearing (f) the application for review shall be made only to the Judge who passed the decree or made the order. Such an application however may be disposed of by the successor of the Judge who passed the decree provided that the Judge who passed the decree has ordered notice to issue under rule 4 sub rule (2) proviso (a). It is not necessary that the application should also be disposed of by the Judge who passed the decree (u).

Rule 5 provides for the hearing of applications for review.

**3 [S 625]** The provisions as to the form of preferring appeals shall apply, *mutatis mutandis*, to applications for review.

Form of applications for review

This rule relates to form and does not enlarge the right. It does not make O 43 r 1 (t) applicable to a refusal to restore an application for review (v).

**4 [S 626]** (1) Where it appears to the Court that there is not sufficient ground for a review, it shall reject the application.

Application where rejected

(2) Where the Court is of opinion that the application for review should be granted, it shall grant the same.

Application where granted

Provided that—

(a) no such application shall be granted without previous notice to the opposite party, to enable him to

(r) *S. 624 v. S. 620 (1880) 14 M.L.J. 667*  
*1880* *S. 624 v. S. 620 (1880) 14 M.L.J. 667*  
*me 4 (1880) 7 M.L.J. 493*  
*Chaudh v. B. H. G. (1880) 47 All. 51*  
*I.C. 9 (1) A. 4804*

(s) *B. Hari Lal v. M. N. Lal (1880) 14 M.L.J. 667*  
*(t) A. H. v. D. H. (1880) 14 M.L.J. 667*  
*(u) C. N. v. J. N. (1880) 14 M.L.J. 667*  
*(v) G. N. v. J. N. (1880) 14 M.L.J. 667*

r 4

to appear and be heard in support of the decree or order, a review of which is applied for and

- (b) no such application shall be granted on the ground of discovery of new matter or evidence which the applicant alleges was not within his knowledge, or could not be adduced by him when the decree or order was passed or made, without strict proof of such allegation

**Alterations in the rule**—The words and the Judge shall record with his order his reason for such opinion which occurred in the old section after the words it shall grant the same in sub r (2) have been omitted. Those words were construed by the Privy Council as being no more than a direction to the Judge how to act when he had decided to grant the application (w)

**No such application shall be granted without previous notice to the opposite party**—The expression opposite party means the party interested to support the order sought to be vacated or modified upon the application for review. When an appeal is summarily dismissed under O 41 r 11 the order of dismissal may be set aside on an ex parte application for review without notice to the respondent. The respondent in such a case cannot be said to be the opposite party within the meaning of cl. (a) of this rule (x)

**New matter or evidence**—The effect of this expression is the same as if the words were new and important matter or evidence as in rule 1 above (y)

**Strict proof**—As to the meaning of the words strict proof in sub r (2) cl. (b) see notes to r 7 below. Sub rule (1) cl. (b) application in contravention of provisions of rule (4)

**Form**—As to form of notice required by sub r 2 (a) see App G form no 14.

**Second application for review**—See notes under the same head to r 7 below

**Death of party pending review**—The order granting a review only holds the judgment in suspense. The death of a party does not therefore cause the suit or appeal to abate (z)

**Appeal**—It is provided in general terms by O 43 r 1 cl. (w) that an appeal lies from an order under this rule granting an application for review. The High Courts of Calcutta Patna Rangoon and Lahore have held that cl. (w) is to be read with and subject to rule 7 (1) below so that an appeal lies only on the grounds mentioned in that rule (a). The Bombay High Court held in one case (b) that the appeal is against the order granting the review quite irrespective of the limitation contained in rule 1. Subsequent to this decision the Bombay High Court deleted cl. (w) from the rule so that there is no appeal now except on the grounds mentioned in rule 1 below (c). See notes to r 7 under the head Appeal

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>(w) <i>Shahar Baksh v. B. I. et al.</i> (1900) 7 Cal 333. — I A 79</p> <p>(x) <i>Janaki Nath v. Prabhat</i> (1916) 43 C 1 18, 30 I C 898 dissenting from <i>Abdul Hakim v. Hem Chandra</i> (1915) 42 C 1 433 30 I C 16. <i>Official Trustee of Bengal v. Benode B. I. et al.</i> (1904) 51 Cal 943 84 I C 147 (25) A C 114. But see <i>Varajana v. Muthu</i> (19 7) 50 Mad 6 97 I C 1008 ( 8) A M 980</p> <p>(y) <i>Ch. anj. Lal v. Tulsi</i> (19 0) 4 Cal 568 56 I C 734 (F B)</p> <p>(z) <i>Achyut v. Tapidas</i> (19 4) 48 Bom 10 9 I C 753 (4) A B 310</p> <p>(a) <i>Hari Charan v. B. an Khan</i> (1914) 41 Cal 746 25 I C 903. <i>Abd v. Mehend s Lal</i></p> | <p>(1915) 42 Cal 830 9 I C. 8. <i>Andalal v. Pa. chan</i> (1918) 45 C 1 80 8 4 I C 484. <i>Sunder Mali v. Upendra Nath</i> (1916) 1 Pat L J 193 35 I C 15 A T K P L M. <i>Muthu v. Lakshmi Narayan</i> (1908) 6 Rang 154 111 I C 80 ( 3) A B 177. <i>Lau Jin v. Ma Mya</i> (19 9) 7 Rang 15 118 I C 10 ( 2) A B 105. <i>Sukandar v. Boland</i> (19 0) 8 Lah 617</p> <p>(b) <i>Daso v. Karbasappa</i> (19 2) 2 Bom L R 1448 94 I C 531 ( 6) A B 11</p> <p>(c) <i>Kunverra v. Pilamberdas</i> (19 0) 2 Bom L R 1355. <i>Shidramappa v. Gura shanappa</i> (19 9) 31 Bom L R 13 116 I C — (22) A B 153</p> |
|--|--|

5 [S 627] Where the Judge or Judges, or any one of the Judges, who passed the decree or made the order, a review of which is applied for, continues or continue attached to the Court at the time when the application

Application for review in Court consists of two or more Judges

for a review is presented, and is not or are not precluded by absence or other cause for a period of six months next after the application from considering the decree or order to which the application refers, such Judge or Judges or any of them shall hear the application, and no other Judge or Judges of the Court shall hear the same

6 [S 628] (1) Where the application for a review is heard by more than one Judge and the Court is equally divided, the application shall be rejected

Application where rejected

(2) Where there is a majority, the decision shall be according to the opinion of the majority

7 [S 629] (1) An order of the Court rejecting the application shall not be appealable, but an order granting an application may be objected to on the ground that the application was—

Order of rejection not appealable. Objections to order granting application

- (a) in contravention of the provisions of rule 2,
- (b) in contravention of the provisions of rule 4, or
- (c) after the expiration of the period of limitation prescribed therefor and without sufficient cause

Such objection may be taken at once by an appeal from the order granting the application or in any appeal from the final decree or order passed or made in the suit

(2) Where the application has been rejected in consequence of the failure of the applicant to appear he may apply for an order to have the rejected application restored to the file, and, where it is proved to the satisfaction of the Court that he was prevented by any sufficient cause from appearing when such application was called on for hearing, the Court shall order it to be restored to the file upon such terms as to costs or otherwise as it thinks fit and shall appoint a day for hearing the same

(3) No order shall be made under sub rule (2) unless notice of the application has been served on the opposite party

### Alterations in the rule —

- 1 The words shall not be appealable have been substituted for the word final This is merely a verbal alteration
- 2 The words the Court shall order it to be restored in sub r (2) have been substituted for the words the Court may order it to be restored.
- 3 The last paragraph of the old section has been transferred to r 9

### Appeal—

(i) *Order rejecting application for review*—No appeal lies under the Code from an order rejecting an application for review Nor does an appeal lie from such an order under cl 15 of the Letters Patent for that clause is controlled by the express provisions of this rule which says that such an order shall not be appealable and even if it is not so controlled an order rejecting an application for review is not a judgment within the meaning of that clause (d) Nor is the order open to revision under s 115 of the Code for even if it is wrong it is no more than an erroneous exercise of discretion ( ) But where there is no exercise of discretion at all as where the Court rejects the application not after considering whether there are sufficient grounds for review [r 4 sub r 1] but on the erroneous view that it has no jurisdiction to entertain the application, the order is open to revision, for it is then a case of failure to exercise a jurisdiction vested in the Court by law (f)

(ii) *Order granting application for review*—An appeal lies from an order granting an application for review O 43 r 1 cl. (w) But as provided by sub-r 1 it lies only in the three cases mentioned therein, for otherwise the provisions of sub-r (1) so far as they relate to appeal would be quite superfluous [see notes to r 4 above Appeal.] In cases other than those specified in the rule no appeal lies from an order granting a review either under this rule or under cl 15 of the Letters Patent (g) Thus if an appeal is preferred from an order admitting an application for review on the ground that the alleged sufficient reason for which the application was admitted did not constitute sufficient reason within the meaning of r 1 of this Order the appeal should not be entertained (h) Nor is the order appealable solely on the ground that the application for review was time barred (i) There must be an error both as to limitation and in the application of the rule as to sufficient reason If the appeal is entertained the order of the appellate Court will be set aside in revision under s 115 on the ground of material irregularity (j)

- (d) *Achaya v Rat arcis* (1886) 9 Mad 3  
*Tirmal v Kanha ya* (19 3) 45 AH 53  
 84 I C 58 (3) A 3 6
- (e) *P m L v Ratan Lal* (1904) 26 AH 572  
*Lalshim n v M ruts* (19 3) 6 Bom L  
 P 284 80 I C 267 (24) A B 344
- (f) *Alô r Kh n v Muhammad Ali Khan* (1909)  
 31 All 610 4 I C 23
- (g) *Bomb / a d Per ia Steam Navigation Co  
 v Zuari* (1888) 12 Bom 171 *Munoo  
 Ram v Bishen Perkash* (1897) 4 Cal  
 88 *Darya Bibi v Bad Prasad* (1896)  
 15 All 44 *Audhoy Ch ra v Shamont*  
 (1899) 16 Cal 88 *Khurshed Alam Khan  
 v R amat Hal Kh n* (1912) 40 All 68  
 43 I C 490 *N ndalal M Buck v P cha  
 na* (1918) 45 Cal 60 4 I C 434  
*S / Na n v K / Beh ri* (19 1) 25  
 C.W.N 884 66 I C 909 (1) A C 66  
*M / v A ja Behari* (19 ) 44 AH  
 605 6 I C 31 (—) A 4 206 I k ta

- v Fee a* (19 4) 46 M d L J 463 83 L C  
 548 (24) A M 80 *Meeh v D ya* (1905)  
 29 C W N 10 80 I C 456 (6) A L  
 243 *Sundar v Habib Chk* (19 0) 4 All  
 6 7 60 I C 81 *Mallam Sa an v P r  
 bat* (19 5) 47 All 891 83 I C 6 1  
 (—) A A 55 *Sri rana v Official In-  
 s / a* (190 ) 50 M d 891 103 L C 5  
 (7) A M 641 *Sik nder Kaa v S and  
 Khan* (1907) 8 Lah 617 100 L C 907  
 (27) A L 435 *B Khan M / v Gk Lam  
 Hassan* (1903) 9 Lah 38 22 L C 313  
 (8) A L 603
- (h) *Ali Akba v Khurshad Ali* (190 ) 27 All  
 695 *Ismail v / a a* (1913) Punj Rec  
 no 11 P 45 16 I C 925.
- (i) *Khurshed Alam Khan v Rahmat Ali Khan*  
 (1918) 40 AH 63 43 I C 490
- (j) *Abdul Sadig v Abdul Aziz* (1900) 1 All  
 1

(iii) *Second appeal from order passed in appeal under this rule*—No second appeal lies from an order passed in appeal from an order granting an application for review. This is now sufficiently clear from the provisions of O 43 r 1 cl. (v) read with s 104 sub s (2). A applies for a review and the application is granted. B appeals from the order granting the application. Whether the appellate Court confirms or sets aside the order of the lower Court, no second appeal lies to the High Court from the order of the appellate Court (1).

(iv) *Appeal from order refusing to readmit application for review dismissed for default under sub rule (2)*—No appeal lies from an order refusing to readmit an application for review of judgment which has been dismissed for default under sub-rule (2) (i)

Sub rule (1) (b) In contravention of the provision of rule 4 —It is provided by r 4 above that no application for review should be granted on the ground of discovery of new matter without *strict proof* of the allegation as to such discovery. The words *strict proof* mean proof according to the formalities of law. Where an order therefore is made granting a review on proof of discovery of new matter according to the formalities of law no appeal lies from the order on the ground that the evidence adduced in proof of the allegation as to discovery of new matter was not sufficient to prove the allegation. The words *strict proof* do not refer to *sufficiency of proof* in securing the conviction of the judicial mind on the fact in dispute (m)

**Grounds of objection in appeal**—An order granting an application for review can only be objected to upon the three grounds specified in the rule and no other whether the objection is taken by an appeal from the order (n) or in an appeal from the final decree passed in the suit (o). The appellate Court can interfere if a review has been granted on insufficient grounds (r).

**Second application for review**—Though no appeal lies from an order rejecting an application for review it does not preclude a second application for review on ground *different* from those taken in the first application (q)

Where application for review is time barred.—The period for an application for review of judgment by a Provincial Court of Small Causes is 15 days from the date of the decree by the High Court in the exercise of its original jurisdiction 20 days and by other Courts 90 days [Limitation Act 1908 arts 171 162 173] and the applicant is entitled under s 12 of the Limitation Act to deduct time spent in obtaining copy of the decree (r) But the Court may admit the application after the period of limitation if the applicant satisfies the Court that he had sufficient cause for not making the application within the prescribed period [Limitation Act 1908 s 5] Where a second application for review is made after the period of limitation the mere fact that the second application was not made because the first was pending does not constitute sufficient cause for admitting the second (s) If an application for review is admitted after the period of limitation on the ground that the applicant has shown sufficient cause the order granting the application may be appealed from as provided by cl (c) of sub r (1) and the order

(k) See *Than S ng h* v *Chundun S s gh* (1885)  
11 Cal 1130 *Gopal Das v A f K h* n  
(1859) 11 All 383 *Payayya v Chela  
mayya* (1883) 1 Mad 1 *Pa li Chun  
d* *Valit am* (18 ) v Cal 310 See  
also *Bala Bhi a* (1859) 13 Bom 490

(l) *Barrat Ali v Ma ng Aug* (19 ) 6 Rang  
1 1 10 I C 708 (27) A.L. 04

(m) *Abd v Afahnd* (1915) 4 Cal 830 9  
1 C S *Baz Nemathu v E m m* f  
1 bu (1918) 4 Bom 95 46 I C 14  
*va Julal M Dick v P m n* *McKerjee*  
(1918) 45 Cal 60 4 I C 484 *thura Julal  
v Tla m* (19 0) 47 C 1 504 56 I C  
34 F B 1

( ) *Ki f d v Rahm tull f* (1918) 40 All 68  
43 I C 490  
(a) *Lari Churn Gob nd Presl d* (1895)  
Cil 884  
(b) *Vrupa f rit* (19 6) 30 C W V 94 8  
I C D (6) A C 37  
(c) *Gob f R m v El ta th* (1558) 15 Cal  
48 *Paius v Math a* (1916) 33 All  
85 S I C. 6 II rs S gh v  
*Al Hammod* (19 7) 8 Lah 54 10 I C 5 3  
(27) A.L. 200  
(d) *Fur l v Um r* (19 ) Lah L J 1 9 89  
I C 10 9 (5) A L S  
(e) *iam n v Mal r* (190 ) 6 Rom 42

may be set aside in appeal if the appellate Court holds that there was not sufficient cause for admitting the application after the period of limitation (f)

**Review granted without jurisdiction**—If a review is granted in a case where the Court has no jurisdiction to grant it it is not clear whether an appeal lies from the order granting the review. But the order being one made without jurisdiction, it comes within the purview of s. 115 and is therefore open to revision (u). The High Court will not interfere in revision solely on the ground that the Judge granting the review had omitted to record that the additional evidence was important (v). It has been held that no appeal lies if the review is granted in the inherent jurisdiction (w).

**8 [S. 630]** When an application for review is granted, a note thereof shall be made in the register and the Court may at once rehear the case or make such order in regard to the rehearing as it thinks fit.

Registry of application granted and order for rehearing

**9 [S. 629 Last para]** No application to review an order made on an application for a review or a decree or order passed or made on a review shall be entertained.

Bar of certain applications

See notes to r. 7 above. Second application for review

## ORDER XLVIII

### Miscellaneous

**1 [S. 93] (1)** Every process issued under this Code shall be served at the expense of the party on whose behalf it is issued, unless the Court otherwise directs.

Process to be served at expenses of party issuing

**(2)** The Court fee chargeable for such service shall be paid within a time to be fixed before the process is issued.

Costs of service

**2 [S. 94]** All orders, notices and other documents required by this Code to be given to or served on any person shall be served in the manner provided for the service of summons.

Orders and notices how served

**3 [S. 644]** The forms given in the appendices, with such variation as the circumstances of each case may require, shall be used for the purposes therein mentioned.

Use of forms in appendices

(i) *Madho Das v. R. Kman* (1880) 2 All. 8  
(u) *Ra. a. adha v. Naaya an* (1903) 27 Mad. 60  
607 *Chundal v. Sa. u. a.* (199) 1 Bom. 309

(v) *Srin. case v. Official Assignee* (1907) 50 Mad. 801  
103 I. C. 377 (27) A. M. 641  
(w) *Basanta v. Abhay* (193) 37 Cal. L. J. 99  
31 C. 309 (3) A. C. 450

## ORDER XLIX

*Chartered High Courts*

**1 [S 636]** Notice to produce documents, summonses to witnesses, and every other judicial process, issued in the exercise of the original civil jurisdiction of the High Court, and of its matrimonial, testamentary and intestate jurisdictions except summonses to defendants, writs of execution and notices to respondents may be served by the attorneys in the suits, or by persons employed by them, or by such other persons as the High Court by any rule or order, directs

Who may serve processes of High Court

Persons employed by them—These are persons in the regular service of the attorney. Notice cannot be served by a village headman specially employed for the purpose (x)

**2 [New]** Nothing in this schedule shall be deemed to limit or otherwise affect any rules in force at the commencement of this Code for the taking of evidence or the recording of judgments and orders by a Chartered High Court

Saving in respect of Chartered High Courts

**3 [Cf S 638]** The following rules shall not apply to any Chartered High Court in the exercise of its ordinary or extraordinary original Civil jurisdiction, namely—

Application of rules

- (1) rule 10 and rule 11, clauses (b) and (c), of Order VII,
- (2) rule 3 of Order X,
- (3) Rule 2 of Order XVI,
- (4) rules 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15 and 16 (so far as relates to the manner of taking evidence) of Order XVIII,
- (5) rules 1 to 8 of Order XX, and
- (6) rule 7 of Order XXXIII (so far as relates to the making of a memorandum),

and rule 35 of Order XLI shall not apply to any such High Court in the exercise of its appellate jurisdiction

Additional rule made by the Bombay High Court under s 122—See Appendix III below



## ORDER L

*Provincial Small Cause Courts*

r 1      1 [New] The provisions hereinafter specified shall not extend to Courts constituted under the Provincial Small Cause Courts' Act, 188., or to Courts exercising the jurisdiction of a Court of Small Causes under that Act, that is to say

(a) so much of this schedule as relates to—

- (i) suits excepted from the cognizance of a Court of Small Causes or the execution of decrees in such suits,
- (ii) the execution of decrees against immovable property or the interest of a partner in partnership property,
- (iii) the settlement of issues, and

(b) the following rules and orders,—

- Order II, r 1 (frame of suit),
- Order X, r 3 (record of examination of parties),
- Order XV, except so much of rule 4 as provides for the pronouncement at once of judgment,
- Order XVIII, rules 5 to 12 (evidence),
- Orders XLI to XLV (appeals),
- Order XLVII, rules 2, 3, 5, 6, 7 (review),
- Order LI

See s 7 and notes thereto

## ORDER LI

*Presidency Small Cause Courts*

r 1      1 [New] Save as provided in rules 22 and 23 of Order V, rules 4 and 7 of Order XXI, and rule 4 of Order XXVI, and by the Presidency Small Cause Courts' Act, 1882, this schedule shall not extend to any suit or proceeding in any Court of Small Causes established in the towns of Calcutta, Madras and Bombay

## APPENDIX A

### PLEADINGS

#### (1) TITLES OF SUITS

IN THE COURT OF

*A B (add description and residence)*

*Plaintiff*

*against*

*C D (add description and residence)*

*Defendant*

#### (2) DESCRIPTION OF PARTIES IN PARTICULAR CASES

The Secretary of State for India in Council

The Advocate General of

The Collector of

The State of

The *A B* Company Limited having its registered office at

*A B* a public officer of the *C D* Company

*A B (add description and residence)* on behalf of himself and all other creditors of *C D* late of *(add description and residence)*

*A B (add description and residence)* on behalf of himself and all other holders of debentures issued by the

Company Limited

The Official Receiver

*A B* a minor *(add description and residence)* by *C D* [or by the Court of Wards] his next friend.

*A B (add description and residence)* a person of unsound mind [or of weak mind] by *C D* his next friend.

*A B* a firm carrying on business in partnership at

*A B (add description and residence)* by his constituted attorney *C D (add description and residence)*

*A B (add description and residence)* Shebait of Thakur

*A B (add description and residence)* executor of *C D* deceased

*A B (add description and residence)* heir of *C D* deceased

### (3) PLAINTS

## Money Lent

(Title)

A B the above named plaintiff states as follows —

|               |  |                         |                         |                       |
|---------------|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1             | On the   | day of                  | 19                      | he lent the defendant |
|               |  | rupees repayable on the |                         | day of                |
| 2             | The defendant has not paid the same except   |                         |                         | rupees paid           |
| on the        |  | day of                  | 19                      |                       |
|               | <i>[If the plaintiff claims exemption from any law of limitation say —]</i>                |                         |                         |                       |
| 3             | The plaintiff was a minor (or insane) from the   |                         |                         | day of                |
|               | till the   |                         | day of                  |                       |
| 4             | <i>[Facts showing when the cause of action arose and that the Court has jurisdiction].</i> |                         |                         |                       |
| 5             | The value of the subject matter of the suit for the purpose of jurisdiction is             |                         |                         |                       |
| rupees        | and for the purpose of Court fees is   |                         | rupees                  |                       |
| 6             | The plaintiff claims   |                         | rupees with interest at | per                   |
| cent from the |  | day of                  | 19                      |                       |

No 2

### MONEY OVERPAID

(Title)

4 B the above named plaintiff states as follows —

1 On the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19 \_\_\_\_\_ the plaintiff  
agreed to buy and the defendant agreed to sell \_\_\_\_\_ bars of silver  
at \_\_\_\_\_ annas per tola of fine silver

2 The plaintiff procured the said bars to be assayed by E F who was paid by the defendant for such assay and E F declared each of the bars to contain 1500 tolas of fine silver and the plaintiff accordingly paid the defendant

3 Each of the said bars contained only 1 200 tolas of fine silver of which fact the plaintiff was ignorant when he made the payment

4 The defendant has not repaid the sum so overpaid

[As in paras 4 and 5 of Form No 1 and Relief claimed]

103

GOODS SOLD AT A FIXED PRICE AND DELIVERED

(Tulle)

4 B the above named plaintiff states as follows —

1 On the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19 \_\_\_\_ L F sold and delivered to the defendant [one hundred barrels of flour or the goods mentioned in the schedule hereto annexed or sundry goods]

2 The defendant promised to pay  
goods on delivery [or on the day of  
the plaint was filed]

3 He has not paid the same

4 E F died on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_  
his last will be appointed his brother the plaintiff his executor  
[As in paras 4 and 5 of Form No 1]

7 The plaintiff as executor of *E F claims [Peli f claimed]*

## Forms of Pleadings

## No 4

## GOODS SOLD AT A REASONABLE PRICE AND DELIVERED

(Title)

A B the above named plaintiff states as follows —

1 On the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19 \_\_\_\_ plaintiff sold and delivered to the defendant [sundry articles of house furniture] but no express agreement was made as to the price

2 The goods were reasonably worth \_\_\_\_\_ rupees

3 The defendant has not paid the money

[As in paras 4 and 5 of Form No 1 and Relief claimed]

## No 5

## GOODS MADE AT DEFENDANT'S REQUEST AND NOT ACCEPTED

(Title)

A B the above named plaintiff states as follows —

1 On the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19 \_\_\_\_ E F agreed with the plaintiff that the plaintiff should make for him [six tables and fifty chairs] and that E F should pay for the goods on delivery \_\_\_\_\_ rupees

2 The plaintiff made the goods and on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19 \_\_\_\_ offered to deliver them to E F and has ever since been ready and willing so to do

3 E F has not accepted the goods or paid for them

[As in paras 4 and 5 of Form No 1 and Relief claimed]

## No 6

## DEFICIENCY UPON A RE-SALE [GOODS SOLD AT AUCTION]

(Title)

A B the above named plaintiff states as follows —

1 On the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19 \_\_\_\_ the plaintiff put up at auction sundry [goods] subject to the condition that all goods not paid for and removed by the purchaser within [ten days] after the sale should be re-sold by auction on his account of which condition the defendant had notice

2 The defendant purchased [one crate of crockery] at the auction at the price of \_\_\_\_\_ rupees

3 The plaintiff was ready and willing to deliver the goods to the defendant on the date of the sale and for [ten days] after

4 The defendant did not take away the goods purchased by him nor pay for them within [ten days] after the sale nor afterwards.

5 On the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19 \_\_\_\_ the plaintiff re-sold the [crate of crockery] on account of the defendant by public auction for \_\_\_\_\_ rupees

6 The expenses attendant upon such re-sale amounted to \_\_\_\_\_

7 The defendant has not paid the deficiency thus arising amounting to \_\_\_\_\_ rupees

[As in paras 4 and 5 of Form No 1 and Relief claimed]

1 On the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_ the plaintiff and  
defendant having a difference between them concerning [ a demand of the plaintiff for

## Forms of Ple

the price of ten barrels of oil which the defendant refused to pay] agreed in writing to submit the difference to the arbitration of *E F* and *G H* and the original document is annexed hereto

On the day of 10 the arbitrator awarded that the defendant should [pay the plaintiff rupees]

3 The defendant has not paid the money  
[As in paras 4 and 5 of Form No 1 and Relief claimed]

No 11  
ON A FOREIGN JUDGMENT  
(Title)

4 B the above named plaintiff states as follows —

On the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_ at \_\_\_\_\_ in  
the State [or Kingdom] of \_\_\_\_\_ the \_\_\_\_\_ Court of  
that State [or Kingdom] in a suit therein pending between the plaintiff and the defendant  
duly adjudged that the defendant should pay to the plaintiff \_\_\_\_\_ rupees  
with interest from the said date.

2 The defendant has not paid the money  
[As in paras 4 and 5 of Form No 1 and Relief claimed]

No 1'  
AGAINST SURETY FOR PAYMENT OF RENT  
(Title)

4 B the above named ; plaintiff states as follows —

I On the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19 \_\_\_\_\_ E F hired from  
the plaintiff for the term of \_\_\_\_\_ years the [house No \_\_\_\_\_]  
Street] at the annual rent of \_\_\_\_\_ rupees payable [monthly]

2 The defendant agreed in consideration of the letting of the premises to E F to guarantee the punctual payment of the rent.

|   |                           |    |              |
|---|---------------------------|----|--------------|
| 3 | The rent for the month of | 19 | amounting to |
|   | rupees has not been paid  |    |              |

[If by the terms of the agreement notice is required to be given to the surety add —]

4 On the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_ the plaintiff  
gave notice to the defendant of the non payment of the rent and demanded payment  
thereof

✓ The defendant has not paid the same  
[As in paras 4 and 5 of Form No 1 and Relief claimed]

No 13  
 DEED OF AGREEMENT TO PURCHASE LAND  
 (Title)

1 B the above named plaintiff states as follows —

1 On the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_ the plaintiff and  
defendant entered into an agreement and the original document is hereto annexed

[Or On the day of 19 the plaintiff and defendant mutually agreed that the plaintiff should sell to the defendant and that the defendant should purchase from the plaintiff forty bighas of land in the village of for rupees.]

## of Pleadings

2 On the                      day of                      19                      the plaintiff being then the absolute owner of the property [and the same being free from all incumbrances as was made to appear to the defendant] tendered to the defendant a sufficient instrument of transfer of the same [or was ready and will and is still ready and willing and offered to transfer the same to the defendant by a sufficient instrument] on the payment by the defendant of the sum agreed upon

3 The defendant has not paid the money

*[As in paras 4 and 5 of Form No 1 and Relief claimed]*

---

No 14

NOT DELIVERING GOODS SOLD

(Title)

A B the above named plaintiff states as follows —

1 On the                      day of                      19                      the plaintiff and defendant mutually agreed that the defendant should deliver [one hundred barrels of flour] to the plaintiff on the                      day of                      19                      and that the plaintiff should pay therefor                      rupees on delivery

2 On the [said] day the plaintiff was ready and willing and offered, to pay the defendant the said sum upon delivery of the goods

3 The defendant has not delivered the goods and the plaintiff has been deprived of the profits which would have accrued to him from such delivery

*[As in paras 4 and 5 of Form No 1 and Relief claimed]*

---

No 15

WROGFUL DISMISSAL

(Title)

A B the above named plaintiff states as follows —

1 On the                      day of                      19                      the plaintiff and defendant mutually agreed that the plaintiff should serve the defendant as [an accountant or in the capacity of foreman or as the case may be] and that the defendant should employ the plaintiff as such for the term of [one year] and pay him for his services                      rupees monthly]

2 On the                      day of                      19                      the plaintiff entered upon the service of the defendant and has ever since been and still is ready and willing to continue in such service during the remainder of the said year whereof the defendant always has had notice

3 On the                      day of                      19                      the defendant wrongfully discharged the plaintiff and refused to permit him to serve as aforesaid or to pay him for his services

*[As in paras 4 and 5 of Form No 1 and Relief claimed]*

---

No 16

BEFACH OF CONTRACT TO SERVE

(Title)

A B the above named plaintiff states as follows —

1 On the                      day of                      19                      the plaintiff and defendant mutually agreed that the plaintiff should employ the defendant at an [annual] salary of                      rupees and that the defendant should serve the plaintiff as [an artist] for the term of [one year]

## Forms of Plea

2 The plaintiff has always been ready and willing to perform his part of the agree  
ment [and on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_ offered so to do] App

3 The defendant (entered upon) the service of the plaintiff on the above mentioned day but afterwards on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19 \_\_\_\_\_ he refused to serve the plaintiff as aforesaid.

[As in paras 4 and 5 of Form No 1 and Relief claimed]

## No. 17

## AGAINST A BUILDER FOR DEFECTIVE WORKMANSHIP

(Title)

**A B** the above named plaintiff states as follows —

I On the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_, the plaintiff and defendant entered into an agreement and the original document is hereto annexed [Or state the tenor of the contract]

2 The plaintiff duly performed all the conditions of the agreement on his part

3 The defendant [built the house referred to in the agreement in a bad and unworkmanlike manner]

[As in paras 4 and 5 of Form No 1 and Relief claimed]

## No. 18.

## ON A BOND FOR THE FIDELITY OF A CLERK.

(Title)

**A B** the above named plaintiff states as follows —

1 On the day of 19 the plaintiff took  
E F into his employment as a clerk.

2 In consideration thereof on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_  
the defendant agreed with the plaintiff that if E F should not faithfully perform his  
duties as a clerk to the plaintiff or should fail to account to the plaintiff for all money  
evidences of debt or other property received by him for the use of the plaintiff the de  
fendant would pay to the plaintiff whatever loss he might sustain by reason thereof  
not exceeding \_\_\_\_\_ rupees

[Or 2 In consideration thereof the defendant by his bond of the same date bound himself to pay the plaintiff the penal sum of                      rupees subject to the condition that if E. F. should faithfully perform his duties as clerk and cashier to the plaintiff and should justly account to the plaintiff for all moneys 'evidences of debt or other property which should be at any time held by him in trust for the plaintiff the bond should be void]

[Or 2 In consideration thereof on the same date the defendant executed a bond in favour of the plaintiff and the original document is hereto annexed ]

3 Between the day of 19 and the day of 19 EF received money and other property amounting to the value of rupees for the use of the plaintiff for which sum he has not accounted to him and the same still remains due and unpaid

[ Is in paras 4 and 5 of Form No 1 and Relief claimed ]



## No 19

BY TENANT AGAINST LANDLORD WITH SPECIAL DAMAGE

(Title)

A B the above named plaintiff states as follows —

I On the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_ the defendant by a registered instrument let to the plaintiff [the house No \_\_\_\_\_ Street] for the term of years contracting with the plaintiff that he the plaintiff and his legal representatives should quietly enjoy possession thereof for the said term

2 ALL conditions were fulfilled and all things happened necessary to entitle the plaintiff to maintain his suit

3 On the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ during the said term, E F who was the lawful owner of the said house unlawfully evicted the plaintiff therefrom and still withholds the possession thereof from him

4 The plaintiff was thereby (prevented from continuing the business of a tailor at the said place was compelled to expend rupees in moving and lost the custom of *G H* and *I F* by such removal)

[As in paras 4 and 5 of Form No 1 and Relief claimed]

No. 20

### ON AN AGREEMENT OF INDEMNITY

(Title)

4 B the above named plaintiff states as follows —

I On the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_ the plaintiff and defend  
ant being partners in trade under the style of A. B. and C. D. dissolved the partnership  
and mutually agreed that the defendant should take and keep all the partnership pro  
perty pay all debts of the firm and indemnify the plaintiff against all claims that might  
be made upon him on account of any indebtedness of the firm

2 The plaintiff duly performed all the conditions of the agreement on his part

3 On the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_ [a judgment was re-  
covered against the plaintiff and defendant by E F in the High Court of Judicature at  
upon a debt due from the firm to E F and on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_

19 } the plaintiff paid rupees [in satisfaction of the same]

4 The defendant has not paid the same to the plaintiff

[As in paras 4 and 5 of Form No 1 and Relief claimed]

No 21

## PROCURING PROPERTY BY FRAUD

(Title)

A B the above named plaintiff state as follows —

1 On the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19 \_\_\_\_\_ the defendant for the purpose of inducing the plaintiff to sell him certain goods represented to the plaintiff that [he the defendant was solvent and worth \_\_\_\_\_ rupees over all his liabilities]

2 The plaintiff was thereby induced to sell (and deliver) to the defendant [dry goods] of the value of \_\_\_\_\_ rupees

3 The said representations were false (or state the particular falsehoods) and were then known by the defendant to be so

## Forms of Pleadings

4 The defendant has not paid for the goods [or if the goods were not delivered] The plaintiff in preparing and shipping the goods and procuring their restoration expended rupees

[As in paras 4 and 5 of Form No 1 and Relief claimed]

## No 22

## FRAUDULENTLY PROCURING CREDIT TO BE GIVEN TO ANOTHER PERSON

(Title)

A B the above named plaintiff states as follows —

1 On the day of 19 the defendant represented to the plaintiff that E F was solvent and in good credit and worth rupees over all his liabilities [or that E F then held a responsible situation and was in good circumstances and might safely be trusted with goods on credit]

2 The plaintiff was thereby induced to sell to E F [rice] of the value of rupees [on months credit]

3 The said representations were false and were then known by the defendant to be so and were made by him with intent to deceive and defraud the plaintiff [or, to deceive and injure the plaintiff]

4 E F [did not pay for the said goods at the expiration of the credit aforesaid, or] has not paid for the said rice and the plaintiff has wholly lost the same

[As in paras 4 and 5 of Form No 1 and Relief claimed]

## No 23

## POLLUTING THE WATER UNDER THE PLAINTIFF'S LAND

(Title)

A B the above named plaintiff states as follows —

1 [The plaintiff is and at all the times hereinafter mentioned was possessed of certain land called and situate in and of a well therein and of water in the well and was entitled to the use and benefit of the well and of the water therein and to have certain springs and streams of water which flowed and ran into the well to supply the same to flow or run without being fouled or polluted]

2 On the day of 19 the defendant wrongfully fouled and polluted the well and the water therein and the springs and streams of water which flowed into the well

3 In consequence the water in the well became impure and unfit for domestic and other necessary purposes and the plaintiff and his family are deprived of the use and benefit of the well and water

[As in paras 4 and 5 of Form No 1 and Relief claimed]

## No 24

## CARRYING ON A NOXIOUS MANUFACTURE

(Title.)

1 B the above named plaintiff states as follows —

1 The plaintiff is and at all the times hereinafter mentioned was, possessed of certain lands called situate in

## of Pleadings

2 Ever since the day of 19 the defendant has wrongfully caused to issue from certain smelting works carried on by the defendant large quantities of offensive and unwholesome smoke and other vapours and noxious matter which spread themselves over and upon the said lands and corrupted the air and settled on the surface of the lands

3 Thereby the trees hedge herbage and crops of the plaintiff growing on the lands were damaged and deteriorated in value and the cattle and livestock of the plaintiff on the lands became unhealthy and many of them were poisoned and died

4 The plaintiff was unable to graze the lands with cattle and sheep as he otherwise might have done and was obliged to move his cattle sheep and farming stock there from and has been prevented from having so beneficial and healthy a use and occupation of the lands as he otherwise would have had

[As in paras 4 and 5 of Form No 1 and Relief claimed]

٧٥ ٢٣

## OBSTRUCTING A RIGHT OF WAY

(Title)

A B the above named plaintiff states as follows —

1 The plaintiff is and at the time hereinafter mentioned was possessed of [a  
house in the village of ]

2 He was entitled to a right of way from the [house] over a certain field to a public highway and back again from the highway over the field to the house for himself and his servants [with vehicles or on foot] at all times of the year

3 On the day of 19 defendant wrongfully obstructed the said way so that the plaintiff could not pass [with vehicles or on foot or in any manner] along the way [and has ever since wrongfully obstructed the same]

4 (State special damage if any)

[As in paras 4 and 5 of Form No 1 and Relief claimed]

## No. 26

## OBSTRUCTING A HIGHWAY

(Title)

1 The defendant wrongfully dug a trench and heaped up earth and stones in the public highway leading from to so as to obstruct it

2 Thereby the plaintiff while lawfully passing along the said highway fell over the said earth and stones (or into the said trench) and broke his arm and suffered great pain and was prevented from attending to his business for a long time and incurred expense for medical attendance

[ is in paras 4 and 5 of Form No 1 and Relief claimed ]

## No. 47

### DIVERTING A WATER COURSE

(Title)

A B the above named plaintiff states as follows —

1 The plaintiff and at the time hereinafter mentioned was possessed of a mill situated on a [stream] known as the [ ] the village of [ ] district of [ ]

## Forms of Pleadings

App

2 By reason of such possession the plaintiff was entitled to the flow of the stream for working the mill

3 On the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19 \_\_\_\_\_ the defendant by cutting the bank of the stream wrongfully diverted the water thereof so that less water ran into the plaintiff's mill

4 By reason thereof the plaintiff has been unable to grind more than \_\_\_\_\_ sacks per day whereas before the said diversion of water he was able to grind \_\_\_\_\_ sacks per day

[As in paras 4 and 5 of Form No 1 and Relief claimed]

## No 28

## OBSTRUCTING A RIGHT TO USE WATER FOR IRRIGATION

(Title)

1 B the above named plaintiff states as follows —

1 Plaintiff is and was at the time hereinafter mentioned possessed of certain lands situate etc and entitled to take and use a portion of the water of a certain stream for irrigating the said lands

2 On the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19 \_\_\_\_\_ the defendant prevented the plaintiff from taking and using the said portion of the said water as aforesaid by wrongfully obstructing and diverting the said stream

[As in paras 4 and 5 of Form No 1 and Relief claimed]

## No 29

## INJURIES CAUSED BY NEGLIGENCE OF A RAILROAD

(Title)

A B the above named plaintiff states as follows —

1 On the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19 \_\_\_\_\_ the defendants were common carriers of passengers by railway between \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_

2 On that day the plaintiff was a passenger in one of the carriages of the defendants on the said railway

3 While he was such passenger at \_\_\_\_\_ [or near the station] of \_\_\_\_\_ or between the station of \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_ a collision occurred on the said railway caused by the negligence and unskilfulness of the defendants' servants whereby the plaintiff was much injured [having his leg broken his head cut etc and state the special damage if any as] and incurred expense for medical attendance and is permanently disabled from carrying on his former business as [a salesman]

[As in paras 4 and 5 of Form No 1 and Relief claimed]

[Or thus —] On that day the defendants by their servants so negligently and unskilfully drove and managed an engine and a train of carriages attached thereto upon and along the defendants' railway which the plaintiff was then lawfully crossing that the said engine and train were driven and struck against the plaintiff whereby etc as in paras 3]

## of Pleadings

A

No 30

## INJURIES CAUSED BY NEGLIGENT DRIVING

(Title)

A B the above named plaintiff states as follows —

1 The plaintiff is a shoe maker carrying on business at The defendant is a merchant of

2 On the                      day of                      19                      the plaintiff was walking southwards along Chowringhee in the city of Calcutta at about 3 o'clock in the afternoon. He was obliged to cross Middleton Street which is a street running into Chowringhee at right angles. While he was crossing this street and just before he could reach the foot pavement on the further side thereof a carriage of the defendant drawn by two horses under the charge and control of the defendant's servants was negligently and suddenly and without any warning turned at a rapid and dangerous pace out of Middleton Street into Chowringhee. The pole of the carriage struck the plaintiff and knocked him down and he was much trampled by the horses.

3 By the blow and fall and trampling the plaintiff's left arm was broken and he was bruised and injured on the side and back as well as internally and in consequence thereof the plaintiff was for four months ill and in suffering and unable to attend to his business and incurred heavy medical and other expenses and sustained great loss of business and profits

[As in paras 4 and 5 of Form No 1 and Relief claimed]

No 31

## FOR MALICIOUS PROSECUTION

(Title)

A B the above named plaintiff states as follows —

1 On the                      day of                      19                      the defendant obtained a warrant of arrest from                      [a Magistrate of the said city or as the case may be] on a charge of                      and the plaintiff was arrested thereon, and imprisoned for                      [days or hours] and gave bail in the sum of                      rupees to obtain his release]

2 In so doing the defendant acted maliciously and without reasonable or probable cause

3 On the                      day of                      19                      the Magistrate dismissed the complaint of the defendant and acquitted the plaintiff

4 Many persons whose names are unknown to the plaintiff hearing of the arrest and supposing the plaintiff to be a criminal have ceased to do business with him or in consequence of the said arrest the plaintiff lost his situation as clerk to one E F or in consequence the plaintiff suffered pain of body and mind and was prevented from transacting his business and was injured in his credit and incurred expense in obtaining his release from the said imprisonment and in defending himself against the said complaint.

[As in paras 4 and 5 of Form No 1 and Relief claimed.]

## No 32

### NOVABLES WRONGFULLY DETAINED

(Title)

A B the above named plaintiff states as follows —

1 On the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19 \_\_\_\_\_ plaintiff owned [or state  
facts showing a right to the possession] the goods mentioned in the schedule hereto annexed  
[or describe the goods] the estimated value of which is \_\_\_\_\_ rupees

2 From that day until the commencement of this suit the defendant has detained the same from the plaintiff

3 Before the commencement of the suit to wit on the \_\_\_\_\_ day  
of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_ the plaintiff demanded the same from the defendant but  
he refused to deliver them

is in paras 4 and 5 of Form No 11

6 The plaintiff claims—

(1) delivery of the said goods or rupees in case delivery cannot be had

(2) Rupees compensation for the detention thereof

### The Schedule

## No 33

AGAINST A FRAUDULENT PURCHASER AND HIS TRANSFEREE WITH NOTICE

(Title)

A B the above named plaintiff states as follows —

I On the day of 19 the defendant C D  
for the purpose of inducing the plaintiff to sell him certain goods represented to the  
plaintiff that [he was solvent and worth rupees over all  
his liabilities)

2 The plaintiff was thereby induced to sell and deliver to C D [one hundred boxes of tea] the estimated value of which is                          rupees

3 The said representations were false and were then known by C D to be so [or at the time of making the said representations C D was insolvent and knew himself to be so]

4 C D afterwards transferred the said goods to the defendant E F without con- sideration [or who had notice of the falsity of the representation]

(As in paras 4 and 5 of Form No 1)

7 The plaintiff claims—

(1) delivery of the said goods or rupees in case delivery cannot  
be had

(2) rupees compensation for the detention thereof

٧٥ ٣٤

### RESCISSION OF A CONTRACT ON THE GROUND OF MISTAKE.

(Title)

A B the above named plaintiff states as follows —

1 On the day of 19 the defendant represented to the plaintiff that a certain piece of ground belonging to the defendant situated at contained ten bighas.

## of Pleadings

2 The plaintiff was thereby induced to purchase the same at the price of \_\_\_\_\_ rupees in the belief that the said representation was true and signed an agreement of which the original is hereto annexed But the land has not been transferred to him

3 On the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19 the plaintiff paid the defendant \_\_\_\_\_ rupees as part of the purchase money

4 That the said piece of ground contained in fact only [five bighas]  
[As in paras 4 and 5 of Form No 1]

7 Plaintiff claims—

(1) \_\_\_\_\_ rupees with interest from the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19

(2) that the said agreement be delivered up and cancelled.

## No 35

## AN INJUNCTION RESTRAINING WASTE.

(Title.)

A B the above named plaintiff states as follows —

1 The plaintiff is the absolute owner of [describe the property]

2 The defendant is in possession of the same under a lease from the plaintiff

3 The defendant has [cut down a number of valuable trees and threatens to cut down many more for the purpose of sale] without the consent of the plaintiff

[As in paras 4 and 5 of Form No 1]

6 The plaintiff claims that the defendant be restrained by injunction from committing or permitting any further waste on the said premises

[Pecuniary compensation may also be claimed]

## No 36

## INJUNCTION RESTRAINING NUISANCE.

(Title)

A B the above named plaintiff states as follows —

1 Plaintiff is and at all the times hereinafter mentioned was the absolute owner of the [house No \_\_\_\_\_ Street Calcutta].

2 The defendant is and at all the said times was the absolute owner of [a plot of ground in the same street \_\_\_\_\_]

3 On the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19, the defendant erected upon his said plot a slaughter house and still maintains the same and from that day until the present time has continually caused cattle to be brought and killed there [and has caused the blood and offal to be thrown into the street opposite the said house of the plaintiff]

4 In consequence the plaintiff has been compelled to abandon the said house and has been unable to rent the same

[As in paras 4 and 5 of Form No 1]

The plaintiff claims that the defendant be restrained by injunction from committing or permitting any further nuisance

Forms of Ple  
Ap

No 37

## PUBLIC NUISANCE

(Title)

*A B* the above named plaintiff states as follows —

1 The defendant has wrongly heaped up earth and stones on a public road knows as Street at so as to obstruct the passage of the public along the same and threatens and intends unless restraining from so doing to continue and repeat the said wrongful act

2 The plaintiff has obtained the consent in writing of the Advocate General [or of the Collector or other officer appointed in this behalf] to the institution of this suit

[As in paras 4 and 5 of Form No 1]

The plaintiff claims—

- (1) a declaration that the defendant is not entitled to obstruct the passage of the public along the said public road]
- (2) an injunction restraining the defendant from obstructing the passage of the public along the said public road and directing the defendant to remove the earth and stones wrongfully heaped up as aforesaid

No 38

## INJUNCTION AGAINST THE DIVERSION OF A WATER-COURSE

(Title)

*A B* the above named plaintiff states as follows —

[As in Form No 27]

The plaintiff claims that the defendant be restrained by injunction from diverting the water as aforesaid

No 39

RESTORATION OF MOVABLE PROPERTY THREATENED WITH DESTRUCTION  
AND FOR AN INJUNCTION

(Title)

*A B* the above named plaintiff states as follows —

1 Plaintiff is and at all times hereinafter mentioned was the owner of a portrait of his grand father [which was executed by an eminent painter] and of which no duplicate exist [or state any facts showing that the property is of a kind that cannot be replaced by money]

2 On the day of 19 he deposited the same for safe keeping with the defendant

3 On the day of 19, he demanded the same from the defendant and offered to pay all reasonable charges for the storage of the same

4 The defendant refuses to deliver the same to the plaintiff and threatens to conceal, dispose of, cut or injure the same if required to deliver it up

5 No pecuniary compensation would be an adequate compensation to the plaintiff for the loss of the [painting].

[As in paras 4 and 5 of Form No 1]



## of Pleadings

A

8 The plaintiff claims—

- (1) that the defendant be restrained by injunction from disposing of, injuring or concealing the said [painting]
- (2) that he be compelled to deliver the same to the plaintiff

## No 40

## INTERPLEADER.

(Title)

*A B* the above named plaintiff states as follows —

1 Before the date of the claims hereinafter mentioned *G H* deposited with the plaintiff [describe the property] for [safe keeping]

2 The defendant *G D* claims the same [under an alleged assignment thereof to him from *G H*]

3 The defendant *E F* also claims the same [under an order of *G H* transferring the same to him]

4 The plaintiff is ignorant of the respective rights of the defendants.

5 He has no claim upon the said property other than for charges and costs and is ready and willing to deliver it to such persons as the Court shall direct

6 The suit is not brought by collusion with either of the defendants.

[As in paras 4 and 5 of Form No 1]

9 The plaintiff claims—

(1) That the defendants be restrained by injunction from taking any proceedings against the plaintiff in relation thereto

(2) that they be required to interplead together concerning their claims to the said property

(3) that some person be authorised to receive the said property pending such litigation

(4) that upon delivering the same to such [person] the plaintiff be discharged from all liability to either of the defendants in relation thereto

## No 41

## ADMINISTRATION BY CREDITOR ON BEHALF OF HIMSELF AND ALL OTHER

## CREDITORS

(Title)

*A B* the above named plaintiff states as follows —

1 *E F* late of \_\_\_\_\_ was at the time of his death and his estate still is indebted to the plaintiff in the sum of \_\_\_\_\_ [Here insert nature of debt and security if any]

2 *E F* died on or about the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_  
By his last will dated the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ he appointed *C D* his executor [or revised his estate in trust etc. or died intestate as the case may be]

3 The will was proved by *C D* [or letters of administration were granted etc.]

4 The defendant has possessed himself of the movable [and immovable or the proceeds of the immovable] property of *E F* and has not paid the plaintiff his debt

[As in paras 4 and 5 of Form No 1]

7 The plaintiff claims that an account may be taken of the movable [ and im movable] property of *E F* deceased and that the same may be administered under the decree of the Court

## No 42

## ADMINISTRATION BY SPECIFIC LEGATEE

(Title)

*[Alter Form No 41 thus]—*

*[Omit paragraph 1 and commence paragraph 2]* *E F* late of died on or about the day of By his last will dated the day of he appointed *C D* his executor and bequeathed to the plaintiff *[here state the specific legacy]*

*For paragraph 4 substitute—*

The defendant is in possession of the movable property of *E F* and amongst other things of the said *[here name the subject of the specific bequest]*

*For the commencement of paragraph 7 substitute—*

The plaintiff claims that the defendant may be ordered to deliver to him the said *[here name the subject of the specific bequest]* or that etc

## No 43

## ADMINISTRATION BY PECUNIARY LEGATEE

(Title)

*[Alter Form No 41 thus]—*

*[Omit paragraph 1 and substitute for paragraph 2]* *E F* late of died on or about the day of By his last will dated the day of he appointed *C D* his executor and bequeathed to the plaintiff a legacy of rupees

*In paragraph 4 substitute legacy for debt**Another Form*

(Title)

*E F* the above named plaintiff states as follows —

1 *A B* of *A* in the died on the day of By his last will dated the day of he appointed the defendant and *M N* *[who died in the testator's lifetime]* his executors and bequeathed his property whether movable or immovable to his executors in trust to pay the rents and income thereof to the plaintiff for his life and after his decease and in default of his having a son who should attain twenty one or a daughter who should attain that age or marry upon trust as to his immovable property for the person who would be the testator's heir at-law and as to his movable property for the persons who would be the testator's next-of kin if he had died intestate at the time of the death of the plaintiff and such failure of his issue as aforesaid

2 The will was proved by the defendant on the day of The plaintiff has not been married

3 The testator was at his death entitled to movable and immovable property the defendant entered into the receipt of the rents of the immovable property and got in the movable property he has sold some part of the immovable property

*[As in paras 4 and 5 of Form No 1]*

## f Pleadings

6 The plaintiff claims—

- (1) to have the movable and immovable property of *A B* administered in this Court and for that purpose to have all proper directions given and accounts taken
- (2) such further or other relief as the nature of the case may require

---

No 44

## EXECUTION OF TRUSTS

(Title)

*A B* the above named plaintiff states as follows —

1 He is one of the trustees under an instrument of settlement bearing date on or about the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ made upon the marriage of *E F* and *G H* the father and mother of the defendant [or an instrument of transfer of the estate and effects of *E F* for the benefit of *C D* the defendant and the other creditors of *E F*]

2 *A B* has taken upon himself the burden of the said trust and is in possession of [or of the proceeds of] the movable and immovable property transferred by the said instrument

3 *C D* claims to be entitled of a beneficial interest under the instrument

[As in paras 4 and 5 of Form No 1]

6 The plaintiff is desirous to account for all the rents and profits of the said immovable property [and the proceeds of the sale of the said or of part of the said immovable property or movable or the proceeds of the sale of or of part of, the said immovable property or the profits accruing to the plaintiff as such trustee in the execution of the said trust] and he prays that the Court will take the accounts of the said trust and also that the whole of the said trust estate may be administered in the Court for the benefit of *C D* the defendant and all other persons who may be interested in such administration in the presence of *C D* and such other persons so interested as the Court may direct or that *C D* may show good cause to the contrary

[NB — Where the suit is by a beneficiary the plaint may be modelled *mutatis mutandis* on the plaint by a legatee]

---

No 45

## FORECLOSURE OR SALE.

(Title)

*A B* the above-named plaintiff states as follows —

1 The plaintiff is mortgagee of lands belonging to the defendant

2 The following are the particulars of the mortgage —

(a) (date)

(b) (names of mortgagor and mortgagee)

(c) (sum secured)

(d) (rate of interest)

(e) (property subject to mortgage)

(f) (amount now due)

(g) (if the plaintiff's title is derivative, state shortly the transfers or devolution under which he claims)

(If the plaintiff is mortgagee in possession add)

## Forms of Pleadings

- 3 The plaintiff took possession of the mortgaged property on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_  
 of \_\_\_\_\_ and is ready to account as mortgagee in possession from that time
- 6 The plaintiff claims—
- (1) Payment or in default [sale or] foreclosure [and possession]  
 [Where Order 34 rule 6 applies]
- (-) in case the proceeds of the sale are found to be insufficient to pay the amount due to the plaintiff then that liberty be reserved to the plaintiff to apply for a decree for the balance

## No 46

## REDEMPTION

(Title)

4 B the above named plaintiff states as follows —

- 1 The plaintiff is mortgagor of lands of which the defendant is mortgagee
- 2 The following are the particulars of the mortgage —
- (a) (date)
- (b) (names of mortgagor and mortgagee)
- (c) (sum secured)
- (d) (rate of interest)
- (e) (property subject to mortgage)
- (f) (If the plaintiff's title is derivative state shortly he transfers or devolution under which he claims)
- (If the defendant is mortgagee in possession add)
- 3 The defendant has taken possession [or has received the rents] of the mortgaged property
- [As in paras 4 and 5 of Form No 1]
- 6 The plaintiff claims to redeem the said property and to have the same re-conveyed to him [and to have possession thereof]

## No 47

## SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE (No 1)

(Title)

4 B the above named plaintiff states as follows —

- 1 By an agreement dated the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ and signed by the defendant he contracted to buy of [or sell to] the plaintiff's certain immovable property therein described and referred to for the sum of \_\_\_\_\_ rupees
- 2 The plaintiff has applied to the defendant specifically to perform the agreement on his part but the defendant has not done so
- 3 The plaintiff has been and still is ready and willing specifically to perform the agreement on his part of which the defendant has had notice
- [As in paras 4 and 5 of Form No 1]

- 6 The plaintiff claims that the Court will order the defendant specifically to perform the agreement and to do all acts necessary to put the plaintiff in full possession of the said property [or to accept a transfer and possession of the said property] and to pay the costs of the suit

## of Pleadings

## No 1

## DEFENCE IN SUITS FOR GOODS SOLD AND DELIVERED

- 1 The defendant did not order the goods
- 2 The goods were not delivered to the defendant
- 3 The price was not Rs
- 4 } Except as to Ps [or] same as { 1
- 5 } 2
- 6 } 3
- 7 The defendant [for A B the defendant's agent] satisfied the claim by payment before suit to the plaintiff [or to C D the plaintiff's agent] on the day of 19
- 8 The defendant satisfied the claim by payment after suit to the plaintiff on the day of 19

## No 2

## DEFENCE IN SUITS ON BONDS

- 1 The bond is not the defendant's bond
- 2 The defendant made payment to the plaintiff on the day according to the condition of the bond.
- 3 The defendant made payment to the plaintiff after the day named and before suit of the principal and interest mentioned in the bond.

## No 3

## DEFENCE IN SUITS ON GUARANTEES

- 1 The principal satisfied the claim by payment before suit
- 2 The defendant was released by the plaintiff giving time to the principal debtor in pursuance of a binding agreement

## No 4.

## DEFENCE IN ANY SUIT FOR DEBT

- 1 As to Rs 200 of the money claimed, the defendant is entitled to set off for goods sold and delivered by the defendant to the plaintiff

Particulars are as follows —

|       |              |     |
|-------|--------------|-----|
|       |              | Rs. |
| 1907  | January 25th | 150 |
|       | February 1st | 50  |
| Total |              | 200 |

- 2 As to the whole [or as to Rs. part of the money claimed] the defendant made tender before suit of Rs. and has paid the same into Court

## No 5

## DEFENCE IN SUITS FOR INJURIES CAUSED BY NEGLIGENT DRIVING

- 1 The defendant denies that the carriage mentioned in the plaint was the defendant's carriage and that it was under the charge or control of the defendant's servants. The carriage belonged to of Street Calcutta livery stable keepers employed by the defendant to supply him with carriages and horses and the person under whose charge and control the said carriage was was the servant of the said

## Forms of Plea

2 The defendant does not admit that the said carriage was turned out of Middleton Street either negligently suddenly or without warning or at a rapid or dangerous pace

3 The defendant says the plaintiff might and could by the exercise of reasonable care and diligence have seen the said carriage approaching him and avoided any collision with it

4 The defendant does not admit the statements contained in the third paragraph of the plaint

## No 6

## DEFENCE IN ALL SUITS FOR WRONGS

- 1 Denial of the several acts [or matters] complained of

## No 7

## DEFENCE IN SUITS FOR DETENTION OF GOODS

- 1 The goods were not the property of the plaintiff
- 2 The goods were detained for a lien to which the defendant was entitled

Particulars are as follows —

1907 May 3rd To carriage of the goods claimed from Delhi to Calcutta —  
45 maunds at Rs 2 per maund P's

## No 8

## DEFENCE IN SUITS FOR INFRINGEMENT OF COPYRIGHT

- 1 The plaintiff is not the author (*assignee etc*)
- 2 The book was not registered
- 3 The defendant did not infringe

## No 9

## DEFENCE IN SUITS FOR INFRINGEMENT OF TRADE MARK

- 1 The trade mark is not the plaintiff's
- 2 The alleged trade mark is not a trade mark
- 3 The defendant did not infringe

## No 10

## DEFENCE IN SUITS RELATING TO NUISANCES

- 1 The plaintiff's rights are not ancient (*or deny his other alleged prescriptive rights*)
- 2 The plaintiff's rights will not be materially interfered with by the defendant's buildings
- 3 The defendant denies that he or his servants pollute the water [*or do what is complained of*]

[*If the defendant claims the right by prescription or otherwise to do what is complained of he must say so and must state the grounds of the claim i.e. whether by prescription grant or what*]

- 4 The plaintiff has been guilty of laches of which the following are particulars —
  - 180 Plaintiff's mill began to work
  - 181 Plaintiff came into possession.
  - 183 First complaint

## of Pleadings

5 As to the plaintiff's claim for damages the defendant will rely on the above grounds of defence and says that the acts complained of have not produced any damage to the plaintiff [If other grounds are relied on they must be stated e.g. limitation as to past damage]

## No 11

## DEFENCE TO SUIT FOR FORECLOSURE

- 1 The defendant did not execute the mortgage
- 2 The mortgage was not transferred to the plaintiff (if more than one transfer is alleged say which is denied)
- 3 The suit is barred by article \_\_\_\_\_ of the second schedule to the Indian Limitation Act 1877
- 4 The following payments have been made viz —
 

|                     |          |
|---------------------|----------|
| (Insert date) _____ | Rs 1 000 |
| (Insert date) _____ | 00       |
- 5 The plaintiff took possession on the \_\_\_\_\_ of \_\_\_\_\_ and has received the rents ever since \_\_\_\_\_ of \_\_\_\_\_
- 6 The plaintiff released the debt on the \_\_\_\_\_ of \_\_\_\_\_
- 7 The defendant transferred all his interest to A B by a document dated \_\_\_\_\_

## No 12

## DEFENCE TO SUIT FOR REDEMPTION

- 1 The plaintiff's right to redeem is barred by article \_\_\_\_\_ of the second schedule to the Indian Limitation Act 1877
- 2 The plaintiff transferred all interest in the property to A B
- 3 The defendant by a document dated the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ transferred all his interest in the mortgage debt and property comprised in the mortgage to A B
- 4 The defendant never took possession of the mortgaged property or received the rents thereof  
(If the defendant admits possession for a time only he should state the time and day possession beyond what he admits)

## No 13

## DEFENCE TO SUIT FOR SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE

- 1 The defendant did not enter into the agreement
- 2 A B was not the agent of the defendant (if alleged by plaintiff)
- 3 The plaintiff has not performed the following conditions—(Conditions)
- 4 The defendants did not—alleged acts of part performance)
- 5 The plaintiff's title to the property agreed to be sold is not such as the defendant bound to accept by reasons of the following matter—(State why)
- 6 The agreement is uncertain in the following respects—(State them)
- 7 (or) The plaintiff has been guilty of delay
- 8 (or) The plaintiff has been guilty of fraud (or misrepresentation)
- 9 (or) The agreement is unfair
- 10 (or) The agreement was entered into by mistake
- 11 The following are particulars of (7) (8) (9) (10) (or as the case may be)
- 12 The agreement was rescinded under Conditions of Sale No 11 (or by mutual agreement)

## Forms of Pleadings

(In cases where damages are claimed and the defendant disputes his liability to damages he must deny the agreement or the alleged breaches or show whatever other ground of defence he intends to rely on e.g. the Indian Limitation Act accord and satisfaction release fraud etc.)

## No 14

## DEFENCE IN ADMINISTRATION SUITS BY PECUNIARY LEGATEE

1 4 B s will contained a charge of debts he died insolvent he was entitled at his death to some immovable property which the defendant sold and which produced the net sum of Rs \_\_\_\_\_ and the testator had some movable property which the defendant got in and which produced the net sum of Rs \_\_\_\_\_

2 The defendant applied the whole of the said sums and the sum of Rs \_\_\_\_\_ which the defendant received from rents of the immovable property in the payment of the funeral and testamentary expenses and some of the debts of the testator

3 The defendant made up his accounts and sent a copy thereof to the plaintiff on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19 \_\_\_\_\_ and offered the plaintiff free access to the vouchers to verify such accounts but he declined to avail himself of the defendant's offer

4 The defendant submits that the plaintiff ought to pay the costs of this suit

## No 15

## PROBATE OF WILL IN SOLEMN FORM

1 The said will and codicil of the deceased were not duly executed according to the provisions of the Indian Succession Act 1865 [or of the Hindu Wills Act 1860]

2 The deceased at the time the said will and codicil respectively purport to have been executed was not of sound mind memory and understanding

3 The execution of the said will and codicil was obtained by the undue influence of the plaintiff [and others acting with him whose names are at present unknown to the defendant]

4 The execution of the said will and codicil was obtained by the fraud of the plaintiff such fraud so far as is within the defendant's present knowledge being [state the nature of the fraud]

5 The deceased at the time of the execution of the said will and codicil did not know and approve of the contents thereof [or of the contents of the residuary clause in the said will as the case may be]

6 The deceased made his true last will dated the 1st January 1873 and thereby appointed the defendant sole executor thereof

The defendant claims —

(1) that the Court will pronounce against the said will and codicil propounded by the plaintiff

(2) that the Court will decree probate of the will of the deceased dated 1st January 1873 in solemn form of law

## No 16

## PARTICULARS (O 6 r 5)

(Title of suit)

The following are the particulars of (here state the matters in respect of which particulars have been ordered) delivered pursuant to the order

Particulars

of the

of

(Here set out the particulars ordered in paragraph of necessary)



## APPENDIX B

### PROCESS

No 1

SUMMONS FOR DISPOSAL OF SUITS (O 5 rr 1 5)

(Title)

[Name description and place of residence]

WHEREAS

has instituted a suit against you for  
 you are hereby summoned to appear in this Court in person or by a pleader duly instructed and able to answer all material questions relating to the suit or who shall be accompanied by some person able to answer all such questions on the  
 day of 19 at o'clock in the noon to answer  
 the claim and as the day fixed for your appearance is appointed for the final disposal of the suit you must be prepared to produce on that day all the witnesses upon whose evidence and all the documents upon which you intend to rely in support of your defence

Take notice that in default of your appearance on the day before mentioned the suit will be heard and determined in your absence

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this  
 day of 19

Judge

- NOTICE —1 Should you apprehend your witnesses will not attend of their own accord, you can have a summons from this Court to compel the attendance of any witness and the production of any document that you have a right to call upon the witness to produce on applying to the Court and on depositing the necessary expenses
- 2 If you admit the claim you should pay the money into Court together with the costs of the suit to avoid execution of the decree which may be against your person or property or both

No 2

SUMMONS FOR SETTLEMENT OF ISSUES (O 5 rr 1 5)

(Title)

To

[Name description and place of residence]

WHEREAS

has instituted a suit against you for  
 you are hereby summoned to appear in the Court in person or by a pleader duly instructed and able to answer all material questions relating to the suit or who shall be accompanied by some person able to answer all such questions on the  
 day of 19 at o'clock in the noon to answer the claim  
 and you are directed to produce on that day all the documents upon which you intend to rely in support of your defence

Take notice that in default of your appearance on the day before mentioned the suit will be heard and determined in your absence

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this  
 day of 19

Judge

## Forms of Pr

NOTICE—1 Should you apprehend your witnesses will not attend of their own accord you can have a summons from this Court to compel the attendance of any witness and the production of any document that you have a right to call on the witness to produce on applying to the Court and on depositing the necessary expenses.

- 2 If you admit the claim you should pay the money into Court together with the costs of the suit to avoid execution of the decree which may be against your person or property or both.

---

No 3

## SUMMONS TO APPEAR IN PERSON (O 6 r 3)

(Title.)

To

[Name description and place of residence.]

## WHEREAS

has instituted a suit against you for  
 you are hereby summoned to appear in this Court in person on the  
 day of 19 at o'clock in the noon  
 to answer the claim and you are directed to produce on that day all the documents  
 upon which you intend to rely in support of your defence

Take notice that in default of your appearance on the day before mentioned the  
 suit will be heard and determined in your absence

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this  
 day of 19

Judge

---

No 4

## SUMMONS IN SUMMARY SUIT ON NEGOTIABLE INSTRUMENT (O 37 r 2)

(Title.)

To

[Name description and place of residence.]

## WHEREAS

has instituted a suit against you under Order XXXI of the Code of Civil Procedure,  
 1908 for Rs balance of principal and interest due to him as the  
 of a of which a copy is hereto annexed you are hereby summoned  
 to obtain leave from the Court within ten days from the service hereof to appear and  
 defend the suit and within such time to cause an appearance to be entered for you  
 In default whereof the plaintiff will be entitled at any time after the expiration of such  
 ten days to obtain a decree for any sum not exceeding the sum of Rs and  
 the sum of Rs for costs together with such interest if any from  
 the date of the institution of the suit as the Court may order

Leave to appear may be obtained on an application to the Court supported by  
 affidavit or declaration showing that there is a defence to the suit on the merits or that  
 it is reasonable that you should be allowed to appear in the suit

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this  
 of 19 day

Judge.

## s of Process

B

No 5

NOTICE TO PERSON WHO THE COURT CONSIDERS SHOULD BE ADDED  
AS CO PLAINTIFF (O 1 r 10)  
(Title.)

To

[Name description and place of residence]

WHEREAS

instituted the above suit against

and whereas it appears necessary that you should be  
added as a plaintiff in the said suit in order to enable the Court effectually and completely  
to adjudicate upon and settle all the questions involved

Take notice that you should on or before

19 signify to this Court whether you consent to be so added

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this  
day of 19

Judge

No 6

SUMMONS TO LEGAL REPRESENTATIVE OF A DECEASED DEFENDANT  
(O 23 r 4)  
(Title.)

To

WHEREAS the plaintiff

instituted a suit in this Court on the

day of

19 against the defendant

who has since deceased and whereas the said plaintiff has made an application to the  
Court alleging that you are the legal representative of the said  
deceased and desiring that you be made the defendant in his stead

You are hereby summoned to attend in this Court on the

19

at

A.M. to defend the said suit and in

default of your appearance on the day specified the said suit will be heard and deter-  
mined in your absence

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this  
day of 19

Judge

No 7

ORDER FOR TRANSMISSION OF SUMMONS FOR SERVICE IN THE  
JURISDICTION OF ANOTHER COURT (O 5 r 21)  
(Title.)

WHEREAS it is stated that

defendant witness in the above suit is at present residing in  
ordered that a summons returnable on the

19 be forwarded to the

for service on the said defendant witness with a duplicate of this

proceeding

The Court fee of  
has been realized in this Court in stamps.

chargeable in respect to the summons

Dated

19

Judge

Forms of Pro

Ap

## No 8

ORDER FOR TRANSMISSION OF SUMMONS TO BE SERVED  
ON A PRISONER. (O 5 r 24)

(Title)

To

The Superintendent of the Jail at

UNDER the provision of Order V rule 24 of the Code of Civil Procedure 1908 a summons in duplication is herewith forwarded for service on the defendant who is a prisoner in jail You are requested to cause a copy of the said summons to be served upon the said defendant and to return the original to the Court signed by the said defendant with a statement of service endorsed thereon by you

Judge

## No 9

ORDER FOR TRANSMISSION OF SUMMONS TO BE SERVED ON A PUBLIC  
SERVANT OR SOLDIER. (O 5 r 27 28)

To

UNDER the provisions of Order V rule 27 (28 or as the case may be) of the Code of Civil Procedure 1908 a summons in duplicate is herewith forwarded for service on the defendant who is stated to be serving under you You are requested to cause a copy of the said summons to be served upon the said defendant and to return the original to this Court signed by the said defendant with a statement of service endorsed thereon by you

Judge

## No 10

## TO ACCOMPANY RETURNS OF SUMMONS OF ANOTHER COURT (O 5 r 23)

(Title)

Plead proceeding from the forwarding  
for service on  
in suit No of 10  
of that Court.

Read Serving Officer's endorsement stating that the  
and proof of the above having been duly taken by me on the oath of and  
it is ordered that the  
be returned to the  
with a copy of this proceeding

Judge

Note.—This form will be applicable to process other than summons the service of which may have to be effected in the same manner

Alterations made in this form by the High Court of Bombay—See Appendix III below rule 4

## of Process

No 11

AFFIDAVIT OF PROCESS SERVER TO ACCOMPANY PETITION  
OF A SUMMONS OR NOTICE. (O 5 r 18)

(Title)

The affidavit of

son of

I

make oath  
affirm

and say as follows —

(1) I am a process server of this Court

(2) On the

day of

19

I received a summons  
notice issued by the Court ofin Suit No  
of 19 in the said Court dated the  
of 19 in the said Court dated the  
day of 19 for service on

(3) The said

was at the time

personally known to me and I served the said summons  
notice on him  
her on the

day of

19

at about

o'clock

in the noon at by tendering a copy thereof to him  
herand requiring his  
her signature to the original summons  
notice

(a)

(b)

(a) Here state whether the persons served signed or refused to sign the process and in  
whose presence

(b) Signature of process server

or

(3) The said

not being personally known to me  
accompanied me to

and pointed out to me a person whom he stated to be the said

and I served the said summons  
notice on him  
her on the day of  
19 at about o'clock in the noon attendering a copy thereof to him  
her and requiring his  
her signature to the original summons  
notice

(a)

(b)

(a) Here state whether the person served signed or refused to sign the process, and in  
whose presence

(b) Signature of process server

or

(3) The said and the house in which he ordinarily resides being  
personally known to me I went to the said house in

and there on the

day of

19

at

about

o'clock in the

noon I did not find the said

(a)

(b)

## Forms of P

(a) Enter fully and exactly the manner in which process was served with special reference to Order 5 rules 15 and 17

(b) Signature of process server

III

(3) One \_\_\_\_\_ accompanied me to \_\_\_\_\_ and there pointed out to me \_\_\_\_\_ which he said was the house in which \_\_\_\_\_ ordinarily resides I did not find the said \_\_\_\_\_ there

(a)

(b)

(a) Enter fully and exactly the manner in which the process was served with special reference to Order 5 rules 15 and 17

(b) Signature of process server

III

*If substituted service has been ordered state fully and exactly the manner in which the summons was served with special reference to the terms of the order for substituted service*

Sworn

Am med by the said

before me this

day

of

19

Empowered under section 139 of the Code of Civil Procedure 1908 to administer the oath to deponents.

Alterations made in this form by the Chief Court of the Punjab under Section 122—See Appendix V below

No 12

NOTICE TO DEFENDANT (O 9 r 8)

(Title)

To

[Name description and place of residence]

WHEREAS this day was fixed for the hearing of the above suit and a summons was issued to you and the plaintiff has appeared in this Court and you did not so appear but from the return of the Nazir it has been proved to the satisfaction of the Court that the said summons was served on you but not in sufficient time to enable you to appear and answer on the day fixed in the said summons

Notice is hereby given to you that the hearing of the suit is adjourned this day and that the \_\_\_\_\_ day of 19 \_\_\_\_\_ is now fixed for the hearing of the same in default of your appearance on the day last mentioned the suit will be heard and determined in your absence

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this \_\_\_\_\_ day of 19 \_\_\_\_\_

Judge

No 13

SUMMONS TO WITNESS (O 16 r 15)

(Title)

To

WHEREAS your attendance is required to \_\_\_\_\_ on behalf of the \_\_\_\_\_ in the above suit you are hereby required [personally] to appear before this Court on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of 19 \_\_\_\_\_ at \_\_\_\_\_ o'clock in the forenoon, and to bring with you [or to send to this Court]

## of Process

No. 11

AFFIDAVIT OF PROCESS SERVER TO ACCOMPANY RETURN  
OF A SUMMONS OR NOTICE. (O 5 r 18.)

(Title)

The affidavit of

son of

I

make oath  
affirm

and say as follows —

(1) I am a process server of this Court

(2) On the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_

I received a summons  
notice issued by the Court of \_\_\_\_\_in Suit No. \_\_\_\_\_  
of 19\_\_\_\_ in the said Court dated the \_\_\_\_\_  
of 19\_\_\_\_ in the said Court dated the \_\_\_\_\_  
day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_ for service on \_\_\_\_\_(3) The said \_\_\_\_\_ was at the time  
personally known to me and I served the said summons  
notice on him  
her on the \_\_\_\_\_  
day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_, at about \_\_\_\_\_ o'clock  
in the \_\_\_\_\_ noon at \_\_\_\_\_ by tendering a copy thereof to him  
her  
and requiring his  
her signature to the original summons  
notice

(a)

(b)

(a) Here state whether the persons served signed or refused to sign the process, and in  
whose presence

(b) Signature of process server

or

(3) The said \_\_\_\_\_ not being personally known to me  
accompanied me to \_\_\_\_\_  
and pointed out to me a person whom he stated to be the said \_\_\_\_\_  
and I served the said summons  
notice on him  
her on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_  
19\_\_\_\_ at about \_\_\_\_\_ o'clock in the \_\_\_\_\_ noon at \_\_\_\_\_ by  
tendering a copy thereof to him  
her and requiring his  
her signature to the original summons  
notice

(a)

(b)

(a) Here state whether the person served signed or refused to sign the process, and in  
whose presence.

(b) Signature of process server

or

(3) The said \_\_\_\_\_ and the house in which he ordinarily resides being  
personally known to me I went to the said house in \_\_\_\_\_  
and there on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_ at  
about \_\_\_\_\_ o'clock in the \_\_\_\_\_ noon I did not find the said \_\_\_\_\_

(a)

(b)

## Forms of P

(a) Enter fully and exactly the manner in which process was served with special reference to Order 5 rules 15 and 17

(b) Signature of process server

or

(3) One \_\_\_\_\_ accompanied me to \_\_\_\_\_ and there pointed out to me \_\_\_\_\_ which he said was the house in which \_\_\_\_\_ ordinarily resides I did not find the said \_\_\_\_\_ there  
(a)  
(b)

(a) Enter fully and exactly the manner in which the process was served with special reference to Order 5 rules 15 and 17

(b) Signature of process server

or

If substituted service has been ordered state fully and exactly the manner in which the summons was served with special reference to the terms of the order for substituted service

Sworn  
Affirmed by the said \_\_\_\_\_ before me this \_\_\_\_\_ day

of \_\_\_\_\_ 19 \_\_\_\_\_

Empowered under section 139 of the Code of Civil Procedure 1908 to administer the oath to deponents.

Alterations made in this form by the Chief Court of the Punjab under Section 122—See Appendix V below

No 12

NOTICE TO DEFENDANT (O 9 r 6)

(Title)

To

[Name description and place of residence]

WHEREAS this day was fixed for the hearing of the above suit and a summons was issued to you and the plaintiff has appeared in this Court and you did not so appear but from the return of the Nazir it has been proved to the satisfaction of the Court that the said summons was served on you but not in sufficient time to enable you to appear and answer on the day fixed in the said summons.

Notice is hereby given to you that the hearing of the suit is adjourned this day and that the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19 \_\_\_\_\_ is now fixed for the hearing of the same in default of your appearance on the day last mentioned the suit will be heard and determined in your absence

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19 \_\_\_\_\_

Judge

No 13

SUMMONS TO WITNESS (O 16 r 15)

(Title)

To

WHEREAS your attendance is required to \_\_\_\_\_ on behalf of the \_\_\_\_\_ in the above suit you are hereby required [personally] to appear before this Court on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19 \_\_\_\_\_ at \_\_\_\_\_ o'clock in the forenoon, and to bring with you [or to send to this Court]



## of Process

A sum of Rs \_\_\_\_\_ being your travelling and other expenses and subsistence allowance for one day is herewith set out. If you fail to comply with this order without lawful excuse you will be subject to the consequences of non attendance laid down in rule 12 of Order XVI of the Code of Civil Procedure.

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_

*Judge*

- NOTICE —(1) If you are summoned only to produce a document and not to give evidence you shall be deemed to have complied with the summons if you cause such document to be produced in this Court on the day and hour aforesaid.
- (2) If you are detained beyond the day aforesaid, a sum of Rs. \_\_\_\_\_ will be tendered to you for each day's attendance beyond the day specified.

## No 14

PROCLAMATION REQUIRING ATTENDANCE OF WITNESS (O 16 r 10)  
(Title)

To

WHEREAS it appears from the examination on oath of the serving officer that the summons could not be served upon the witness in the manner prescribed by law and whereas it appears that the evidence of the witness is material, and he absconds and keeps out of the way for the purpose of evading the service of the summons This proclamation is therefore under rule 10 of Order XVI of the Code of Civil Procedure 1908 issued requiring the attendance of the witness in this Court on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_ at \_\_\_\_\_ o'clock in the forenoon and from day to day until he shall have leave to depart and if the witness fails to attend on the day and hour aforesaid he will be dealt with according to law

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_

*Judge*

## No 15

PROCLAMATION REQUIRING ATTENDANCE OF WITNESS (O 16 r 10)  
(Title)

To

WHEREAS it appears from the examination on oath of the serving officer that the summons has been duly served upon the witness and whereas it appears that the evidence of the witness is material and he has failed to attend in compliance with such summons This proclamation is therefore under rule 10 of Order XVI of the Code of Civil Procedure 1908 issued requiring the attendance of the witness in this Court on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_ at \_\_\_\_\_ o'clock in the forenoon, and from day to day until he shall have leave to depart and if the witness fails to attend on the day and hour aforesaid he will be dealt with according to law

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_

*Judge*

Forms of Pr

Ap

No 16

WARRANT OF ATTACHMENT OF PROPERTY OF WITNESS (O 16 r 10)

(Title)

To

The Bailiff of the Court

WHEREAS the witness \_\_\_\_\_ cited  
 by \_\_\_\_\_ has not after the  
 expiration of the period limited in the proclamation issued for his attendance appeared  
 in Court You are hereby directed to hold under attachment  
 property belonging to the said witness to the value of \_\_\_\_\_ and to  
 submit a return accompanied with an inventory thereof within \_\_\_\_\_ days

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this \_\_\_\_\_ day of  
 19 \_\_\_\_\_

Judge

No 17

WARRANT OF ARREST OF WITNESS (O 16 r 10)

(Title)

To

The Bailiff of the Court

WHEREAS \_\_\_\_\_ has been duly served with a summons but has failed to  
 attend [absconds and keeps out of the way for the purpose of avoiding service of a sum  
 mons] You are hereby ordered to arrest and bring the said \_\_\_\_\_ before the Court

You are further ordered to return this warrant on or before the  
 day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19 \_\_\_\_\_ with an endorsement certifying the day on and  
 the manner in which it has been executed or the reason why it has not been executed

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Judge

No 18

WARRANT OF COMMITTAL (O 16 r 18)

(Title)

To

The Officer in charge of the Jail at

WHEREAS the plaintiff (or defendant) in the abovenamed suit has made application  
 to this Court that security be taken for the appearance of \_\_\_\_\_ to give  
 evidence (or to produce a document) on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_  
 19 \_\_\_\_\_ and whereas the Court has called upon the said \_\_\_\_\_ to furnish  
 such security which he has failed to do This is to require you to receive the said  
 \_\_\_\_\_ into your custody in the civil prison and to produce him before this Court at  
 on the said day and on such other day or days as may be hereafter ordered

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Judge

of Process

3

No 19

WARRANT OF COMMITTAL. (O 16 r 18)

(Title)

To

The Officer in charge of the Jail at

WHEREAS , whose attendance is required before this Court in the abovenamed case to give evidence (or to produce a document) has been arrested and brought before the Court in custody and whereas owing to the absence of the plaintiff (or defendant) the said cannot give such evidence (or produce such document) and whereas the Court has called upon the said to give security for his appearance on the day of 19 at which he has failed to do. Thus to require you to receive the said into your custody in the civil prison and produce him before this Court at on the day of 19

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this day of 19  
*Judge*

---

**APPENDIX C**  
**DISCOVERY, INSPECTION AND ADMISSION**

## No 1

## ORDER FOR DELIVERY OF INTERROGATORIES (0 11 r 1)

In the Court of  
Civil Suit No \_\_\_\_\_  
A B

of

\_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_

*Plaintiff*

*against*

C D E F and C H

*Defendants*

Upon hearing \_\_\_\_\_ and upon reading the affidavit of \_\_\_\_\_ filed  
the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19 \_\_\_\_ It is ordered that the \_\_\_\_\_ be at  
liberty to deliver to the \_\_\_\_\_ interrogatories in writing and that the \_\_\_\_\_  
and \_\_\_\_\_ do answer the interrogatories as prescribed by Order XI rule 8 and  
that the costs of this application be \_\_\_\_\_

## No. 2

## INTERROGATORIES (O 11 r 4)

(Title as in Vol 1 supra)

Interrogatories on behalf of the above named [plaintiff or defendant C D] for the examination of the above named [defendants E F and G H or plaintiff]

- 1 Did not etc  
2 Has not etc

etc

etc

etc

[The defendant E. F. is required to answer the interrogatories numbered ]

[The defendant G H is required to answer the interrogatories numbered

## No 3

## ANSWER TO INTERROGATORIES (O 11 &amp; 9)

(Title as in No 1 supra)

The answer of the above named defendant *E F* to the interrogatories for his examination by the above named plaintiff

In answer to the said interrogatories I the above named E F make oath and say as follows —

- <sup>1</sup> } Enter answers to interrogatories in paragraphs numbered consecutively

- 3 I object to answer the interrogatories numbered \_\_\_\_\_ on the \_\_\_\_\_  
and that [state grounds of objection]

## No 4

## ORDER FOR AFFIDAVIT AS TO DOCUMENTS (O 11 r 12)

(Title as in No 1 *supra*)

Upon hearing \_\_\_\_\_  
It is ordered that the \_\_\_\_\_ do within \_\_\_\_\_ days from the date of  
this order answer on affidavit stating which documents are or have been in his posses-  
sion or power relating to the matter in question in this suit and that the costs of this  
application be \_\_\_\_\_

## of Discovery

## No 6

## AFFIDAVIT AS TO DOCUMENTS (O 11 r 13)

(Title as in No 1 *supra*)I the above named defendant *C D* make oath and say as follows —

1 I have in my possession or power the documents relating to the matters in question in this suit set forth in the first and second parts of the first schedule hereto

2 I object to produce the said documents set forth in the second part of the first schedule hereto *[state grounds of objection]*

3 I have had but have not now in my possession or power the documents relating to the matters in question in this suit set forth in the second schedule hereto

4 The last mentioned documents were last in my possession or power on *[state when and how it has become of them and in whose possession they now are]*

5 According to the best of my knowledge information and belief I have not now and never had in my possession custody or power or in the possession custody or power of my pleader or agent or in the possession custody or power of any other person or my behalf any account book of account voucher receipt letter memorandum paper or writing or any copy of or extract from any such document or any other document whatsoever relating to the matters in question in this suit or any of them or wherein any entry has been made relative to such matters or any of them other than and except the documents set forth in the said first and second schedules hereto

## No 6

## ORDER TO PRODUCE DOCUMENTS FOR EXAMINATION (O 11 r 14)

(Title as in No 1 *supra*)

Upon hearing *and upon reading the affidavit of*  
 the day of *10* It is ordered that the  
 reasonable times on reasonable notice produce at  
 at the following documents namely  
 the be at liberty to inspect and peruse the documents  
 so produced and to make notes of their contents In the meantime it is ordered that  
 all further proceedings be stayed and that the costs of this application be

filed  
 at all  
 alternate  
 and that

## No 7

## NOTICE TO PRODUCE DOCUMENTS (O 11 r 16)

(Title as in No 1 *supra*)

Take notice that the *[plaintiff or defendant]* requires you to produce for his inspection the following documents referred to in your *[plaint or written statement or affidavit]* dated the *10* day of *10*

*[Describe documents required]* *XX* I leader for the

To *1* I leader for the

## No 8

## NOTICE TO INSPECT DOCUMENTS (O 11 r 17)

(Title as in No 1 *supra*)

Take notice that you can inspect the documents mentioned in your notice of the day of *10* *[except the documents numbered]*

in that notice ] at [insert place of inspection] on Thursday next the instant between the hours of 12 and 4 o'clock

Or that the [plaintiff or defendant] objects to giving you inspection of documents mentioned in your notice of the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19 \_\_\_\_\_ on the ground that [state the ground] —

---

No 9

NOTICE TO ADMIT DOCUMENTS (O 12 r 3)

(Title as in No 1 supra)

Take notice that the plaintiff [or defendant] in this suit proposes to adduce in evidence the several documents hereunder specified and that the same may be inspected by the defendant [or plaintiff] his pleader or agent at \_\_\_\_\_ on \_\_\_\_\_ between the hours of \_\_\_\_\_ and the defendant [or plaintiff] is hereby required within forty eight hours from the last mentioned hour to admit that such of the said documents as are specified to be originals were respectively written signed or executed as they purport respectively to have been that such as are specified as copies are true copies and such documents as are stated to have been served sent or delivered were so served sent or delivered respectively saving all just exceptions to the admissibility of all such documents as evidence in this suit

G H pleader [or agent] for plaintiff [or defendant]

To E F pleader [or agent] for defendant [or plaintiff]

[Here describe the documents and specify as to each document whether it is original or a copy]

---

No 10

NOTICE TO ADMIT FACTS (O 12 r 4)

(Title as in No 1 supra)

Take notice that the plaintiff [or defendant] in this suit for the purposes of this suit require defendant [or plaintiff] to admit for the purposes of this suit only the several facts respectively hereunder specified and the defendant [or plaintiff] is hereby required within six days from the service of this notice to admit the said several facts saving all just exceptions to the admissibility of such facts as evidence in this suit

G H pleader [or agent] for plaintiff [or defendant]

T F F pleader [or agent] for defendant [or plaintiff].

The facts the admission of which is required are—

- 1 That M died on the 1st January 1890
- 2 That he died intestate
- 3 That N was his only lawful son
- 4 That O died on the 1st April 1896
- 5 That O was never married

---

No 11

ADMISSION OF FACTS PURSUANT TO NOTICE (O 12 r 4)

(Title as in No 1 supra.)

The defendant [or plaintiff] in this suit for the purposes of this suit only hereby admits the several facts respectively hereunder specified, subject to the qualifications or limitation if any hereunder specified, saving all just exceptions to the admissibility of any such facts or any of them as evidence in this suit

## of Discovery

Provided that this admission is made for the purposes of this suit only and is not an admission to be used against the defendant [or plaintiff] on any other occasion or by any one other than the plaintiff [or defendant or party requiring the admission].

E F pleader [or agent] for defendant [or plaintiff]

To G H pleader [or agent] for plaintiff [or defendant]

| Facts admitted                         | Qualifications or limitation if any subject to which they are admitted. |
|--|---|
| 1 That M. died on the 1st January 1890 | 1   |
| 2 That he died intestate               | 2   |
| 3 That N was his lawful son            | 3 But not that he was his only lawful son                               |
| 4 That O died                          | 4 But not that he died on the 1st April 1896                            |
| 5 That O was never married             | 5   |

## No 12

## NOTICE TO PRODUCE (GENERAL FORM) (O 12 r 8)

(Title as in No 1 *supra*)

Take notice that you are hereby required to produce and show to the Court at the first hearing of this suit all books papers letters copies of letters and other writings and documents in your custody possession or power containing any entry memorandum or minute relating to the matters in question in this suit and particularly

G H pleader [or agent] for plaintiff [or defendant],

To E F pleader [or agent] for defendant [or plaintiff].

## APPENDIX D

### DECREES

No 1

DECREE IN ORIGINAL SUIT (O 20 K 6 7)

(Title)

Claim for

This suit coming on this day for final disposal before \_\_\_\_\_ in the  
 presence of \_\_\_\_\_ for the plaintiff and of \_\_\_\_\_ for the  
 defendant it is ordered and decreed that \_\_\_\_\_ and that the  
 sum of Rs \_\_\_\_\_ be paid by the \_\_\_\_\_ to the  
 on account of the costs of this suit with interest thereon at the rate of \_\_\_\_\_ per  
 cent per annum from this date to date of realization

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19  
 Judge

#### Costs of Suit

| Plaintiff                   |    |   | Defendant |                           |    |   |   |
|-----------------------------|----|---|-----------|---------------------------|----|---|---|
|                             | Rs | A | P         |                           | Rs | A | P |
| 1 Stamp for plaint          |    |   |           | Stamp for power           |    |   |   |
| 2 Do for power              |    |   |           | Do for petition           |    |   |   |
| 3 Do for exhibits           |    |   |           | Pleader s fee             |    |   |   |
| 4 Pleader s fee on Rs       |    |   |           | Subsistence for witnesses |    |   |   |
| 5 Subsistence for witnesses |    |   |           | Service of process        |    |   |   |
| 6 Commissioner s fee        |    |   |           | Commissioner s fee        |    |   |   |
| 7 Service of process        |    |   |           |                           |    |   |   |
| Total                       |    |   |           | Total                     |    |   |   |

No 2

SIMPLE MONEY DECREE (Section 34)

(Title)

Claim for

This suit coming on this day for final disposal before \_\_\_\_\_ in the  
 presence of \_\_\_\_\_ for the plaintiff and of \_\_\_\_\_ for the  
 defendant it is ordered that the \_\_\_\_\_ do pay to the \_\_\_\_\_ the  
 sum of Rs \_\_\_\_\_ with interest thereon at the rate of \_\_\_\_\_ per cent.  
 per annum from \_\_\_\_\_ to the date of realization of the said sum and do also  
 pay Rs \_\_\_\_\_ the costs of this suit, with interest thereon at the rate  
 of \_\_\_\_\_ per cent per annum from this date to the date of realization.

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19  
 Judge



## Forms of Decrees

## App D

## Costs of suit

| Plaintiff |                         |    |   | Defendant |                           |    |   |   |
|-----------|-------------------------|----|---|-----------|---------------------------|----|---|---|
|           |                         | Rs | A | P         |                           | Ps | A | P |
| 1         | Stamp for plaints       |    |   |           | Stamp for power           |    |   |   |
| 2         | Do for power            |    |   |           | Do for petition           |    |   |   |
| 3         | Do for exhibit          |    |   |           | Pleader's fee             |    |   |   |
|           | Pleader's fee on P's    |    |   |           | Subsistence for witnesses |    |   |   |
|           | Subsistence for witness |    |   |           | Service of process        |    |   |   |
|           | secy                    |    |   |           | Commissioner's fee        |    |   |   |
|           | Commissioner's fee      |    |   |           |                           |    |   |   |
|           | Service of process      |    |   |           |                           |    |   |   |
| Total     |                         |    |   |           | Total                     |    |   |   |

**A B**—These forms have been substituted for old Forms Nos 3 to 11 by sec 8 of the Transfer of Property (Amendment) Supplementary Act, 1929, which comes into force on 1st April 1930

## FORM No 3

*Preliminary decree for foreclosure*

(Order XXIV rule 2—Where accounts are directed to be taken.)

(Title)

This suit coming on this \_\_\_\_\_ day etc It is hereby ordered and decreed that it be referred to \_\_\_\_\_ as the Commissioner to take the accounts following —

- (i) an account of what is due on this date to the plaintiff for principal and interest on his mortgage mentioned in the plaint (such interest to be computed at the rate payable on the principal or where no such rate is fixed at six per cent per annum or at such rate as the Court deems reasonable)
- (ii) an account of the income of the mortgaged property received up to this date by the plaintiff or by any other person by the order or for the use of the plaintiff or which without the wilful default of the plaintiff or such person might have been so received
- (iii) an account of all sums of money properly incurred by the plaintiff up to this date for costs charges and expenses (other than the costs of the suit) in respect of the mortgage security together with interest thereon (such interest to be computed at the rate agreed between the parties or failing such rate at the same rate as is payable on the principal or failing both such rates at nine per cent per annum)
- (iv) an account of any loss or damage caused to the mortgaged property before this date by any act or omission of the plaintiff which is destructive of or permanently injurious to the property or by his failure to perform any of the duties imposed upon him by any law for the time being in force or by the terms of the mortgage-deed.

2 And it is hereby further ordered and decreed that any amount received by the plaintiff under clause (ii) or adjudged due under clause (iv) above together with interest thereon, shall

## Forms of

first be adjusted against any sums paid by the plaintiff under clause (iii) together with interest thereon and the balance if any shall be added to the mortgage money or as the case may be debited in reduction of the amount due to the plaintiff on account of interest on the principal sum adjudged due and thereafter in reduction or discharged of the principal

3 And it is hereby further ordered that the said Commissioner shall present the account to this Court with all convenient despatch after making all just allowances on or before the                      day of                      and that upon such report of the Commissioner being received it shall be confirmed and countersigned subject to such modification as may be necessary after consideration of such objections as the parties to the suit may make

4 And it is hereby further ordered and decreed—

- (i) that the defendant do pay into Court on or before the                      day of                      or any later date up to which time for payment may be extended by the Court such sum as the Court shall find due and the sum of                      l s                      for the costs of the suit awarded to the plaintiff
- (ii) that on such payment and on payment thereafter before such date as the Court may fix of such amount as the Court may adjudge due in respect of such costs of the suit and such costs charges and expenses as may be payable under rule 10 together with such subsequent interest as may be payable under rule 11 of Order XXXV of the First Schedule to the Code of Civil Procedure 1908 the plaintiff shall bring into Court all documents in his possession or power relating to the mortgaged property in the plaint mentioned and all such documents shall be delivered over to the defendant or to such person as he appoints and the plaintiff shall if so required re convey or re transfer the said property free from the said mortgage and clear of and from all incumbrances created by the plaintiff or any person claiming under him or any person under whom he claims and free from all liability whatsoever arising from the mortgage or this suit and shall if so required deliver up to the defendant quiet and peaceable possession of the said property

5 And it is hereby further ordered and decreed that in default of payment as aforesaid the plaintiff shall be at liberty to apply to the Court for a final decree that the defendant shall thenceforth stand absolutely debarred and foreclosed of and from all right to redeem the mortgaged property described in the Schedule annexed hereto and shall if so required deliver up to the plaintiff quiet and peaceable possession of the said property and that the parties shall be at liberty to apply to the Court from time to time as they may have occasion and on such application or otherwise the Court may give such directions as it thinks fit

## SCHEDULE.

*Description of the mortgaged property*

## FORM No 3A.

*Preliminary decree for foreclosure*

(Order XXXV rule 2—Where the Court declares the amount due) :

## (Title)

This suit coming on this                      day etc                      It is hereby declared that the amount due to the plaintiff on his mortgage mentioned in the plaint calculated up to this day of                      is the sum of Rs                      for principal the sum of Rs.                      for interest on the said principal the sum of Rs.                      for cost charges and

## Forms of Decrees

**App D** expenses (other than the costs of the suit) properly incurred by the plaintiff in respect of the mortgage security together with interest thereon and the sum of Rs. for the costs of this suit awarded to the plaintiff making in all the sum of Rs.

2 And it is hereby ordered and decreed as follows —

- (i) that the defendant do pay into Court on or before the day of or any later date up to which time for payment may be extended by the Court of the said sum of Rs.
- (ii) that on such payment and on payment thereafter before such date as the Court may fix of such amount as the Court may adjudge due in respect of such costs of the suit and such costs charges and expenses as may be payable under rule 10 together with such subsequent interest as may be payable under rule 11 of Order XXXIV of the First Schedule to the Code of Civil Procedure 1908 the plaintiff shall bring into Court all documents in his possession or power relating to the mortgaged property in the plaint mentioned and all such documents shall be delivered over to the defendant or to such person as he appoints and the plaintiff shall if so required reconvey or re transfer the said property free from the said mortgage and clear of and from all incumbrances created by the plaintiff or any person claiming under him or any person under whom he claims and free from all liability whatsoever arising from the mortgage of this suit and shall if so required deliver up to the defendant quiet and peaceable possession of the said property

3 And it is hereby further ordered and decreed that in default of payment as aforesaid the plaintiff may apply to the Court for a final decree that the defendant shall thenceforth stand absolutely debarred and foreclosed of and from all right to redeem the mortgaged property described in the Schedule annexed hereto and shall if so required deliver up to the plaintiff quiet and peaceable possession of the said property and that the parties shall be at liberty to apply to the Court from time to time as they may have occasion and on such application or otherwise the Court may give such directions as it thinks fit

## SCHEDULE.

*Description of the mortgaged property*

## FORM No 4

*Final decree for foreclosure**(Order XXIV rule 3)**(Title)*

Upon reading the preliminary decree passed in this suit on the day of and further orders (if any) dated the day of the application of the plaintiff dated the day of for a final decree and after hearing the parties and it appearing that the payment directed by the said decree and orders has not been made by the defendant or any person on his behalf or any other person entitled to redeem the said mortgage

It is hereby ordered and decreed that the defendant and all persons claiming through or under him be and they are hereby absolutely debarred and foreclosed of and from all right of redemption of and in the property in the aforesaid preliminary decree mentioned (and (if the defendant be in possession of the said mortgaged property) that the defendant shall deliver to the plaintiff quiet and peaceable possession of the said mortgaged property]

## Forms

2 And it is hereby further declared that the whole of the liability whatsoever of the defendant up to this day arising from the said mortgage mentioned in the plaint or from this suit is hereby discharged and extinguished

## FORM No 5

*Preliminary decree for sale*

(Order XXXIV rule 4—Where accounts are directed to be taken)

## (Title)

This suit coming on this                      day etc It is hereby ordered and decreed that it be referred to                      as the Commissioner to take the accounts following—

- (i) an account of what is due on this date to the plaintiff for principal and interest on his mortgage mentioned in the plaint (such interest to be computed at the rate payable on the principal or where no such rate is fixed at six per cent per annum or at such rate as the Court deems reasonable)
- (ii) an account of the income of the mortgaged property received up to this date by the plaintiff or by any other person by the order or for the use of the plaintiff or which without the wilful default of the plaintiff or such person might have been so received
- (iii) an account of all sums of money properly incurred by the plaintiff up to this date for costs charges and expenses other than the costs of the suit in respect of the mortgage security together with interest thereon (such interest to be computed at the rate agreed between the parties or failing such rate at the same rate as is payable on the principal or failing both such rates at nine per cent per annum)
- (iv) an account of any loss or damage caused to the mortgaged property before this date by any act or omission of the plaintiff which is destructive of or permanently injurious to the property or by his failure to perform any of the duties imposed upon him by any law for the time being in force or by the terms of the mortgage deed

2 And it is hereby further ordered and decreed that any amount received under clause (iv) or adjudged due under clause (ii) above together with interest thereon shall first be adjusted against any sums paid by the plaintiff under clause (iii) together with interest thereon and the balance if any shall be added to the mortgage money or as the case may be be debited in reduction of the amount due to the plaintiff on account of interest on the principal sum adjudged due and thereafter in reduction or discharge of the principal

3 And it is hereby further ordered that the said Commissioner shall present the account to this Court with all convenient despatch after making all just allowances or or before the                      day of                      , and that upon such report of the Commissioner being received it shall be confirmed and countersigned subject to such modification as may be necessary after consideration of such objections as the parties to the suit may make.

4 And it is hereby further ordered and decreed—

- (i) that the defendant do pay into Court on or before the                      day of                      or any later date up to which time for payment may be extended by the Court such sum as the Court shall find due and the sum of Rs                      for the costs of the suit awarded to the plaintiff

## Forms of Decrees

## App D

- (ii) that on such payment and on payment thereafter before such date as the Court may fix of such amount as the Court may adjudge due in respect of such costs of the suit and such costs charges and expenses as may be payable under rule 10 together with such subsequent interest as may be payable under rule 11 of Order XXXIV of the First Schedule to the Code of Civil Procedure 1908 the plaintiff shall bring into Court all documents in his possession or power relating to the mortgaged property in the plaint mentioned, and all such documents shall be delivered over to the defendant or to such person as he appoints and the plaintiff shall if so required, re-convey or re-transfer the said property free from the mortgage and clear of and from all incumbrances created by the plaintiff or any person claiming under him or any person under whom he claims and shall if so required deliver up to the defendant quiet and peaceable possession of the said property

5 And it is hereby further ordered and decreed that in default of payment as aforesaid the plaintiff may apply to the Court for a final decree for the sale of the mortgaged property and on such application being made the mortgaged property or a sufficient part thereof shall be directed to be sold and for the purposes of such sale the plaintiff shall produce before the Court or such officer as it appoints all documents in his possession or power relating to the mortgaged property

6 And it is hereby further ordered and decreed that the money realised by such sale shall be paid into Court and shall be duly applied (after deduction therefrom of the expenses of the sale) in payment of the amount payable to the plaintiff under this decree and under any further orders that may be passed in this suit and in payment of any amount which the Court may adjudge due to the plaintiff in respect of such costs of the suit, and such costs charges and expenses as may be payable under rule 10 together with such subsequent interest as may be payable under rule 11 of Order XXXIV of the First Schedule to the Code of Civil Procedure 1908 and that the balance if any shall be paid to the defendant or other persons entitled to receive the same

7 And it is hereby further ordered and decreed that if the money realised by such sale shall not be sufficient for payment in full of the amount payable to the plaintiff as aforesaid the plaintiff shall be at liberty (where such remedy is open to him under the terms of his mortgage and is not barred by any law for the time being in force) to apply for a personal decree against the defendant for the amount of the balance and that the parties are at liberty to apply to the Court from time to time as they may have occasion, and on such application or otherwise the Court may give such directions as it thinks fit.

## SCHEDULE.

*Description of the mortgaged property*

## FORM NO 5A.

*Preliminary decree for sale.*

(Order XXXIV, rule 4—When the Court declares the amount due)

(Title)

This suit coming on this \_\_\_\_\_ day etc It is hereby declared that the amount due to the plaintiff on the mortgage mentioned in the plaint calculated up to this day of \_\_\_\_\_ is the sum of Rs \_\_\_\_\_ for principal, the sum of Rs \_\_\_\_\_ for interest on the said principal the sum of Rs. \_\_\_\_\_ for costs charges and expenses (other than the costs of the suit) properly incurred by the plaintiff in respect of the mortgage-security together with interest thereon and the sum of Rs. \_\_\_\_\_ for the costs of the suit awarded to the plaintiff making in all the sum of Rs. \_\_\_\_\_

2 And it is hereby ordered and decreed as follows —

- (1) that the defendant do pay into Court on or before the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ or any later date up to which time for payment may be extended by the Court the said sum of Rs \_\_\_\_\_
- (11) that on such payment and on payment thereafter before such date as the Court may fix of such amount as the Court may adjudge due in respect of such costs of the suit and such costs charges and expenses as may be payable under rule 10 together with such subsequent interest as may be payable under rule 11 of Order XXXIV of the First Schedule to the Code of Civil Procedure 1908 the plaintiff shall bring into Court all documents in his possession or power relating to the mortgaged property in the plaint mentioned and all such documents shall be delivered over to the defendant or to such person as he appoints and the plaintiff shall if so required re-convey or re-transfer the said property free from the said mortgage and clear of and from all incumbrances created by the plaintiff or any person claiming under him or any person under whom he claims and shall if so required deliver up to the defendant quiet and peaceable possession of the said property

3 And it is hereby further ordered and decreed that in default of payment as aforesaid the plaintiff may apply to the Court for a final decree for the sale of the mortgaged property and on such application being made the mortgaged property or a sufficient part thereof shall be directed to be sold and for the purposes of such sale the plaintiff shall produce before the Court or such officer as it appoints all documents in his possession or power relating to the mortgaged property

4 And it is hereby further ordered and decreed that the money realised by such sale shall be paid into Court and shall be duly applied (after deduction therefrom of the expenses of the sale) in payment of the amount payable to the plaintiff under this decree and under any further orders that may be passed in this suit and in payment of any amount which the Court may adjudge due to the plaintiff in respect of such costs of the suit and such costs charges and expenses as may be payable under rule 10 together with such subsequent interest as may be payable under rule 11 of Order XXXIV of the First Schedule to the Code of Civil Procedure 1908 and that the balance if any shall be paid to the defendant or other persons entitled to receive the same

5 And it is hereby further ordered and decreed that if the money realised by such sale shall not be sufficient for payment in full of the amount payable to the plaintiff as aforesaid the plaintiff shall be at liberty (where such remedy is open to him under the terms of his mortgage and is not barred by any law for the time being in force) to apply for a personal decree against the defendant for the amount of the balance and that the parties are at liberty to apply to the Court from time to time as they may have occasion and on such application or otherwise the Court may give such directions as it thinks fit

#### SCHEDULE

#### *Description of the mortgaged property*

#### FORM No 6

#### *Final decree for sale.*

(Order XXXIV rule 5)

(Title)

Upon reading the preliminary decree passed in this suit on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ and further orders (if any) dated the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ and the application of the plaintiff dated the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ for a final decree

## Forms of Decrees

## App D

and after hearing the parties and it appearing that the payment directed by the said decree and orders has not been made by the defendant or any person on his behalf or any other person entitled to redeem the mortgage

It is hereby ordered and decreed that the mortgaged property in the aforesaid preliminary decree mentioned or a sufficient part thereof be sold and that for the purpose of such sale the plaintiff shall produce before the Court or such officer as it appoints all documents in his possession or power relating to the mortgaged property

2 And it is hereby further ordered and decreed that the money realised by such sale shall be paid into the Court and shall be duly applied (after deduction therefrom of the expenses of the sale) in payment of the amount payable to the plaintiff under the aforesaid preliminary decree and under any further orders that may have been passed in this suit and in payment of any amount which the Court may have adjudged due to the plaintiff for such costs of the suit including the costs of this application and such costs, charges and expenses as may be payable under rule 10 together with such subsequent interest as may be payable under rule 11 of Order XXXIV of the First Schedule to the Code of Civil Procedure 1908 and that the balance if any shall be paid to the defendant or other persons entitled to receive the same

## Form No 7

*Preliminary decree for redemption where on default of payment by mortgagor a decree for foreclosure is passed*

(Order XXXIV rule 7—Where accounts are directed to be taken)

(Title)

This suit coming on this                      day etc It is hereby ordered and decreed that it be referred to                      as the Commissioner to take the accounts following—

- (i) an account of what is due on this date to the defendant for principal and interest on the mortgage mentioned in the plaint (such interest to be computed at the rate payable on the principal or where no such rate is fixed at six percent per annum or at such rate as the Court deems reasonable)
- (ii) an account of the income of the mortgaged property received up to this date by the defendant or by any other person by order or for the use of the defendant or which without the wilful default of the defendant or such person might have been so received
- (iii) an account of all sums of money properly incurred by the defendant up to this date for costs charges and expenses (other than the costs of the suit) in respect of the mortgage security together with interest thereon (such interest to be computed at the rate agreed between the parties or failing such rate at the same rate as is payable on the principal or failing both such rates at nine percent per annum)
- (iv) an account of any loss or damage caused to the mortgaged property before this date by any act or omission of the defendant which is destructive of or permanently injurious to the property or by his failure to perform any of the duties imposed upon him by any law for the time being in force or by the terms of the mortgage-deed.

2 It is hereby further ordered and decreed that any amount received under clause (ii) or adjudged due under clause (iv) above together with interest thereon, shall be adjudged against any sums paid by the defendant under clause (iii) together with interest thereon and the balance if any shall be added to the mortgage money or as the case

## Forms of

may be debited in reduction of the amount due to the defendant on account of interest on the principal sum adjudged due and thereafter in reduction or discharge of the principal

3 And it is hereby further ordered that the said Commissioner shall present the account to this Court with all convenient despatch after making all just allowances on or before the                      day of                      and that upon such report of the Commissioner being received it shall be confirmed and countersigned subject to such modification as may be necessary after consideration of such objections as the parties to the suit may make

4 And it is hereby further ordered and decreed—

- (i) that the plaintiff do pay into Court on or before the                      day of                      or any later date up to which time for payment may be extended by the Court such sum as the Court shall find due and the sum of Rs                      for the costs of the suit awarded to the defendant
- (ii) that on such payment and on payment thereafter before such date as the Court may fix of such amount as the Court may adjudge due in respect of such costs of the suit and such costs charges and expenses as may be payable under rule 10 together with such subsequent interest as may be payable under rule 11 of Order XXIV of the First Schedule to the Code of Civil Procedure 1908 the defendant shall bring into Court all documents in his possession or power relating to the mortgaged property in the plaint mentioned and all such documents shall be delivered over to the plaintiff or to such person as he appoints and the defendant shall if so required re convey or re transfer the said property free from the said mortgage and clear of and from all incumbrances created by the defendant or any person claiming under him or any person under whom he claims and free from all liability whatsoever arising from the mortgage of this suit and shall if so required deliver up to the plaintiff quiet and peaceable possession of the said property

5 And it is hereby further ordered and decreed that in default of payment as aforesaid the defendant shall be at liberty to apply to the Court for a final decree that the plaintiff shall thenceforth stand absolutely debarred and foreclosed of and from all right to redeem the mortgaged property described in the Schedule annexed hereto and shall if so required deliver up to the defendant quiet and peaceable possession of the said property and that the parties shall be at liberty to apply to the Court from time to time as they may have occasion and on such application or otherwise the Court may give such directions as it thinks fit

## SCHEDULE.

*Description of the mortgaged property*Form No 7A<sub>1</sub>

*Preliminary decree for redemption where on default of payment by mortgagor a decree for sale is passed*

(Order XXXI rule 7—Where accounts are directed to be taken.)

## (Title)

This suit coming on this                      day etc It is hereby ordered and decreed that it be referred to                      as the Commissioner to take the accounts following—

- (i) an account of what is due on this date to the defendant for principal and interest on the mortgage mentioned in the plaint (such interest to be computed at the rate payable on the principal or where no such rate is fixed at six per cent per annum or at such rate as the Court deems reasonable)



## Forms of Decrees

## App D

- (ii) an account of the income of the mortgaged property received up to this date by the defendant or by any other person by the order or for the use of the defendant or which without the wilful default of the defendant or such person might have been so received
- (iii) an account of all sums of money properly incurred by the defendant up to the date for costs charges and expenses (other than the costs of the suit) in respect of the mortgage security together with interest thereon (such interest to be computed at the rate agreed between the parties or failing such rate at the same rate as is payable on the principal or failing both such rates at nine per cent per annum)
- (iv) an account of any loss or damage caused to the mortgaged property before the date by any act or omission of the defendant which is destructive of or permanently injurious to the property or by his failure to perform any of the duties imposed upon him by any law for the time being in force or by the terms of the mortgage deed

2 And it is hereby further ordered and decreed that any amount received under clause (ii) or adjudged due under clause (ii) above together with interest thereon shall first be adjusted against any sums paid by the defendant under clause (iii) together with interest thereon and the balance if any shall be added to the mortgage money or as the case may be be debited in reduction of the amount due to the defendant on account of interest on the principal sum adjudged due and thereafter in reduction or discharge of the principal

3 And it is hereby further ordered that the said Commissioner shall present the account to this Court with all convenient despatch after making all just allowances on or before the                      day of                      and that upon such report of the Commissioner being received it shall be confirmed and countersigned subject to such modification as may be necessary after consideration of such objections as the parties to the suit may make

4 And it is hereby further ordered and decreed—

- (i) that the plaintiff do pay into Court on or before the                      day of                      or any later date up to which time for payment may be extended by the Court such sum as the Court shall find due and the sum of Rs                      for the costs of the suit awarded to the defendant
- (ii) that on such payment and on payment thereafter before such date as the Court may fix of such amount as the Court may adjudge due in respect of such costs of the suit and such costs charges and expenses as may be payable under rule 10 together with such subsequent interest as may be payable under rule 11 of Order XXXIV of the First Schedule to the Code of Civil Procedure 1908 the defendant shall bring into Court all documents in his possession or power relating to the mortgaged property in the plaint mentioned, and all such documents shall be delivered over to the plaintiff or to such person as he appoints and the defendant shall if so required reconvey or retransfer the said property free from the said mortgage and clear of and from all incumbrances created by the defendant or any person claiming under him or any person under whom he claims and shall if so required deliver up to the plaintiff quiet and peaceable possession of the said property

5 And it is hereby further ordered and decreed that in default of payment as aforesaid the defendant may apply to the Court for a final decree for the sale of the mortgaged property and on such application being made the mortgaged property or a

sufficient part thereof shall be directed to be sold and for the purposes of such sale the defendant shall produce before the Court or such officer as it appoints all documents in his possession or power relating to the mortgaged property

6 And it is hereby further ordered and decreed that the money realised by such sale shall be paid into Court and shall be duly applied (after deduction therefrom of the expenses of the sale) in payment of the amount payable to the defendant under this decree and under any further orders that may be passed in this suit and in payment of any amount which the Court may adjudged due to the defendant in respect of such costs of the suit and such costs charges and expenses as may be payable under rule 10 together with such subsequent interest as may be payable under rule 11 of Order XXIV of the First Schedule to the Code of Civil Procedure 1908 and that the balance if any shall be paid to the plaintiff or other persons entitled to receive the same

7 And it is hereby further ordered and decreed that if the money realised by such sale shall not be sufficient for payment in full of the amount payable to the defendant as aforesaid the defendant shall be at liberty (where such remedy is open to him under the terms of his mortgage and is not barred by any law for the time being in force) to apply for a personal decree against the plaintiff for the amount of the balance and that the parties are at liberty to apply to the Court from time to time as they may have occasion and on such application or otherwise the Court may give such directions as it thinks fit

#### SCHEDULE

##### *Description of the mortgaged property*

#### FORM No 7B

*Preliminary decree for redemption where on default of payment by mortgagor a decree for foreclosure is passed*

(Order XXIV rule 7 —Where the Court declares the amount due)

#### (TITLE)

This suit coming on this      day etc It is hereby declared that the amount due to the defendant on the mortgage mentioned in the plaint calculated up to this day of      is the sum of Rs      for principal the sum of Rs      for interest on the said principal the sum of Rs      for costs charges and expenses (other than the costs of the suit) properly incurred by the defendant in respect of the mortgage security together with interest thereon and the sum of Rs      for the costs of the suit awarded to the defendant making in all the sum of Rs

2 And it is hereby ordered and decreed as follows —

- (i) that the plaintiff do pay into Court on or before the      day of      or any later date up to which time for payment may be extended by the Court the said sum of Rs.
- (ii) that on such payment and on payment thereafter before such date as the Court may fix of such amount as the Court may adjudge due in respect of such costs of the suit and such costs charges and expenses as may be payable under rule 10 together with such subsequent interest as may be payable under rule 11 of Order XXIV of the First Schedule to the Code of Civil Procedure 1908 the defendant shall bring into Court all documents in his possession or power relating to the mortgaged property in the plaint mentioned and all such documents shall be delivered over to the plaintiffs, or to such person as he appoints, and the defendant shall if so required re-convey or re transfer the said property free from the said mortgage and clear of and from

## Forms of Decrees

## App D

and after hearing the parties and it appearing that the payment directed by the said decree and orders has not been made by the plaintiff or any person on his behalf or any other person entitled to redeem the mortgage

It is hereby ordered and decreed that the mortgaged property in the aforesaid preliminary decree mentioned or a sufficient part thereof be sold and that for the purposes of such sale the defendant shall produce before the Court or such officer as it appears all documents in his possession or power relating to the mortgaged property

2 And it is hereby further ordered and decreed that the money realised by such sale shall be paid into Court and shall be duly applied (after deduction therefrom of the expenses of the sale) in payment of the amount payable to the defendant under the aforesaid preliminary decree and under any further orders that may have been passed in this suit and in payment of any amount which the Court may have adjudged due to the defendant for such costs of this suit including the costs of this application and such costs charges and expenses as may be payable under rule 10 together with the subsequent interest as may be payable under rule 11 of Order XXIV of the First Schedule to the Code of Civil Procedure 1908 and that the balance if any shall be paid to the plaintiff or other persons entitled to receive the same

## FORM NO 7F

*Final decree in a suit for foreclosure sale or redemption where the mortgagor pays the amount of the decree*

(Order XXIV rules 3 5 and 8)

(Title)

This suit coming on this                      day for further consideration and it appears that on the            day of            the mortgagor or            the same being a person entitled to redeem has paid into Court all amounts due to the mortgagee under the preliminary decree dated the            day of            It is hereby ordered and decreed that—

- (i) the mortgagee do execute a deed of reconveyance of the property in the aforesaid preliminary decree mentioned in favour of the mortgagor\* [or as the case may be            who has redeemed the property] or an acknowledgment of the payment of the amount due in his favour
- (ii) the mortgagee do bring into Court all documents in his possession and power relating to the mortgaged property in the suit

And it is hereby further ordered and decreed that upon the mortgagee executing the deed of reconveyance or acknowledgment in the manner aforesaid—

- (i) the said sum of Rs            be paid out of Court to the mortgagee
- (ii) the said deeds and documents brought into the Court be delivered out of Court to the mortgagor\* [or the person making the payment] and the mortgagor do when so required concur in registering at the cost of the mortgagor or other person making the payment) the said deed of reconveyance or the acknowledgment in the office of the Sub Registrar of            and
- (iii) \* [if the mortgagee plaintiff or defendant as the case may be is in possession of the mortgaged property] that the mortgagee do forthwith deliver possession of the mortgaged property in the aforesaid preliminary decree mentioned to the mortgagor\* [or such person as aforesaid who has made the payment]

\* Words not required to be deleted

## Forms of

## FORM No 8

*Decree against mortgagor personally for balance after the sale of the mortgaged property*

(Order XXXIV rules 6 and 8A)

(Title)

Upon reading the application of the mortgagee (the plaintiff or defendant as the case may be) and reading the final decree passed in the suit on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ and the Court being satisfied that the net proceeds of the sale held under the afore said final decree amounted to Rs \_\_\_\_\_ and have been paid to the applicant out of the Court on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ and that the balance now due to him under the aforesaid decree is Rs \_\_\_\_\_

And whereas it appears to the Court that the said sum is legally recoverable from the mortgagor (plaintiff or defendant as the case may be) personally

It is ordered hereby and decreed as follows —

That the mortgagor (plaintiff or defendant as the case may be) do pay to the mortgagee (defendant or plaintiff as the case may be) the said sum of Rs \_\_\_\_\_ with further interest at the rate of six per cent per annum from the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ (the date of payment out of Court referred to above) up to the date of realization of the said sum and the costs of this application

## FORM No 9

*Preliminary decree for foreclosure or sale*

[Plaintiff

1st Mortgagee

is

Defendant No 1

Mortgagor

Defendant No 2

2nd Mortgagee]

(Order XXXIV rules 2 and 4)

(Title)

The suit coming on this \_\_\_\_\_ day etc It is hereby declared that the amount due to the plaintiff on the mortgage mentioned in the plaint calculated up to this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ is the sum of Rs \_\_\_\_\_ for principal the sum of Rs \_\_\_\_\_ for interest on the said principal the sum of Rs \_\_\_\_\_ for costs charges and expense (other than the costs of the suit) incurred by the plaintiff in respect of the mortgage security with interest thereon and the sum of Rs \_\_\_\_\_ for the costs of this suit awarded to the plaintiff making in all the sum of of Rs \_\_\_\_\_

(So that declarations to be introduced with regard to the amount due to defendant No 2 in respect of his mortgage if the mortgage money due thereunder has become payable at the date of the suit)

It is further declared that the plaintiff is entitled to payment of the amount due to him in priority to defendant No 2\* [or (if there are several subsequent mortgagees) that the several parties hereto are entitled in the following order to the payment of the sums due to them respectively —]

3 And it is hereby ordered and decreed as follows —

(1) (a) that defendants or one of them do pay into Court on or before the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ or any later date up to which time for payment has been extended by the Court the said sum of Rs \_\_\_\_\_ due to the plaintiff and

## Forms of Decrees

## App D

(b) that defendant No 1 do pay into Court on or before the  
day of \_\_\_\_\_ or any later date up to  
which time for payment has been extended by the Court the sum  
sum of Rs \_\_\_\_\_ due to defendant No 2 and

- (ii) that on payment of the sum declared to be due to the plaintiffs by defendant No 1 or either of them in the manner prescribed in clause (i) (a) and on payment thereafter before such date as the Court may fix of such amount as the Court may adjudge due in respect of such costs of the suit and such costs, charges and expenses as may be payable under rule 10 together with such subsequent interest as may be payable under rule 11 of Order XXIV of the First Schedule to the Code of Civil Procedure 1908 the plaintiff shall bring into Court all documents in his possession or power relating to the mortgaged property in plaintiff mentioned and all such documents shall be delivered over to the defendant No \_\_\_\_\_ (who has made the payment) or to such person as he appoints and the plaintiff shall, if so required, re-convey or re-transfer the said property free from the said mortgage and clear of and from all incumbrances created by the plaintiff or any person claiming under him or any person under whom he claims and also free from all liability whatsoever arising from the mortgage or this suit and shall if so required deliver up to the defendant No \_\_\_\_\_ (who has made the payment) quiet and peaceable possession of the said property

*(Similar declarations to be introduced if defendant No 1 pays the amount found or declared to be due to defendant No 2 with such variations as may be necessary having regard to the nature of his mortgage)*

4 And it is hereby further ordered and decreed that in default of payment as aforesaid of the amount due to the plaintiff the plaintiff shall be at liberty to apply to the Court for a final decree—

- (i) *\*[in the case of a mortgage by conditional sale or an anomalous mortgage where the only remedy provided for in the mortgage-deed is foreclosure and not sale] that the defendant jointly and severally shall thenceforth stand absolutely debarred and foreclosed of and from all right to redeem the mortgaged property described in the Schedule annexed hereto and shall if so required deliver to the plaintiff quiet and peaceable possession of the said property or*
- (ii) *\*[in the case of any other mortgage] that the mortgaged property or a sufficient part thereof shall be sold and that for the purposes of such sale the plaintiff shall produce before the Court or such officer as it appoints all documents in his possession or power relating to the mortgaged property and*
- (iii) *\*[in the case where a sale is ordered under clause 4 (ii) above] that the money realised by such sale shall be paid into Court and be duly applied (after deduction therefrom of the expenses of the sale) in payment of the amount payable to the plaintiff under this decree and under any further orders that may have been passed in this suit and in payment of the amount which the Court may adjudge due to the plaintiff in respect of such costs of this suit and such costs, charges and expenses as may be payable under rule 10 together with such subsequent interest as may be payable under rule 11 of Order XXIV of the First Schedule to the Code of Civil Procedure 1908 and that the balance if any shall be applied in payment of the amount due to defendant No. \_\_\_\_\_ and*

that if any balance be left it shall be paid to the defendant No 1 or other persons entitled to receive the same and

- (11) that if the money realised by such sale shall not be sufficient for payment in full of the amounts due to the plaintiff and defendant No 2 the plaintiff or defendant No 2 or both of them as the case may be shall be at liberty (when such remedy is open under the terms of their respective mortgages and is not barred by any law for the time being in force) to apply for a personal decree against defendant No 1 for the amounts remaining due to them respectively

5 And it is hereby further ordered and decreed—

- (a) that if defendant No 2 pays into Court to the credit of this suit the amount adjudged due to the plaintiff but defendant No 1 makes default in the payment of the said amount defendant No 1 shall be at liberty to apply to the Court to keep the plaintiff's mortgage alive for his benefit and to apply for a final decree (in the same manner as the plaintiff might have done under clause 4 above)—

\*[(1) that defendant No 1 shall thenceforth stand absolutely debarred and foreclosed of and from all right to redeem the mortgaged property described in the Schedule annexed hereto and shall if so required deliver up to defendant No 2 quiet and peaceable possession of the said property ] or

\*[(11) that the mortgaged property or a sufficient part thereof be sold and that for the purposes of such sale defendant No 2 shall produce before the Court or such officer as it appoints all documents in his possession or power relating to the mortgaged property and (b) (if on the application of defendant No 2 such a final decree for foreclosure is passed) that the whole of the liability of defendant No 1 arising from the plaintiff's mortgage or from the mortgage of defendant No 2 or from this suit shall be deemed to have been discharged and extinguished

6 And it is hereby further ordered and decreed \**(in the case where a sale is ordered under clause 5 above)*—

- (i) that the money realised by such sale shall be paid into Court and be duly applied (after deduction therefrom of the expenses of the sale) first in payment of the amount paid by defendant No 2 in respect of the plaintiff's mortgage and the costs of the suit in connection therewith and in payment of the amount which the Court may adjudge due in respect of subsequent interest on the said amount and that the balance if any shall then be applied in payment of the amount adjudged due to defendant No 2 in respect of his own mortgage under this decree and any further orders that may be passed and in payment of the amount which the Court may adjudge due in respect of such costs of this suit and such costs charges and expenses as may be payable to defendant No 2 under rule 10 together with such subsequent interest as may be payable under rule 11 of Order XXXIV of the First Schedule to the Code of Civil Procedure 1908 and that the balance if any shall be paid to defendant No 1 or other persons entitled to receive the same and

- (11) that if the money realised by such sale shall not be sufficient for payment in full of the amount due in respect of the plaintiff's mortgage or defendant No 2's mortgage defendant No 1 shall be at liberty (where such remedy is open to him under the terms of his mortgage and is not barred by any law for the time being in force) to apply for a personal decree against defendant No 1 for the amount of the balance

\* Words not required to be deleted.

## Forms of Decrees

App D 7 And it is hereby further ordered and decreed that the parties are at liberty to apply to the Court from time to time as they may have occasion and on such application or otherwise the Court may give such directions as it thinks fit

## SCHEDULE

*Description of the mortgaged property*

## FORM No 10

*Preliminary decree for redemption of prior mortgage and foreclosure or sale on subsequent mortgage*

[Plaintiff

2nd Mortgagee.

11

Defendant No 1

Mortgagor

Defendant No 2

1st Mortgagee]

(Order XXXIV rules 2 4 and 7)

(TITLE.)

The suit coming on this                      day etc It is hereby declared that the amount due to defendant No 2 on the mortgage mentioned in the plaint calculated up to this                      day of                      is the sum of Rs.                      for principal the sum of Rs.                      for interest on the said principal the sum of Rs.                      for costs charges and expenses (other than the costs of the suit) properly incurred by defendant No 2 in respect of the mortgage security with interest thereon and the sum of Rs.                      for the costs of the suit awarded to defendant No 2 making in all the sum of Rs

(Similar declarations to be introduced with regard to the amount due from defendant No 1 to the plaintiff in respect of his mortgage if the mortgage money due thereunder has become payable at the date of the suit)

2 It is further declared that defendant No 2 is entitled to payment of the amount due to him in priority to the plaintiff \* [or if (there are several subsequent mortgagees) that the several parties hereto are entitled in the following order to the payment of the sums due to them respectively —]

3 And it is hereby ordered and decreed as follows —

(1) (a) that the plaintiff or defendant No 1 or one of them do pay into Court on or before the                      day of                      or any later date up to which time for payment has been extended by the Court the said sum of Rs                      , due to defendant No 2 and

(b) that defendant No 1 do pay into Court on or before the                      day of                      or any later date up to which time for payment has been extended by the Court the said sum of Rs.                      due to the plaintiff and

(ii) that on payment of the sum declared due to defendant No 2 by the plaintiff and defendant No 1 or either of them in the manner prescribed in clause (i) (a) and on payment thereafter before such date as the Court may fix of such amount as the Court may adjudge due in respect of such costs of the suit and such costs charges and expenses as may be payable under rule 10 together with such subsequent interest as may be payable under rule 11 of Order XXXIV of the First Schedule to the Code of Civil Procedure 1908 defendant No 2 shall bring into Court all documents in his possession or power relating

to the mortgaged property in the plaint mentioned and all such documents shall be delivered over to the plaintiff or defendant No 1 (whoever has made the payment) or to such person as he appoints and defendant No 2 shall if so required re convey or re transfer the said property free from the said mortgage and clear of and from all incumbrances created by defendant No 2 or any person claiming under him or any person under whom he claims and also free from all liability whatsoever arising from the mortgage or this suit and shall if so required deliver up to the plaintiff or defendant No 1 (whoever has made the payment) quiet and peaceable possession of the said property

*(Similar declarations to be introduced if defendant No 1 pays the amount found or declared due to the plaintiff with such variations as may be necessary having regard to the nature of his mortgage)*

4 And it is hereby further ordered and decreed that in default of payment as aforesaid of the amount due to defendant No 2 defendant No 2 shall be at liberty to apply to the Court that the suit be dismissed or for a final decree—

- (i) *\*[in the case of a mortgage by conditional sale or an anomalous mortgag where the only remedy provided for in the mortgage deed is foreclosure and not sale]* that the plaintiff and defendant No 1 jointly and severally shall thenceforth stand absolutely debarred and foreclosed of and from all right to redeem the mortgaged property described in the Schedule annexed hereto and shall if so required deliver to the defendant No 2 quiet and peaceable possession of the said property or
- (ii) *\*[in the case of any other mortgage]* that the mortgaged property or a sufficient part thereof shall be sold and that for the purposes of such sale defendant No 2 shall produce before the Court or such officer as it appoints all documents in his possession or power relating to the mortgaged property and
- (iii) *\*[in the case where a sale is ordered under clause 4 (ii) above]* that the money realised by such sale shall be paid into Court and be duly applied (after deduction therefrom of the expenses of the sale) in payment of the amount payable to defendant No 2 under the decree and any further orders that may be passed in this suit and in payment of the amount which the Court may adjudge due to defendant No 2 in respect of such costs of the suit and such costs charges and expenses as may be payable to the plaintiff under rule 10 together with such subsequent interest as may be payable under rule 11 of Order XXXIV of the First Schedule to the Code of Civil Procedure 1908 and that the balance if any shall be applied in payment of the amount due to the plaintiff and that if any balance be left it shall be paid to defendant No 1 or other persons entitled to receive the same and
- (iv) that if the money realised by such sale shall not be sufficient for payment in full of the amounts due to defendant No 2 and the plaintiff defendant No 2 or the plaintiff or both of them as the case may be shall be at liberty (when such remedy is open under the terms of their respective mortgages and is not barred by any law for the time being in force) to apply for a personal decree against defendant No 1 for the amounts remaining due to them respectively



## Forms of Decrees

## App D

5 And it is hereby further ordered and decreed —

(a) that if the plaintiff pays into Court to the credit of this suit the amount adjudged due to defendant No 2 but defendant No 1 makes default in the payment of the said amount the plaintiff shall be at liberty to apply to the Court to keep defendant No 2's mortgage alive for his benefit and to apply for a final decree *(in the same manner as the defendant No 2 might have done under clause 4 above)*—

\*[(i) that defendant No 1 shall thenceforth stand absolutely debarred and foreclosed of and from all right to redeem the mortgaged property described in the Schedule annexed hereto and shall if so required deliver up to the plaintiff quiet and peaceable possession of the said property ] or

\* [(ii) that the mortgaged property or a sufficient part thereof be sold and that for the purposes of such sale the plaintiff shall produce before the Court or such officer as it appoints all documents in his possession or power relating to the mortgaged property ]

and (b) (if on the application of defendant No 2 such a final decree for foreclosure is passed) that the whole of the liability of defendant No 1 arising from the plaintiff's mortgage or from the mortgage of defendant No 2 or from this suit shall be deemed to have been discharged and extinguished.

6 And it is hereby further ordered and decreed *(in the case where a sale is ordered under clause 5 above)*—

(i) that the money realised by such sale shall be paid into Court and be duly applied (after deduction therefrom of the expenses of the sale) first in payment of the amount paid by the plaintiff in respect of defendant No 2's mortgage and the costs of the suit in connection therewith and in payment of the amount which the Court may adjudge due in respect of subsequent interest on the said amount and that the balance if any shall then be applied in payment of the amount adjudged due to the plaintiff in respect of his own mortgage under this decree and any further orders that may be passed and in payment of the amount which the Court may adjudge due in respect of such costs of the suit and such costs charges and expenses as may be payable to the plaintiff under rule 10 together with such subsequent interest as may be payable under rule 11 of Order XXIV of the First Schedule to the Code of Civil Procedure 1908 and that the balance if any shall be paid to defendant No 1 or other persons entitled to receive the same and

(ii) that if the money realised by such sale shall not be sufficient for payment in full of the amount due in respect of defendant No 2's mortgage or the plaintiff's mortgage defendant No 2 shall be at liberty (where such remedy is open to him under the terms of his mortgage and is not barred by any law for the time being in force) to apply for a personal decree against defendant No 1 for the amount of the balance

7 And it is hereby further ordered and decreed that the parties are at liberty to apply to the Court from time to time as they may have occasion and on such application or otherwise the Court may give such directions as it thinks fit.

## SCHEDULE.

*Description of the mortgaged property*

\* Words not required to be deleted

## FORM No 11

*Preliminary decree for sale*  
 [ Plaintiff—Sub or derivative mortgagee ]  
 vs  
 Defendant No 1 —Mortgagor  
 [ Defendant No 2 —Original mortgagee ]  
 (Order XXXIV rule 4 )  
 (TITLE )

This suit coming on this            day etc    It is hereby declared that the amount due to defendant No 2 on his mortgage calculated up to this            day of            is the sum of Rs            for principal the sum of Rs            for interest on the said principal the sum of Rs            for costs charges and expenses (other than the costs of the suit) in respect of the mortgage security together with interest thereon and the sum of Rs.            for the costs of the suit awarded to defendant No 2 making in all the sum of Rs

*(Similar declarations to be introduced with regard to the amount due from defendant No 2 to the plaintiff in respect of his mortgage )*

2 And it is hereby ordered and decreed as follows —

- (i) that defendant No 1 do pay into Court on or before the said day of            or any later date up to which time for payment may be extended by the Court the said sum of Rs            due to defendant No 2

*(Similar declarations to be introduced with regard to the amount due to the plaintiff defendant No 2 being at liberty to pay such amount )*

- (ii) that on payment of the sum declared due to defendant No 2 by defendant No 1 in the manner prescribed in clause 2 (i) and on payment there after before such date as the Court may fix of such amount as the Court may adjudge due in respect of such costs of the suit and such costs charges and expenses as may be payable under rule 10 together with such subsequent interest as may be payable under rule 11 of Order XXXIV of the First Schedule to the Code of Civil Procedure 1908 the plaintiff and defendant No 2 shall bring into Court all documents in their possession or power relating to the mortgaged property in the plaint mentioned and all such documents (except such as relate only to the sub mortgage) shall be delivered over to defendant No 1 or to such person as he appoints, and defendant No 2 shall if so required re convey or re transfer the property to defendant No 1 free from the said mortgage clear of and from all incumbrances created by defendant No 2 or any person claiming under him or any person under whom he claims and free from all liability arising from the mortgage or this suit and shall if so required deliver up to defendant No 1 quiet and peaceable possession of the said property and

- (iii) that upon payment into the Court by defendant No. 1 of the amount due to defendant No 2 the plaintiff shall be at liberty to apply for payment to him of the sum declared due to him together with any subsequent costs of the suit and other costs charges and expenses as may be payable under rule 10 together with such subsequent interest as may be payable under rule 11 of Order XXXIV of the First Schedule to the Code of Civil Procedure 1908 and that the balance if any shall then be paid to defendant No. 2 and that if the amount paid into the Court be not sufficient to pay in full the sum due to the plaintiff the plaintiff shall be at liberty (if such remedy is open to him by the terms of the mortgage and is not barred by any law for the time being in force) to apply for a personal decree against defendant No. 2 for the amount of the balance

## Forms of Decrees

App D

3 And it is further ordered and decreed that if defendant No 2 pays into Court to the credit of this suit the amount adjudged due to the plaintiff the plaintiff shall bring into the Court all documents etc [as in sub clauses (ii) of clause 2]

4 And it is hereby further ordered and decreed that in default of payment by defendants Nos 1 and 2 as aforesaid the plaintiff may apply to the Court for a final decree for sale and on such application being made the mortgaged property or a sufficient part thereof shall be directed to be sold and that for the purposes of such sale the plaintiff and defendant No 2 shall produce before the Court or such officer as it appoints all documents in their possession or power relating to the mortgaged property

5 And it is hereby further ordered and decreed that the money realised by such sale shall be paid into Court and be duly applied (after deduction therefrom of the expenses of the sale) first in payment of the amount due to the plaintiff as specified in clause 1 above with such costs of the suit and other costs charges and expenses as may be payable under rule 10 together with such subsequent interest as may be payable under rule 11 of Order XXIV of the First Schedule to the Code of Civil Procedure 1908 and that the balance if any shall be applied in payment of the amount due to defendant No 2 and that if any balance be left it shall be paid to defendant No 1 or other persons entitled to receive the same

6 And it is hereby further ordered and decreed that if the money realised by such sale shall not be sufficient for payment in full of the amounts payable to the plaintiff and defendant No 2 the plaintiff or defendant No 2 or both of them as the case may be shall be at liberty (if such remedy is open under their respective mortgages and is not barred by any law for the time being in force) to apply for a personal decree against defendant No 2 or defendant No 1 (as the case may be) for the amount of the balance

7 And it is hereby further ordered and decreed that if defendant No 2 pays into Court to the credit of this suit the amount adjudged due to the plaintiff but defendant No 1 makes default in payment of the amount due to defendant No 2 defendant No 1 shall be at liberty to apply to the Court for a final decree for foreclosure or sale (as the case may be)—(declarations in the ordinary form to be introduced according to the nature of defendant No 2's mortgage and the remedies open to him thereunder)

8 And it is hereby further ordered and decreed that the parties are at liberty to apply to the Court as they may have occasion and on such application or otherwise the Court may give such directions as it thinks fit

## SCHEDULE

*Description of the mortgaged property*

No 12

## DECREE FOR RECTIFICATION OF INSTRUMENT

(Title)

It is hereby declared that the \_\_\_\_\_ dated the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_ does not truly express the intention of the parties to such \_\_\_\_\_  
And it is decreed that the said \_\_\_\_\_ be rectified by \_\_\_\_\_

No 13

## DECREE TO SET ASIDE A TRANSFER IN FRAUD OF CREDITORS.

(Title)

It is hereby declared that the \_\_\_\_\_ dated the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_ and made between \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_ is void as against the plaintiff and all other the creditors, if any of the defendant \_\_\_\_\_

## No 14

## INJUNCTION AGAINST PRIVATE NUISANCE

(Title)

Let the defendant his agents servants and workmen be perpetually restrained from burning or causing to be burnt any bricks on the defendant's plot of land marked B in the annexed plan so as to occasion a nuisance to the plaintiff as the owner or occupier of the dwelling house and garden mentioned in the plaint as belonging to and being occupied by the plaintiff

## No 15

## INJUNCTION AGAINST BUILDING HIGHER THAN OLD LEVEL

(Title)

Let the defendant his contractors agents and workmen be perpetually restrained from continuing to erect upon his premises in any house or building of a greater height than the buildings which formerly stood upon his said premises and which have been recently pulled down so or in such manner as to darken injure or obstruct such of the plaintiff's windows in his said premises as are ancient lights

## No 16

## INJUNCTION RESTRAINING USE OF PRIVATE ROAD

(Title)

Let the defendant his agents servants and workmen be perpetually restrained from using or permitting to be used any part of the lane at the soil of which belongs to the plaintiff as a carriage way for the passage of carts carriages or other vehicles either going to or from the land marked B in the annexed plan or for any purpose whatsoever

## No 17

## PRELIMINARY DECREE IN AN ADMINISTRATION SUIT

(Title)

It is ordered that the following accounts and inquiries be taken and made that is to say —

*In creditor's suit—*

1 That an account be taken of what is due to the plaintiff and all other the creditors of the deceased

*In suits by legatees—*

2 That an account be taken of the legacies given by the testator's will

*In suits by next-of kin—*

3 That an inquiry be made and account taken of what or of what share if any the plaintiff is entitled to as next-of kin (or one of the next of kin) of the intestate

[After the first paragraph the decree will where necessary order in a creditor's suit inquiry and accounts for legatees heirs at law and next-of kin. In suits by claimants other than creditors after the first paragraph in all cases, an order to inquire and take an account of creditors will follow the first paragraph and such of the others as may be necessary will follow omitting the first formal words. The form is continued as in a creditor's suit.]

## Forms of Decrees

## App D

- 4 An account of the funeral and testamentary expenses
- 5 An account of the movable property of the deceased come to the hands of the defendant or to the hands of any other person by his order or for his use
- 6 An inquiry what part (if any) of the movable property of the deceased is outstanding and undisposed of
- 7 And it is further ordered that the defendant do on or before the day of next pay into Court all sums of money which shall be found to have come to his hands or to the hands of any person by his order or for his use
- 8 And that if the \* shall find it necessary for carrying out the objects of the suit to sell any part of the movable property of the deceased that the same be sold accordingly and the proceeds paid into Court
- 9 And that Mr E F be receiver in the suit (or proceeding) and receive and get in all outstanding debts and outstanding movable property of the deceased, and pay the same into the hands of the \* (and shall give security by bond for the due performance of his duties to the amount of rupees)
- 10 And it is further ordered that if the movable property of the deceased be found insufficient for carrying out the objects of the suit then the following further inquiries be made and accounts taken, that is to say—
  - (a) an inquiry what immovable property the deceased was seized of or entitled to at the time of his death
  - (b) an inquiry what are the incumbrances (if any) affecting the immovable property of the deceased or any part thereof
  - (c) an account so far as possible of what is due to the several incumbrancers and to include a statement of the priorities of such of the incumbrancers as shall consent to the sale hereinafter directed
- 11 And that the immovable property of the deceased or so much thereof as shall be necessary to make up the fund in Court sufficient to carry out the object of the suit be sold with the approbation of the Judge free from incumbrances (if any) of such incumbrancers as shall consent to the sale and subject to the incumbrances of such of them as shall not consent
- 12 And it is ordered that G H shall have the conduct of the sale of the immovable property and shall prepare the conditions and contracts of sale subject to the approval of the \* and that in case any doubt or difficulty shall arise the papers shall be submitted to the Judge to settle
- 13 And it is further ordered that for the purpose of the inquiries hereinbefore directed the \* shall advertise in the newspapers according to the practice of the Court or shall make such inquiries in any other way which shall appear to the \* to give the most useful publicity to such enquiries
- 14 And it is ordered that the above inquiries and accounts be made and taken and that all other acts ordered to be done be completed before the day of and that the \* do certify the result of the inquiries and the accounts and that all other acts ordered are completed and have his certificate in that behalf ready for the inspection of the parties on the day of
- 15 And lastly it is ordered that this suit [or proceeding] stand adjourned for [making final decree to the day of  
Such part only of this decree is to be used as is applicable to the particular case]

## No 18

## FINAL DECREE IN AN ADMINISTRATION SUIT BY A LEGATEE.

(Title)

1 It is ordered that the defendant do on or before the day of pay into Court the sum of Rs the balance by the said certificate found to be due from the said defendant on account of the estate of the testator and also the sum of Rs for interest at the rate of Rs per cent per annum from the day of to the day of amounting together to the sum of Rs

2 Let the \* of the said Court tax the costs of the plaintiff any defendant in this suit and let the amount of the said costs when so taxed be paid out of the said sum of Rs order to be paid into Court as aforesaid as follows —

(a) The costs of the plaintiff to Mr his attorney [or pleader] and the costs of the defendant to Mr his attorney [or pleader]

(b) And (if any debts are due) with the residue of the said sum of Rs after payment of the plaintiff's and defendant's costs as aforesaid let the sums found to be owing to the several creditors mentioned in the schedule to the certificate of the \* together with subsequent interest on such of the debts as bear interest be paid and after making such payments let the amount coming to the several legatees mentioned in the schedule together with subsequent interest (to be verified as aforesaid) be paid to them

3 And if there should then be any residue let the same be paid to the residuary legatees

## No 19

PRELIMINARY DECREE IN AN ADMINISTRATION SUIT BY A LEGATEE  
WHERE AN EXECUTOR IS HELD PERSONALLY LIABLE FOR THE  
PAYMENT OF LEGACIES

(Title.)

1 It is declared that the defendant is personally liable to pay the legacy of Rs bequeathed to the plaintiff

2 And it is ordered that an account be taken of what is due for principal and interest on the said legacy

3. And it is also ordered that the defendant do, within weeks after the date of the certificate of the \* pay to the plaintiff the amount of what the \* shall certify to be due for principal and interest

4 And it is ordered that the defendant to pay the plaintiff his costs of suits the same to be taxed in case the parties differ

---

Here insert name of proper officer

## Forms of Decrees

## App D

- 4 An account of the funeral and testamentary expenses
- 5 An account of the movable property of the deceased come to the hands of the defendant or to the hands of any other person by his order or for his use
- 6 An inquiry what part (if any) of the movable property of the deceased is outstanding and undisposed of
- 7 And it is further ordered that the defendant do on or before the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ next pay into Court all sums of money which shall be found to have come to his hands or to the hands of any person by his order or for his use
- 8 And that if the \_\_\_\_\_ \* shall find it necessary for carrying out the objects of the suit to sell any part of the movable property of the deceased that the same be sold accordingly and the proceeds paid into Court
- 9 And that Mr *E F* be receiver in the suit (or proceeding) and receive and get in all outstanding debts and outstanding movable property of the deceased, and pay the same into the hands of the \_\_\_\_\_ \* (and shall give security by bond for the due performance of his duties to the amount of \_\_\_\_\_ rupees)
- 10 And it is further ordered that if the movable property of the deceased be found insufficient for carrying out the objects of the suit then the following further inquiries be made and accounts taken that is to say—
- (a) an inquiry what immovable property the deceased was seized of or entitled to at the time of his death
- (b) an inquiry what are the incumbrances (if any) affecting the immovable property of the deceased or any part thereof
- (c) an account so far as possible of what is due to the several incumbrancers and to include a statement of the priorities of such of the incumbrancers as shall consent to the sale hereinafter directed
- 11 And that the immovable property of the deceased or so much thereof as shall be necessary to make up the fund in Court sufficient to carry out the object of the suit be sold with the approbation of the Judge free from incumbrances (if any) of such incumbrancers as shall consent to the sale and subject to the incumbrances of such of them as shall not consent
- 12 And it is ordered that *G H* shall have the conduct of the sale of the immovable property and shall prepare the conditions and contracts of sale subject to the approval of the \_\_\_\_\_ \* and that in case any doubt or difficulty shall arise the papers shall be submitted to the Judge to settle
- 13 And it is further ordered that for the purpose of the inquiries hereinbefore directed the \_\_\_\_\_ \* shall advertise in the newspapers according to the practice of the Court or shall make such inquiries in any other way which shall appear to the \_\_\_\_\_ \* to give the most useful publicity to such enquiries
- 14 And it is ordered that the above inquiries and accounts be made and taken and that all other acts ordered to be done be completed before the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ and that the \_\_\_\_\_ \* do certify the result of the inquiries and the accounts and that all other acts ordered are completed and have his certificate in that behalf ready for the inspection of the parties on the day of \_\_\_\_\_
- 15 And lastly it is ordered that this suit [or proceeding] stand adjourned for [making final decree to the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_] Such part only of this decree is to be used as is applicable to the particular case ]

## No 18

## FINAL DECREE IN AN ADMINISTRATION SUIT BY A LEGATEE.

(Title)

1 It is ordered that the defendant do on or before the day of pay into Court the sum of Rs the balance by the said certificate found to be due from the said defendant on account of the estate of the testator and also the sum of Rs for interest at the rate of Rs per cent per annum from the day of to the day of amounting together to the sum of Rs

2 Let the \* of the said Court tax the costs of the plaintiff any defendant in this suit and let the amount of the said costs when so taxed be paid out of the said sum of Rs order to be paid into Court as aforesaid as follows —

(a) The costs of the plaintiff to Mr his attorney [or pleader] and the costs of the defendant to Mr his attorney [or pleader]

(b) And (if any debts are due) with the residue of the said sum of Rs after payment of the plaintiff's and defendant's costs as aforesaid let the sums found to be owing to the several creditors mentioned in the schedule to the certificate of the \* together with subsequent interest on such of the debts as bear interest be paid and after making such payments let the amount coming to the several legatees mentioned in the schedule together with subsequent interest (to be verified as aforesaid) be paid to them

3 And if there should then be any residue let the same be paid to the residuary legatees

## No 19

PRELIMINARY DECREE IN AN ADMINISTRATION SUIT BY A LEGATEE  
WHERE AN EXECUTOR IS HELD PERSONALLY LIABLE FOR THE  
PAYMENT OF LEGACIES

(Title)

1 It is declared that the defendant is personally liable to pay the legacy of Rs bequeathed to the plaintiff

2 And it is ordered that an account be taken of what is due for principal and interest on the said legacy

3. And it is also ordered that the defendant do, within weeks after the date of the certificate of the \* pay to the plaintiff the amount of what the \* shall certify to be due for principal and interest

4 And it is ordered that the defendant to pay the plaintiff his costs of suits, the same to be taxed in case the parties differ



## Forms of Decrees

App D

No 20

## FINAL DECREE IN AN ADMINISTRATION SUIT BY NEXT OF KIN

(Title)

1 Let the \* of the said Court tax the costs of the plaintiff and defendant in this suit and let the amount of the said plaintiff's costs when so taxed be paid by the defendant to the plaintiff out of the sum of Rs the balance by the said certificate found to be due from the said defendant on account of the personal estate of *EF* the intestate within one week after the taxation of the said costs by the said \* and let the defendant return for her own use out of such sum her costs when taxed

2 And it is ordered that the residue of the said sum of Rs after payment of the plaintiff's and defendant's costs as aforesaid be paid and applied by defendant as follows

- (a) Let the defendant within one week after the taxation of the said costs by the \* as aforesaid pay one third share of the said residue to the plaintiffs *AB* and *CD* his wife in her right as the sister and one of the next of kin of the said *EF* the intestate
- (b) Let the defendant retain for her own use one other third share of the said residue as the mother and one of the next of kin of the said *EF* the intestate
- (c) And let the defendant within one week after the taxation of the said costs by the \* as aforesaid pay the remaining one third share of the said residue to *GH* as the brother and the other next of kin of the said *EF* the intestate

No 21

PRELIMINARY DECREE IN A SUIT FOR DISSOLUTION OF PARTNERSHIP  
AND THE TAKING OF PARTNERSHIP ACCOUNTS

(Title)

It is declared that the proportionate shares of the parties in the partnership are as follows —

It is declared that this partnership shall stand dissolved [or shall deemed to have been dissolved] as from the day of and it is ordered that the dissolution thereof as from that day be advertised in the Gazette etc

And it is ordered that be the receiver of the partnership estate and effects in this suit and to get in all the outstanding book-debts and claims of the partnership

And it is ordered that the following accounts be taken —

- 1 An account of the credits property and effects now belonging to the said partnership
- 2 An account of the debts and liabilities of the said partnership
- 3 An account of all dealings and transactions between the plaintiff and defendant from the foot of the settled account exhibited in this suit and marked (A) and not disturbing any subsequent settled accounts

Here insert name of proper officer

## Forms of D

And it is ordered that the good will of the business heretofore carried on by the plaintiff and defendant as in the plaint mentioned and the stock in trade be sold on the premises and that the \*may on the application of any of the parties fix a reserved bidding for all or any of the lots at such sale and that either of the parties is to be at liberty to bid at the sale

And it is ordered that the above accounts be taken and all the other acts required to be done be completed before the day of and that the \* do certify the result of the accounts and that all other acts are completed and have his certificate in that behalf ready for the inspection of the parties on the day of

And lastly it is ordered that this suit stand adjourned for making a final decree to the day of

## No 22

FINAL DECREE IN A SUIT FOR DISSOLUTION OF PARTNERSHIP AND  
THE TAKING OF PARTNERSHIP ACCOUNTS  
(Title)

It is ordered that the fund now in Court amounting to the sum of Rs be applied as follows —

1 In payment of the debts due by the partnership set forth in the certificate of the \* amounting on the whole to Rs

2 In payment of the costs of all parties in this suit amounting to Rs  
[These Costs must be ascertained before the decree is drawn up]

3 In payment of the sum of Rs to the plaintiff as his share of the partnership assets of the sum of Rs being the residue of the said sum of Rs now in Court to the defendant as his share of the partnership as etc

[Or and that the remainder of the said sum of Rs be paid to the said plaintiff [or defendant] in part payment of the sum of Rs certified to be due to him in respect of the partnership accounts]

4 And that the defendant [or plaintiff] do on or before the day of pay to the plaintiff [or defendant] the sum of Rs being the balance of the said sum of Rs due to him which will then remain due

## No 23

DECREE FOR RECOVERY OF LAND AND MESNE PROFITS  
(Title)

It is hereby decreed as follows —

(1) That the defendant do put the plaintiff in possession of the property specified in the schedule hereunto annexed

(2) That the defendant do pay to the plaintiff the sum of Rs with interest thereon at the rate of per cent per annum to the date of realization on account of mesne profits which have accrued due prior to the institution of the suit

Or

(-) That an inquiry be made as to the amount of mesne profits which have accrued due prior to the institution of the suit

(3) That an inquiry be made as to the amount of mesne profits from the institution of the suit until [the delivery of possession to the decree holder] [the relinquishment of possession by the judgment debtor with notice to the decree holder through the Court] [the expiration of three years from the date of the decree].

Here insert name of proper officer

## APPENDIX E

### EXECUTION

#### No 1

NOTICE TO SHOW CAUSE WHY A PAYMENT OR ADJUSTMENT SHOULD NOT BE  
RECORDED AS CERTIFIED (O 21 r 2)

(Title)

To

WHEREAS in execution of the decree in the above named suit has  
applied to this Court that the sum of Rs recoverable under the  
decree has been paid and should be recorded as certified this is to give you notice  
adjusted that you are to appear before this Court on the day of 19  
to show cause why the payment aforesaid should not be recorded as certified  
adjustment

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this day of  
19

Judge

#### No 2

PRECEPT (Section 46)

(Title)

UPON hearing the decree holder it is ordered that this precept be sent to the Court  
of at under section 46 of the Code of Civil Pro-  
cedure 1908 with directions to attach the property specified in the annexed schedule and  
to hold the same pending an application which may be made by the decree holder  
for execution of the decree

Dated the Schedule day of 19  
Judge

#### No 3

ORDER SENDING DECREE FOR EXECUTION TO ANOTHER COURT (O 21 r 6)

(Title)

WHEREAS the decree holder in the above suit has applied to this Court for a certifi-  
cate to be sent to the Court of at  
for execution of the decree in the above suit by the said Court alleging that  
the judgment debtor resides or has property within the local limits of the jurisdiction  
of the said Court and it is deemed necessary and proper to send a certificate to the said  
Court under Order XXI rule 6 of the Code of Civil Procedure 1908 it is

Ordered

That a copy of this order be sent to with a copy of the decree  
and of any order which may have been made for execution of the same and a certificate  
of non satisfaction

Dated the day of 19  
Judge

#### No 4

CERTIFICATE OF NON SATISFACTION OF DECREE (O 21 r 6)

(Title)

Certified that no (1) satisfaction of the decree of this Court in Suit No  
of 19 a copy of which is hereunto attached has been obtained by execution  
within the jurisdiction of this Court

Dated the day of 19  
Judge

(1) If partial strike out no and state to what extent

Forms of E

Ap

No 5

CERTIFICATE OF EXECUTION OF DECREE TRANSFERRED TO ANOTHER COURT

(O 21 P 6)

(Title)

| Number of suit and the Court by which the decree was passed | Names of parties | Date of application for execution | Number of the execution case | Processes issued and dates of service thereof | Costs of execution | Amount realized | How the case is disposed of | Remarks |
|---|------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|---|--------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|---------|
| 1   | 2                | 3                                 | 4                            | 5   | 6                  | 7               | 8                           | 9       |
|   |                  |                                   |                              |   | Rs A P             | Is A P          |                             |         |

Signature of Muharrir in charge.

Signature of Judge

## APPENDIX E

### EXECUTION

## No 1

NOTICE TO SHOW CAUSE WHY A PAYMENT OR ADJUSTMENT SHOULD NOT BE  
RECORDED AS CERTIFIED (O 21, r 2)

(Title)

To

WHEREAS in execution of the decree in the above named suit applied to this Court that the sum of Rs. \_\_\_\_\_ recoverable under the decree has been paid and should be recorded as certified this is to give you notice that you are to appear before this Court on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_ to show cause why the payment adjustment aforesaid should not be recorded as certified

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_

And

## No 2

PRECEPT (Section 46 )

(Title)

Upon hearing the decree holder it is ordered that this precept be sent to the Court of \_\_\_\_\_ at \_\_\_\_\_ under section 46 of the Code of Civil Procedure 1908 with directions to attach the property specified in the annexed schedule and to hold the same pending an application which may be made by the decree holder for execution of the decree.

Dated the \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_  
Schedule  
day of \_\_\_\_\_  
Judge \_\_\_\_\_

## No 3

ORDER SENDING DECREE FOR EXECUTION TO ANOTHER COURT (O 21 r 6)

(Title)

WHEREAS the decree holder in the above suit has applied to this Court for a certificate to be sent to the Court of \_\_\_\_\_ at \_\_\_\_\_ for execution of the decree in the above suit by the said Court alleging that the judgment debtor resides or has property within the local limits of the jurisdiction of the said Court and it is deemed necessary and proper to send a certificate to the said Court under Order XXI rule 6 of the Code of Civil Procedure 1908 it is

*Ordered*

That a copy of this order be sent to \_\_\_\_\_ with a copy of the decree and of any order which may have been made for execution of the same and a certificate of non satisfaction.

Dated the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_  
Judy

## No 4

CERTIFICATE OF NON SATISFACTION OF DECREE (0 21 r 6)

(Title)

Certified that no (1) satisfaction of the decree of this Court in Suit No  
of 19      a copy of which is hereunto attached has been obtained by execution  
within the jurisdiction of this Court

Dated the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_  
Ind. # \_\_\_\_\_

(1) If partial strike out no and state to what extent

Forms of Exe

App

No 5

## CERTIFICATE OF EXECUTION OF DECREE TRANSFERRED TO ANOTHER COURT

(O 21 r 6)

(Title)

| Number of suit and<br>the Court by which<br>the decree was<br>passed | Names of parties | Date of application<br>for execution | Number of the exe-<br>cution case | Processes issued and<br>dates of service<br>thereof | Costs of execution | Amount realized | How the case is dis-<br>posed of | Remarks |
|--|------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|--------------------|-----------------|----------------------------------|---------|
| 1  | 2                | 3                                    | 4                                 | 5   | 6                  | 7               | 8                                | 9       |
|  |                  |                                      |                                   |   | Rs A P             | Rs A P          |                                  |         |

Signature of Muharrir in charge.

Signature of Judge

Forms of Execution  
App E

No 6

APPLICATION FOR EXECUTION OF DECREE (O 21 r 11)  
In the Court of

below set forth — decree holder hereby apply for execution of the decree herein

| 1           | 2                              | 3                 | 4  | 5                                 | 6  | 7   | 8                              | 9                           | 10  |
|-------------|--------------------------------|-------------------|--|-----------------------------------|--|---|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|
| No of suit  | Names of parties               | Date of decree    | Whether any appeal preferred from decree | Payment or adjustment made if any | Previous application if any with date and result         | Amount with interest due upon the decree or other relief granted thereon together with particulars of any cross decrees | Amount of costs if any awarded | Against whom to be executed | Mode in which the assistance of the Court is required   |
| 789 of 1897 | A B—Plaintiff<br>C D—Defendant | October 11th 1897 | No                                       | None                              | Rs 72 4 recorded on application dated the 4th March 1899 | Rs 314 8 2 principal [interest at 6 per cent per annum from date of decree till payment]                                | Rs 47 10 8<br>Total 55 12 4    | Against the defendant C D   | <p>[When attachment and sale of movable property is sought]</p> <p>I pray that the total amount of Rs [together with interest on the principal sum up to date of payment] and the costs of taking out this execution be realized by attachment and sale of defendant's movable property as per annexed list and paid to me</p> <p>[When attachment and sale of immovable property is sought]</p> <p>I pray that the total amount of Rs [together with interest on the principal sum up to date of payment] and the costs of taking out this execution be realized by the attachment and sale of defendant's immovable property specified at the foot of this application and paid to me</p> |

I  
knowledge and belief

declare that what is stated herein is true to the best of my

Dated the

Signed

day of

Decree holder

## Forms of Execution

(When attachment and sale of immovable property is sought)

*Description and Specification of Property*

The undivided one third share of the judgment debtor in a house situated in the village of \_\_\_\_\_ value Rs 40 and bounded as follows —

East by G's house west by H's house south by the public road north by private lane and J's house

I \_\_\_\_\_ declare that what is stated in the above description is true to the best of my knowledge and belief and so far as I have been able to ascertain the interest of the defendant in the property therein specified

*Signed**Decree holder*

No 7

NOTICE TO SHOW CAUSE WHY EXECUTION SHOULD NOT ISSUE (O 21 r 10)

*(Title)*

To \_\_\_\_\_ WHEREAS \_\_\_\_\_ has made application to this Court for execution of decree in Suit No \_\_\_\_\_ of \_\_\_\_\_ 19 \_\_\_\_\_ on the allegation that the said decree has been transferred to him by assignment this is to give you notice that you are to appear before this Court \_\_\_\_\_ on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19 \_\_\_\_\_ to show cause why execution should not be granted

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19 \_\_\_\_\_ Judge

No 8

WARRANT OF ATTACHMENT OF MOVABLE PROPERTY IN EXECUTION  
OF A DECREE FOR MONEY (O 21 r 30)

*(Title)*

To \_\_\_\_\_ The Bailiff of the Court

WHEREAS \_\_\_\_\_ was ordered by decree of this Court passed on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19 \_\_\_\_\_ in Suit No \_\_\_\_\_ of \_\_\_\_\_ 19 \_\_\_\_\_ to pay to the plaintiff the sum of \_\_\_\_\_ Rs \_\_\_\_\_ as noted in the margin and whereas the said sum of Rs \_\_\_\_\_ has not been paid These are to command you to attach the movable property of the said \_\_\_\_\_ as set forth in the schedule hereunto annexed or which shall be pointed out to you by the said \_\_\_\_\_ and unless the said \_\_\_\_\_ shall pay to you the said sum of Rs \_\_\_\_\_ together with the costs of this attachment to hold the same until further orders from this Court

|                    |  |  |  |  |
|--------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Principal          |  |  |  |  |
| Interest           |  |  |  |  |
| Costs              |  |  |  |  |
| Costs of execution |  |  |  |  |
| Further Interest   |  |  |  |  |
| Total              |  |  |  |  |

You are further commanded to return this warrant on or before the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19 \_\_\_\_\_ with an endorsement certifying the day on which and manner in which it has been executed or why it has not been executed.

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19 \_\_\_\_\_ Judge

*Schedule*



## Forms of Execution

App E

No 9

WARRANT FOR SEIZURE OF SPECIFIC MOVABLE PROPERTY ADJUDGED BY DECREE  
(O 21 r 31)

(Title)

To

The Bailiff of the Court

WHEREAS was ordered by decree of this Court passed  
on the day of 19 in Suit No of  
19 to deliver to the plaintiff the movable property (or a  
share in the movable property) specified in the schedule hereunto annexed and whereas  
the said property (or share) has not been delivered

These are to command you to seize the said movable property (or a  
share of the said movable property) and to deliver it to the plaintiff or to such person  
as he may appoint in his behalf

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this day of  
19

Schedule

No 10

## NOTICE TO STATE OBJECTIONS TO DRAFT OF DOCUMENT (O 21 r 34)

(Title)

To

TAKE notice that on the day of 19  
the decree holder in the above suit presented an application to this Court that the Court  
may execute on your behalf a deed of whereof a draft  
is hereunto annexed, of the immovable property specified hereunder and that the  
day of 19 is appointed for the hearing of  
the said application and that you are at liberty to appear on the said day and to state  
in writing any objections to the said draft

Description of Property

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this day of  
19

Judge

No 11

## WARRANT TO THE BAILIFF TO GIVE POSSESSION OF LAND ETC (O 21 r 35)

(Title)

To

The Bailiff of the Court

WHEREAS the undermentioned property in the occupancy of  
has been decreed to the plaintiff in this suit You are hereby  
directed to put the said in possession of the same and you  
are hereby authorised to remove any person bound by the decree who may refuse to  
vacate the same

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this day of  
19

Schedule

Judge

Forms of Ex

Ap

No 12

NOTICE TO SHOW CAUSE WHY WARRANT OF ARREST SHOULD NOT ISSUE

(O 21 r 37)

(Title)

To

WHEREAS \_\_\_\_\_ has made  
 application to this Court for execution of decree in Suit No \_\_\_\_\_ of 19\_\_\_\_  
 by arrest and imprisonment of your person you are hereby required to appear before  
 this Court on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_ to show  
 cause why you should not be committed to the civil prison in execution of the said decree

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_  
 19\_\_\_\_

No 13

WARRANT OF ARREST IN EXECUTION (O 21 r 38)

(Title)

To

The Bailiff of the Court

WHEREAS \_\_\_\_\_ was adjudged by a decree of the  
 Court in Suit No \_\_\_\_\_ of 19\_\_\_\_ dated the \_\_\_\_\_  
 day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_ to pay to the decree holder the sum of

|           |  |  |  |  |
|-----------|--|--|--|--|
|           |  |  |  | Rs _____                                 |
| Principal |  |  |  | as noted in the margin                   |
| Interest  |  |  |  | and whereas the said sum of Rs _____     |
| Costs     |  |  |  | has not been paid to the said decree     |
| Execution |  |  |  | holder in satisfaction of the said de    |
|           |  |  |  | creed these are to command you to        |
|           |  |  |  | arrest the said judgment debtor and      |
|           |  |  |  | unless the said judgment debtor shall    |
|           |  |  |  | pay to you the said sum of Rs _____      |
|           |  |  |  | together with Rs _____ for the cost      |
|           |  |  |  | of executing this process to bring the   |
|           |  |  |  | said defendant before the Court with     |
|           |  |  |  | all convenient speed You are fur         |
|           |  |  |  | ther commanded to return this warrant on |
|           |  |  |  | or before the _____ day of _____         |
|           |  |  |  | 19____                                   |

with an endorsement certifying the day on which and manner in which it  
 has been executed or the reason why it has not been executed

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_  
 19\_\_\_\_ Judge

No 14

WARRANT OF COMMITTAL OF JUDGMENT DEBTOR TO JAIL (O 21 r 40)

(Title)

To

The Officer in charge of the Jail at

WHEREAS \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_  
 who has been brought before this Court this \_\_\_\_\_  
 under a warrant in execution of a decree which was made and pronounced by the said

## Forms of Execution.

App E. Court on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19 \_\_\_\_\_ and by which decree it was ordered that the said \_\_\_\_\_ should pay  
 And whereas the said \_\_\_\_\_ has not obeyed the decree no \_\_\_\_\_  
 filed the Court that he is entitled to be discharged from custody you are hereby directed the Court that he is entitled to be discharged from custody you are hereby directed in the name of the King Emperor of India commanded and required to take and receive the said \_\_\_\_\_ into the civil prison and keep him imprisoned there \_\_\_\_\_ or until the said \_\_\_\_\_  
 for a period not exceeding \_\_\_\_\_  
 decree shall be fully satisfied, or the said \_\_\_\_\_ shall be otherwise entitled to be released according to the terms and provisions of section 58 of the Code of Civil Procedure 1908 and the Court does hereby fix \_\_\_\_\_ annas per diem as the rate of the monthly allowance for the subsistence of the said \_\_\_\_\_ during his confinement under this warrant of committal.  
 GIVEN under my signature and the seal of this Court this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19 \_\_\_\_\_ Judge

## No 15

ORDER FOR THE RELEASE OF A PERSON IMPRISONED IN EXECUTION OF A DECREE  
(Sections 48 49)

(Title)

To

The Officer in charge of the Jail at \_\_\_\_\_  
 UNDER orders passed this day you are hereby directed to set free judgment-debtor now in your custody  
 Dated \_\_\_\_\_ Judge

## No 16

## ATTACHMENT IN EXECUTION

PROHIBITORY ORDER WHERE THE PROPERTY TO BE ATTACHED CONSISTS OF MOVABLE PROPERTY TO WHICH THE DEFENDANT IS ENTITLED SUBJECT TO A LIEN OR PRIOR OF SOME OTHER PERSON TO THE IMMEDIATE POSSESSION THEREOF (O 21 r 45)

(Title)

To

WHEREAS \_\_\_\_\_ on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19 \_\_\_\_\_ in Suit No \_\_\_\_\_ of 19 \_\_\_\_\_ in favour of \_\_\_\_\_ for \_\_\_\_\_ It is ordered that the defendant be and is hereby prohibited and restrained until the further order of this Court from receiving from \_\_\_\_\_ the following property in the possession of the said \_\_\_\_\_ that is to say \_\_\_\_\_ to which the defendant is entitled subject to any claim of the \_\_\_\_\_ and the said \_\_\_\_\_ is hereby prohibited and restrained until the further order of this Court from delivering the said property to any person or persons whomsoever

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19 \_\_\_\_\_ Judge

Forms of Ex

Ap

No 17

## ATTACHMENT IN EXECUTION

PROHIBITORY ORDER WHERE THE PROPERTY CONSISTS OF DEBTS OR SECURED  
BY NEGOTIABLE INSTRUMENT (O 21 r 46)

To  
WHEREAS  
has failed to satisfy a decree passed against on the day  
of 19 in Suit No of 19 in favour of  
for Rs It is ordered that the defendant  
be and is hereby prohibited and restrained until the further order of this Court from  
receiving from you a certain debt alleged now to be due from you to the said defendant  
namely and that you the said be and you are  
hereby prohibited and restrained until the further order of this Court from making  
payment of the said debt or any part thereof to any person whomsoever or otherwise  
than into this Court

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this day of 19 Judge

No 18

## ATTACHMENT IN EXECUTION

PROHIBITORY ORDER WHERE THE PROPERTY CONSISTS OF SHARES IN THE  
CAPITAL OF A CORPORATION (O 21 r 46)

(Title)

To  
WHEREAS  
Secretary of Defendant and to  
Corporation  
has failed to satisfy a decree passed against  
on the day of 19 in Suit No of  
19 in favour of for Rs It is  
ordered that you the defendant be and you are hereby prohibited and restrained  
until the further order of this Court from making any transfer of shares in  
the afore-said Corporation namely or from receiving payment  
of any dividends thereon and you, the Secretary  
of the said Corporation are hereby prohibited and restrained from permitting any such  
transfer or making any such payment

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this day of 19 Judge

No 19

ORDER TO ATTACH SALARY OF PUBLIC OFFICER OR SERVANT OF RAILWAY  
COMPANY OR LOCAL AUTHORITY (O 21 r 49)

(Title)

To  
WHEREAS judgment-debtor in the above named case  
is a (describe office of judgment debtor) receiving his salary (or allowance) at your  
hands and whereas decree holder in the said case has applied in this Court  
for the attachment of the salary (or allowance) of the said to the  
extent of due to him under the decree You are hereby required to  
withhold the said sum of from the salary of the said in  
monthly instalments of and to remit the said sum in monthly instalments  
to this Court

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this day of 19 Judge

## Forms of Execution

App E.

No 20

ORDER OF ATTACHMENT OF NEGOTIABLE INSTRUMENT (O 21 r 51)

(Title)

To

The Bailiff of the Court

WHEREAS an order has been passed by this Court on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of  
 19 \_\_\_\_\_ for the attachment of \_\_\_\_\_

You are hereby directed to seize the said \_\_\_\_\_ and bring the same into Court.

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this \_\_\_\_\_ day of  
 19 \_\_\_\_\_

Judge

No 21

ATTACHMENT

PROHIBITORY ORDER WHERE THE PROPERTY CONSISTS OF MONEY OR OF ANY  
 SECURITY IN THE CUSTODY OF A COURT OF JUSTICE OR OFFICER OF  
 GOVERNMENT (O 21 r 52)

(Title)

To

Sir

The plaintiff having applied under rule 22 of Order XXI of the Code of Civil Pro-  
 cedure 1908 for an attachment of certain money now in your hands (*here state how the  
 money is supposed to be in the hands of the person addressed on what account etc*) I  
 request that you will hold the said money subject to the further order of this Court

I have the honour to be

Sir

Your most obedient Servant  
 Judge

Dated

day of

19

No 22

NOTICE OF ATTACHMENT OF A DECREE TO THE COURT WHICH PASSED IT  
 (O 21 r 53)

(Title)

To

The Judge of the Court of

Sir

I have the honour to inform you that the decree obtained in your Court on the \_\_\_\_\_  
 day of 19 \_\_\_\_\_ by \_\_\_\_\_ in suit No. \_\_\_\_\_  
 of 19 \_\_\_\_\_ in which he was \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_

was

has been attached by this Court on the application of \_\_\_\_\_  
 the \_\_\_\_\_ in the suit specified above You are therefore requested  
 to stay the execution of the decree of your Court until you receive an intimation from  
 this Court that the present notice has been cancelled or until execution of the said  
 decree is applied for by the holder of the decree now sought to be executed or by his  
 judgment debtor

I have the honour etc.  
 Judge

Dated the

day of

19

Forms of Exec

App

No 23

NOTICE OF ATTACHMENT OF A DECREE TO THE HOLDER OF THE DECREE

(O 21 r 53)

(Title)

To

WHEREAS an application has been made in this Court by the decree holder in the above suit for the attachment of a decree obtained by you on the day of

19 in the Court of in Suit No

of 19 in which was and

was It is ordered that you the said be and you are hereby prohibited and restrained until the further order of this Court from transferring or charging the same in any way

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this day of 19

Judge

No 24

ATTACHMENT IN EXECUTION

PROHIBITORY ORDER WHERE THE PROPERTY CONSISTS OF IMMOVABLE PROPERTY

(O 21 r 54)

(Title)

To

Defendant

WHEREAS you have failed to satisfy a decree passed against you on the day of 19 in Suit No of 19 in favour of for Rs It is ordered that you the said be and you are hereby prohibited and restrained until the further order of this Court from transferring or charging the property specified in the schedule hereunto annexed by sale gift or otherwise and that all persons be and that they are hereby prohibited from receiving the same by purchase gift or otherwise

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this day of 19

Schedule

Judge

No 25

ORDER FOR PAYMENT TO THE PLAINTIFF ETC OF MONEY ETC IN THE HANDS OF A THIRD PARTY (O 21 r 56)

(Title)

To

WHEREAS the following property has been attached in execution of a decree in Suit No of 19 passed on the day of 19 in favour of for Rs

It is ordered that the property so attached consisting of Rs in money and Rs in currency notes or a sufficient part thereof to satisfy the said decree shall be paid over by you the said to

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this day of 19

Judge

No 26

NOTICE TO ATTACHING CREDITOR. (O 21 r 53)

(Title)

To

WHEREAS has made application to this Court for the removal of attachment on placed at your instance

## Forms of Execution

App E      in execution of the decree      in suit No      of 19  
this is to give you notice to appear before this Court on      the  
day of      10      either in person or by  
pleader of the Court duly instructed to support your claim as attaching creditor  
GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this      day of      19  
Judge

No 27

## WARRANT OF SALE OF PROPERTY IN EXECUTION OF A DECREE FOR MONEY

(0 21 r 66)

(Title)

To

**The Bailiff of the Court.**

THESE are to command you to sell by auction after giving days previous notice by affixing the same in this Court house and after making due proclamation the property attached under a warrant from this Court dated the day of 19 in execution of a decree in favour of in Suit No. of 19 or so much of the said property as shall realize the sum of Rs being the of the said decree and costs still remaining unsatisfied

You are further commanded to return this warrant on or before the day of 19 with an endorsement certifying the manner in which it has been executed or the reason why it has not been executed

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_  
JMS

No 28

NOTICE OF THE DAY FIXED FOR SETTLING A SALE PROCLAMATION

(O 21 r 66)

(Title)

To

WHEREAS in the abovenamed suit

holder has applied for the sale of

hereby informed that the

day of

has been fixed for settling the terms of the proclamation of sale

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this      day of

Judgment-debtor  
the decree  
You are  
19

٧٥ ٢٩

PROCLAMATION OF SALE. (O 21 r 60)

(Title )

Notice is hereby given that under rule 64 of Order XXI of the Code of Civil Procedure 1908 an order has been passed by this Court for the sale of the attached property

Suit No. \_\_\_\_\_ of 19\_\_\_\_  
decided by the  
of \_\_\_\_\_ in which  
was paid till and  
was defining.

mentioned in the annexed schedule in satisfaction of the claim of the decree holder in the suit (1) mentioned in the margin amounting with costs and interest up to date of sale to the sum of

## Forms of Execution

The sale will be by public auction and the property will be put up for sale in lots specified in the schedule. The sale will be of the property of the judgment debtor abovenamed as mentioned in the schedule below and the liabilities and claims attaching to the said property so far as they have been ascertained are those specified in the schedule against each lot.

In the absence of any order of postponement the sale will be held by \_\_\_\_\_ at the monthly sale commencing at \_\_\_\_\_ o'clock on the \_\_\_\_\_ at \_\_\_\_\_. In the event however of the debt above specified and of the costs of the sale being tendered or paid before the knocking down of any lot the sale will be stopped.

At the sale the public generally are invited to bid either personally or by duly authorised agent. No bid by or on behalf of the judgment creditors above mentioned however will be accepted nor will any sale to them be valid without the express permission of the Court previously given. The following are the further

*Conditions of Sale*

1 The particulars specified in the schedule below have been stated to the best of the information of the Court but the Court will not be answerable for any error, misstatement or omission in this proclamation.

2 The amount by which the biddings are to be increased shall be determined by the officer conducting the sale. In the event of any dispute arising as to the amount bid or as to the bidder the lot shall at once be again put up to auction.

3 The highest bidder shall be declared to be the purchaser of any lot provided always that he is legally qualified to bid and provided that it shall be in the discretion of the Court or officer holding the sale to decline acceptance of the highest bid when the price offered appears so clearly inadequate as to make it advisable to do so.

4 For reasons recorded it shall be in the discretion of the officer conducting the sale to adjourn it subject always to the provisions of rule 69 of Order XXI.

5 In the case of movable property the price of each lot shall be paid at the time of sale or as soon after as the officer holding the sale directs and in default of payment the property shall forthwith be again put up and re-sold.

6 In the case of immovable property the person declared to be the purchaser shall pay immediately after such declaration a deposit of 25 per cent on the amount of his purchase money to the officer conducting the sale and in default of such deposit the property shall forthwith be put up again and re-sold.

7 The full amount of the purchase money shall be paid by the purchaser before the Court closes on the fifteenth day after the sale of the property exclusive of such day or if the fifteenth day be a Sunday or other holiday then on the first office day after the fifteenth day.

8 In default of payment of the balance of purchase money within the period allowed the property shall be re-sold after the issue of a fresh notification of sale. The deposit after defraying the expenses of the sale may if the Court thinks fit be forfeited to the Government and the defaulting purchaser shall forfeit all claim to the property or to any part of the sum for which it may be subsequently sold.

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this \_\_\_\_\_

day of \_\_\_\_\_  
Judge



## Forms of Execution

## App E

## Schedule of Property

| Number of lot | Description of property to be sold with the name of each owner where there are more judgment debtors than one | The revenue assessed upon the estate or part of the estate if the property to be sold is an interest in an estate or a part of an estate paying revenue to Government | Detail of any Incumbrances to which the property is liable | Claim If any who have been put forward to the property and any other known particular bearing on its nature and value |
|---------------|---|---|--|---|
|               |   |   |  |   |

No 30

ORDER ON THE NAZIR FOR CAUSING SERVICE OF PROCLAMATION OF SALE

(O 21 r 66)

(Title)

To

The Nazir of the Court

WHEREAS an order has been made for the sale of the property of the Judgment debtor specified in the schedule hereunder annexed and whereas the day of 19 has been fixed for the sale of the said property copies of the proclamation of sale are by this warrant made over to you and you are hereby ordered to have the proclamation published by beat of drum within each of the properties specified in the said schedule to affix a copy of the said proclamation on a conspicuous part of each of the said properties and afterwards on the Court house and then to submit to this Court a report showing the dates on which and the manner in which the proclamations have been published.

Dated the

day of

19

July

Schedule

No 31

CERTIFICATE BY OFFICER HOLDING A SALE OF THE DEFICIENCY OF PRICE  
ON A RE SALE OF PROPERTY BY REASON OF  
PURCHASER'S DEFAULT (O 21 r 71)

(Title)

Certified that at the re sale of the property in execution of the decree in the above named suit in consequence of default on the part of there was a deficiency in the price of the said property amounting to Rs. and that the expenses attending such re sale amounted to Rs. making a total of Rs. which sum is recoverable from the default of

Dated the

day of

19

Officer holding the sale

Forms of Execu

App

## No 32

NOTICE TO PERSON IN POSSESSION OF MOVABLE PROPERTY  
SOLD IN EXECUTION (O 21 r 79)

(Title)

To

WHEREAS

has become the purchaser at a public sale in execution of the decree in the above suit  
of now in your possession you are hereby prohibited  
from delivering possession of the said  
to any person except the said

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this day of 19

Judge

## No 33

PROHIBITORY ORDER AGAINST PAYMENT OF DEBTS SOLD IN EXECUTION  
TO ANY OTHER THAN THE PURCHASER (O 21 r 79)

(Title)

To

and to

WHEREAS

became the purchaser at a public sale in execution of the decree in the above suit has  
of being debts due from you  
to you

It is ordered that you be and you  
are hereby prohibited from receiving and you from making  
payment of the said debt to any person or persons except the said

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this day of 19

Judge.

## No 34

PROHIBITORY ORDER AGAINST THE TRANSFER OF SHARES SOLD IN  
EXECUTION (O 21 r 79)

(Title)

To

and

Secretary of

Corporation

WHEREAS has become the purchaser at a public sale in execu  
tion of the decree in the above suit, of certain shares in the above Corporation that is  
to say of standing in the name  
of you

It is ordered that you  
be and you are hereby prohibited from making any transfer of the  
said shares to any person except the said the purchaser  
aforesaid or from receiving any dividends thereon and you

Secretary of the said Corporation from permitting  
any such transfer or making any such payment to any person except the said  
the purchaser aforesaid

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this day of 19

Judge.

## Forms of Execution

## App E

No 35

CERTIFICATE TO JUDGMENT DEBTOR AUTHORIZING HIM TO MORTGAGE  
LEASE OR SELL PROPERTY (O 21 r 83)

(Title)

WHEREAS in execution of the decree passed in the above suit an order was made on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_ for the sale of the undermentioned property of the judgment debtor \_\_\_\_\_ and whereas the Court has on the application of the said judgment debtor postponed the said sale to enable him to raise the amount of the decree by mortgage lease or private sale of the said property or of some part thereof

This is to certify that the Court doth hereby authorize the said judgment-debtor to make the proposed mortgage lease or sale within a period of \_\_\_\_\_ from the date of this certificate provided that all monies payable under such mortgage lease or sale shall be paid into this Court and not to the said judgment debtor

*Description of Property*

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_  
Jd/y

No 36

NOTICE TO SHOW CAUSE WHY SALE SHOULD NOT BE SET ASIDE  
(O 21 rr 90 92)

(Title)

To

WHEREAS the undermentioned property was sold on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_ in execution of the decree passed in the above named suit and whereas \_\_\_\_\_ the decree holder [or judgment debtor] has applied to this Court to set aside the sale of the said property on the ground of a material irregularity [or fraud] in publishing [or conducting] the sale namely that

Take notice that if you have any cause to show why the said application should not be granted you should appear with your proofs in this Court on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_ when the said application will be heard and determined

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_  
*Description of Property*  
Jd/y

No 37

NOTICE TO SHOW CAUSE WHY SALE SHOULD NOT BE SET ASIDE  
(O 21 rr 91 93)

(Title)

To

WHEREAS \_\_\_\_\_ the purchaser of the undermentioned property sold on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_ in execution of the decree passed in the above named suit has applied to this Court to set aside the sale of the said property on the ground that the judgment-debtor had no saleable interest therein

## Forms of Execut

App

Take notice that if you have any cause to show why the said application should not be granted you should appear with your proofs in this Court on the day of 19 when the said application will be heard and determined

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this day of 19

*Description of Property*

*Judge*

---

No 38

CERTIFICATE OF SALE OF LAND (O 21 r 94)

*(Title)*

THIS is to certify that has been declared the purchaser at a sale by public auction on the day of 19 of in execution of decree in this suit and that the said sale has been duly confirmed by this Court

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this day of 19

*Judge*

---

No 39

ORDER FOR DELIVERY TO CERTIFIED PURCHASER OF LAND AT A SALE  
IN EXECUTION (O 21 r 95)

*(Title)*

To

The Bailiff of the Court

WHEREAS has become the certified purchaser of at a sale in execution of decree in Suit No of 19

You are hereby ordered to put the said the certified purchaser as aforesaid in possession of the same

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this day of 19

*Judge*

---

No 40

SUMMONS TO APPEAR AND ANSWER CHARGE OF OBSTRUCTING EXECUTION  
OF DECREE. (O 21 r 97)

*(Title)*

To

WHEREAS the decree holder in the above suit has complained to this Court that you have resisted (or obstructed) the officer charged with the execution of the warrant for possession

You are hereby summoned to appear in this Court on the day of 19 at AM to answer the said complaint

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this day of 19

*Judge*

## Forms of Execution

App E

No 41

WARRANT OF COMMITTAL. (O 21, r 98)

(Title.)

To

The Officer in Charge of the Jail at

WHEREAS the undermentioned property has been decreed to  
 the plaintiff in this suit and whereas the Court  
 is satisfied that without any just cause resisted [or obstructed]  
 and is still resisting [or obstructing] the said  
 obtaining possession of the property and whereas the said  
 has made application to this Court that the said  
 be committed to the civil prison

You are hereby commanded and required to take and receive the said  
 into the civil prison and to keep him imprisoned there  
 for the period of days.

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this day of 19  
*J. J. J.*

No 42.

AUTHORITY OF THE COLLECTOR TO STAY PUBLIC SALE OF LAND (Section 12)

(Title)

To

Collector of

SIR

In answer to your communication No dated  
 representing that the sale in execution of the decree in this suit of  
 land situate within your district is objectionable  
 I have the honour to inform you that you are authorized to make provision for the  
 satisfaction of the said decree in the manner recommended by you

I have the honour to be

Sir

Your Obedient Servant  
*J. J. J.*

# APPENDIX F

## SUPPLEMENTAL PROCEEDINGS

No 1

WARRANT OF ARREST BEFORE JUDGMENT (O 38 r 1)

(Title)

To

The Bailiff of the Court

WHEREAS

|           |   |  |  |  |
|-----------|---|--|--|--|
| Rs        | the plaintiff in the above suit claims the sum of<br>as noted in the margin and has proved to the satisfac-<br>tion of the Court that<br>there is probable cause for<br>believing that the defen-<br>dant |  |  |  |
| Principal |   |  |  |  |
| Interest  |   |  |  |  |
| Costs     |   |  |  |  |
| Total     |   |  |  |  |

is about to  
These are to command  
you to demand and re-  
ceive from the said

the sum of Rs as sufficient to satisfy the plaintiff's claim  
and unless the said sum of Rs is forthwith delivered to you by or  
on behalf of the said to take the said

into custody and to bring him before this Court in order  
that he may show cause why he should not furnish security to the amount of Rs  
for his personal appearance before the Court until such time as the said suit shall be  
fully and finally disposed of and until satisfaction of any decree that may be passed  
against him in the suit

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this      day of      19  
Judge

No 2

SECURITY FOR APPEARANCE OF A DEFENDANT ARRESTED BEFORE  
JUDGMENT (O 38 r 2)

(Title)

WHEREAS at the instance of      the plaintiff in the above suit  
the defendant has been arrested and brought before  
the Court And whereas on the failure of the said defendant to show cause why he  
should not furnish security for his appearance the Court has ordered him to furnish  
such security

Therefore I      have voluntarily become surety and do hereby  
bind myself my heirs and executors to the said Court that the said defendant shall  
appear at any time when called upon while the suit is pending and until satisfaction  
of any decree that may be passed against him in the said suit and in default of such  
appearance I bind myself my heirs and executors to pay to the said Court at its order  
any sum of money that may be adjudged against the said defendant in the said suit

Witness my hand at      this      day of  
19

Witnesses

(Signed)

1

2

## Forms of Supplemental Proceedings

App F

No 3

SUMMONS TO DEFENDANT TO APPEAR ON SURETY'S APPLICATION FOR  
DISCHARGE (O 38 r 3)

(Title)

To

WHEREAS \_\_\_\_\_ who became surety on the  
day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19 \_\_\_\_\_ for your appearance in the above suit  
has applied to this Court to be discharged from his obligation

You are hereby summoned to appear in this Court in person on the  
day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19 \_\_\_\_\_ at \_\_\_\_\_ A M when the said application will be heard  
and determined

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19 \_\_\_\_\_  
Judge

No 4

## ORDER FOR COMMITTAL (O 38 r 4)

(Title)

To

WHEREAS \_\_\_\_\_ plaintiff in this suit has made application to the  
Court that security be taken for the appearance of \_\_\_\_\_ the defend-  
dant to answer any judgment that may be passed against him in the suit and whereas  
the Court has called upon the defendant to furnish such security or to offer a sufficient  
deposit in lieu of security which he has failed to do It is ordered that the said defendant  
be committed to the civil prison until the decision of the  
suit or if judgment be pronounced against him until satisfaction of the decree

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19 \_\_\_\_\_  
Judge

No 5

ATTACHMENT BEFORE JUDGMENT WITH ORDER TO CALL FOR SECURITY FOR  
FULFILMENT OF DECREE (O 38 r 5)

(Title)

To

The Bailiff of the Court  
WHEREAS \_\_\_\_\_ has proved to the satisfaction of the  
Court that the defendant in the above suit  
These are to command you to call upon the said defendant  
on or before the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19 \_\_\_\_\_  
either to furnish security for the sum of Rupees \_\_\_\_\_ to produce  
and place at the disposal of this Court when required

\_\_\_\_\_ or the value thereof or such portion of the value as may be  
sufficient to satisfy any decree that may be passed against him or to appear and show  
cause why he should not furnish security and you are further ordered to attach the  
said \_\_\_\_\_ and keep the same under sale and secure custody until  
the further order of the Court and you are further commanded to return this warrant  
on or before the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19 \_\_\_\_\_  
with an endorsement certifying the date on which and the manner in which it has been  
executed or the reason why it has not been executed

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19 \_\_\_\_\_  
Judge

## Forms of Supplemental Proceed

App

No 6

SECURITY FOR THE PRODUCTION OF PROPERTY (O 38 r 5)

(Title)

WHEREAS at the instance of the plaintiff in the above suit  
the defendant has been directed by the Court to furnish  
security in the sum of Rs to produce and place at the disposal of the  
Court the property specified in the schedule hereunto annexed

Therefore I have voluntarily become surety and do hereby  
bind myself my heirs and executors to the said Court that the said defendant shall  
produce and place at the disposal of the Court when required the property specified  
in the said schedule or the value of the same or such portion thereof as may be suffi-  
cient to satisfy the decree and in default of his so doing I bind myself my heirs and  
executors to pay to the said Court at its order the said sum of Rs or  
such sum not exceeding the said sum as the said Court may adjudge

|                    |          |        |          |
|--------------------|----------|--------|----------|
| Witness my hand at | Schedule | day of | 19       |
| Witnesses          | this     |        |          |
| 1                  |          |        | (Signed) |
| 2                  |          |        |          |

No 7

ATTACHMENT BEFORE JUDGMENT OR PROOF OF FAILURE TO FURNISH SECURITY  
(O 38 r 6)

(Title)

To

The Bailiff of the Court

WHEREAS the plaintiff in this suit has applied to  
the Court to call upon the defendant to furnish security to fulfil  
any decree that may be passed against him in the suit and whereas the Court has call-  
ed upon the said to furnish such security which he has  
failed to do These are to command you to attach  
the property of the said and keep the same under safe  
and secure custody until the further order of the Court and you are further command-  
ed to return this warrant on or before the  
day of 19 with an endorsement certifying the  
date on which and the manner in which it has been executed or the reason why it has  
not been executed

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this day of 19  
Judge

No 8

TEMPORARY INJUNCTIONS (O 39 r 1)

(Title)

Upon motion made unto this Court by Pleader of  
[or Counsel for] the plaintiff A B and upon reading the petition of the said plaintiff  
in this matter filed [this day] [or the plaint filed in this suit on the  
day of or the written statement of the said plaintiff]  
filed on the day of  
and upon hearing the evidence of and  
in support thereof [if after notice and defendant  
not appearing] and also the evidence of



## Forms of Supplemental Proceedings

App F

as to service of notice of this motion upon the defendant C D] This Court doth order that an injunction be awarded to restrain the defendant C D his servants, agents and workmen from pulling down or suffering to be pulled down the house in the plot in the said suit of the plaintiff mentioned [or in the written statement or petition of the plaintiff and evidence at the hearing of this motion mentioned] being No 9 Oldmonna Street Hindupur in the Taluk of \_\_\_\_\_ and from selling the materials whereof the said house is composed until the hearing of this suit or until the further order of this Court

Dated this

day of

19

Jy 19

[If here the injunction is sought to restrain the negotiation of a note or bill the ordering part of the order may run thus —]

restrain the defendants

day of

19

parting with out of the custody of them or any of them or endorsing assigning or negotiating the promissory note [or bill of exchange] in question dated on or about the \_\_\_\_\_ etc mentioned in the plaintiff's plaint [or petition] and the evidence heard at this motion until the hearing of this suit or until the further order of this Court

[In Copyright cases] to restrain the defendant C D his servants agents or workmen from printing publishing or vending a book, called \_\_\_\_\_ or any part thereof until the etc

[If here part only of a book is to be restrained] to restrain the defendant C D his servants agents or workmen from printing publishing selling or otherwise disposing of such parts of the book in the plaintiff's plaint [or petition and evidence etc] mentioned to have been published by the defendant as hereinafter specified, namely that part of the said book which is entitled \_\_\_\_\_ and also that part which is entitled \_\_\_\_\_ [or which is continued in page \_\_\_\_\_ to page \_\_\_\_\_ both inclusive] until \_\_\_\_\_ etc

[In Patent cases] to restrain the defendant C D his servants, agents and workmen from making or vending any perforated bricks [or as the case may be] upon the principle of the inventions in the plaintiff's plaint [or petition or written statement etc] mentioned belonging to the plaintiffs or either of them during the remainder of the respective terms of the patents in the plaintiff's plaint [or as the case may be] mentioned and from counterfeiting imitating or resembling the same inventions or either of them or making any addition thereto or subtraction therefrom until the hearing etc

[In cases of Trade marks] to restrain the defendant C D his servants agents or workmen from selling or exposing for sale or procuring to be sold any composition or blacking [or as the case may be] described as or purporting to be blacking manufactured by the plaintiff A B in bottles having affixed thereto such labels as in plaintiff's plaint or petition etc] mentioned or any other labels so contrived or expressed as by colourable imitation or otherwise to represent the composition or blacking sold by the defendant to be the same as the composition or blacking manufactured and sold by the plaintiff A B and from using trade cards so contrived or expressed as to represent that any composition or blacking sold or proposed to be sold by the defendant is the same as the composition or blacking manufactured or sold by the plaintiff A B until the etc

[To restrain a partner from in any way interfering in the business] to restrain the defendant C D his servants and agents from entering into any contract and from accepting drawing endorsing or negotiating

## Forms of Supplemental Procees

any bill of exchange note or written security in the name of the partnership firm of *B* and *D* and from contracting any debt buying and selling any goods and from making or entering into any verbal or written promise agreement or undertaking and from doing or causing to be done any act in the name or on the credit of the said partnership firm of *B* and *D* or whereby the said partnership firm can or may in any manner become or be made liable to or for the payment of any sum of money or for the performance of any contract, promise or undertaking until the etc

## No 9

## APPOINTMENT OF A RECEIVER (O 40 r 1)

(Title)

To WHEREAS has been attached in execution of a decree passed in the above suit on the day of 19 in favour of You are hereby (subject to your giving security to the satisfaction of the Court) appointed receiver of the said property under Order XL of the Code of Civil Procedure 1909 with full powers under the provisions of that Order

You are required to render a due and proper account of your receipts and disbursements in respect of the said property on

You will be entitled to remuneration at the rate of per cent upon your receipts under the authority of this appointment

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this day of 19  
Judge.

## No 10

## BOND TO BE OVEN BY RECEIVER (O 40 r 3)

(Title)

Now all men by these presents that we and are jointly and severally bound to of the Court of in Rs to be paid to the said or his successor in office for the time being For which payment to be made we bind ourselves and each of us in the whole our and each of our heirs executors and administrators jointly and severally by these presents

Dated this day of 19

Whereas a plaint has been filed in this Court by against for the purpose of [here insert the object of suit]

And whereas the said has been appointed by order of the above mentioned Court to receive the rents and profits of the immovable property and to get in the outstanding movable property of in the said plaint named

Now the condition of this obligation is such that if the above bounden shall duly account for all and every the sum and sums of money which he shall so receive on account of the rents and profits of the immovable property and in respect of the movable property of the said at such periods as the said Court shall appoint and shall duly pay the balances which shall from time to time be certified to be due from him as the said Court hath directed or shall hereafter direct then this obligation shall be void otherwise it shall remain in full force

Signed and delivered by the above bounden in the presence of

Note—If deposit of money is made the memorandum thereof should follow the terms of the condition of the bond

# APPENDIX G

## APPEAL, REFERENCE AND REVIEW

No 1

MEMORANDUM OF APPEAL (O 41 r 1)

(Title.)

The \_\_\_\_\_ above named appeals to the  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Court at \_\_\_\_\_ from the decree of  
 \_\_\_\_\_ in suit No \_\_\_\_\_ of 19 \_\_\_\_\_ dated the  
 \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19 \_\_\_\_\_ and sets forth the following grounds  
 of objection to the decree appealed from namely —

No 2

SECURITY BOND TO BE GIVEN ON ORDER BEING MADE TO STAY EXECUTION OF  
 DECREE (O 41 r 5)

(Title)

To

This security bond on stay of execution of decree executed by  
 witnesseth —

That \_\_\_\_\_ the plaintiff in Suit No \_\_\_\_\_ of 19  
 having sued \_\_\_\_\_ the defendant in this Court and decree having been passed  
 on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19 \_\_\_\_\_ in favour of the plaintiff and the  
 defendant having preferred an appeal from the said decree in the \_\_\_\_\_ Court  
 the said appeal is still pending

Now the plaintiff decree holder having applied to execute the decree the defendant  
 has made an application praying for stay of execution and has been called upon to furnish  
 security Accordingly I of my own free will stand security to the extent of Rs  
 mortgaging the properties specified in the schedule herunto annexed and covenant  
 that if the decree of the first Court be confirmed or varied by the appellate Court the said  
 defendant shall duly act in accordance with the decrees of the appellate Court and shall  
 pay whatever may be payable by him thereunder and if he should fail therein then an  
 amount so payable shall be realized from the properties hereby mortgaged and if the  
 proceeds of the sale of the said properties are insufficient to pay the amount due I and  
 my legal representatives will be personally liable to pay the balance To this effect  
 I execute this security bond this  
 day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19 \_\_\_\_\_

Schedule

Witnessed by

(Signed)

1

2

No 3

SECURITY BOND TO BE GIVEN DURING THE PENDENCY OF APPEAL (O 41 r 6)  
 (Title)

To

This security bond on stay of execution of decree executed by  
 witnesseth —

That \_\_\_\_\_ the plaintiff in Suit No \_\_\_\_\_ of 19 \_\_\_\_\_ by  
 sued \_\_\_\_\_ the defendant in this Court and a decree having been passed on  
 the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19 \_\_\_\_\_ in favour of the plaintiff and  
 the defendant having preferred an appeal from the said decree in the  
 Court the said appeal is still pending

Now the plaintiff decree holder has applied for execution of the said decree and had been called upon to furnish security Accordingly I of my own free will stand security to the extent of Rs

mortgaging the properties specified in the schedule hereunto annexed and covenant that if the decree of the first Court be reversed or varied by the appellate Court the plaintiff shall restore any property which may be or has been taken in execution of the said decree and shall duly act in accordance with the decree of the appellate Court and shall pay whatever may be payable by him thereunder and if he should fail therein then any amount so payable shall be realized from the properties hereby mortgaged and if the proceeds of the sale of the said properties are insufficient to pay the amount due I and my legal representatives will be personally liable to pay the balance To this effect I execute this security bond this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_

19

*Schedule*

Witnessed by

(Signed)

1

2

---

No 4

## SECURITY FOR COSTS OF APPEAL (O 41 r 10)

(Title)

To

This security bond \_\_\_\_\_ for costs of appeal executed by  
witnesseth —

This appellant has preferred an appeal from the decree in Suit No \_\_\_\_\_ of 19 \_\_\_\_\_ against the respondent and has been called upon to furnish security Accordingly I of my own free will stand security for the costs of the appeal mortgaging the properties specified in the schedule hereunto annexed I shall not transfer the said properties or any part thereof and in the event of any default on the part of the appellant I shall duly carry out any order that may be made against me with regard to payment of the costs of appeal Any amount so payable shall be realized from the properties hereby mortgaged and if the proceeds of the sale of the said properties are insufficient to pay the amount due I and my legal representatives will be personally liable to pay the balance To this effect I execute this security bond this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_

19

*Schedule*

Witnessed by

(Signed)

1

2

---

No 5

## INTIMATION TO LOWER COURT OF ADMISSION OF APPEAL (O 41 r 13)

(Title)

To

You are hereby directed to take notice that \_\_\_\_\_ the  
In the above suit has preferred an appeal to this Court from the decree passed by you  
therein on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19 \_\_\_\_\_

You are requested to send with all practicable despatch all material papers in the  
suit

Dated the \_\_\_\_\_

day of \_\_\_\_\_

19 \_\_\_\_\_

*Judge.*

## Forms of Appeal

## App G

No 6

NOTICE TO RESPONDENT OF THE DAY FIXED FOR THE HEARING OF THE APPEAL  
(O 41 r 14)

(Title)

APPEAL from the \_\_\_\_\_ of the Court of \_\_\_\_\_ dated the  
\_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_

To

Respondent

TAKE notice that an appeal from the decree of \_\_\_\_\_ in the  
case has been presented by \_\_\_\_\_ and registered in the  
Court and that the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_ has been  
fixed by this Court for the hearing of this appeal.

If no appearance is made on your behalf by yourself your pleader or by some one  
by law authorised to act for you in this appeal it will be heard and decided in your  
absence

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this \_\_\_\_\_ day of  
\_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_  
J. J. J.

[NOTE.—If a stay of execution has been ordered intimation should be given of the  
fact on this notice]

No 7

NOTICE TO A PARTY TO A SUIT NOT MADE A PARTY TO THE APPEAL BUT  
JOINED BY THE COURT AS A RESPONDENT (O 41 r 20)

(Title)

WHEREAS you were a party in Suit No \_\_\_\_\_ of 19\_\_\_\_ in the Court  
of \_\_\_\_\_ and whereas the \_\_\_\_\_ has  
preferred an appeal to this Court from the decree passed against him in the said suit  
and it appears to this Court that you are interested in the result of the said appeal

This is to give you notice that this Court has directed you to be made a respon-  
dent in the said appeal and has adjourned the hearing thereof till the \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_ at  
\_\_\_\_\_ A M If no appearance is made on your behalf on the said day  
and at the said hour the appeal will be heard and decided in your absence

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this \_\_\_\_\_ day of  
\_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_  
J. J. J.

No 8

MEMORANDUM OF CROSS OBJECTION (O 41 r 22)

(Title)

WHEREAS the \_\_\_\_\_ has preferred an appeal to the  
\_\_\_\_\_ Court at \_\_\_\_\_ from the decree of  
\_\_\_\_\_ in Suit No \_\_\_\_\_ of 19\_\_\_\_ dated the  
\_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_ and whereas notice of the day fixed  
for hearing the appeal was served on the \_\_\_\_\_ on the  
\_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_ the \_\_\_\_\_ files this memorandum of cross-objec-  
tion under rule 22 of Order VII of the Code of Civil Procedure 1908 and set forth the  
following grounds of objection to the decree appealed from namely —

No 9  
DECREE IN APPEAL. (O 41 r 3j)  
(Title)

Appeal No \_\_\_\_\_ of 19 \_\_\_\_\_ from the decree of the Court of \_\_\_\_\_  
dated the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19 \_\_\_\_\_  
Memorandum of appeal

Plaintiff  
Defendant

The above named appeals to the \_\_\_\_\_ Court at \_\_\_\_\_  
from the decree of \_\_\_\_\_ in the above suit dated the \_\_\_\_\_  
day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19 \_\_\_\_\_ for the following reasons namely —

This appeal coming on for hearing on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_  
19 \_\_\_\_\_ before \_\_\_\_\_ in the presence of \_\_\_\_\_ for  
the appellant and of \_\_\_\_\_ for the respondent it is ordered —

The costs of this appeal as detailed below amounting to Rs \_\_\_\_\_ are to be  
paid by \_\_\_\_\_ The costs of the original suit are to be paid by \_\_\_\_\_  
(1999 under my hand this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19 \_\_\_\_\_  
Judge

Costs of appeal

| Appellant                        |    |     | Respondent                |    |     |
|----------------------------------|----|-----|---------------------------|----|-----|
| Amount                           |    |     | Amount                    |    |     |
|                                  | Rs | a p |                           | Rs | a p |
| 1 Stamp for memorandum of appeal |    |     | Stamp for power           |    |     |
| 2 Do for power                   |    |     | Do for petition           |    |     |
| 3 Service of processes           |    |     | Service of processes      |    |     |
| 4 Pleader's fee on Rs _____      |    |     | Pleader's fee on Rs _____ |    |     |
| Total                            |    |     | Total                     |    |     |

No 10

APPLICATION TO APPEAL IN FORMA PAUPERIS (O 44 r 1)

I \_\_\_\_\_ the \_\_\_\_\_ above named  
present the accompanying memorandum of appeal from the decree in the above suit  
and apply to be allowed to appeal as a pauper

Annexed is a full and true schedule of all the movable and immovable property  
belonging to me with the estimated value thereof

Dated the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19 \_\_\_\_\_  
(Signed)

Note —Where the application is by the plaintiff he should state whether he applied  
and was allowed to sue in the Court of first instance as a pauper

No 11

NOTICE OF APPEAL IN FORMA PAUPERIS (O 44 r 1)

(Title)

Whereas the above named \_\_\_\_\_ has applied to be allowed to appeal as a  
pauper from the decree in the above suit dated the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_  
19 \_\_\_\_\_ and whereas the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19 \_\_\_\_\_

## Forms of Appeal

## App G

been fixed for hearing the application notice is hereby given to you that if you desire to show cause why the applicant should not be allowed to appeal as a pauper an opportunity will be given to you of doing so on the afore mentioned date

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this

day of

19

J 14

---

No 12

NOTICE TO SHOW CAUSE WHY A CERTIFICATE OF APPEAL TO THE KING IN COUNCIL SHOULD NOT BE GRANTED (O 40 r 3)

(Title)

To

TAKE notice that

has applied to this Court for a certificate that as regards amount or value and nature the above case fulfils the requirements of Section 110 of the Code of Civil Procedure 1908 or that it is otherwise a fit one for appeal to His Majesty in Council

The day of 19 is fixed for you to show cause why the Court should not grant the certificate asked for

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this

day of

19

Registra

---

No 13

NOTICE TO RESPONDENT OF ADMISSION OF THE APPEAL TO THE KING IN COUNCIL (O 40 r 8)

(Title)

To

WHEREAS

in the above case has furnished the security and made the deposit required by Order XLV rule 7 of the Code of Civil Procedure 1908

Take notice that the appeal of the said to His Majesty in Council has been admitted on the day of 19

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this

day of

19

Registrar

---

No 14

NOTICE TO SHOW CAUSE WHY A REVIEW SHOULD NOT BE GRANTED (O 40 r 4)

(Title)

To

TAKE notice that review of its decree passed on the the above case The day of 19 is fixed for you to show cause why the Court should not grant a review of its decree in this case

has applied to this Court for a review of its decree passed on the day of 19 is fixed for you to show cause why the Court should not grant a review of its decree in this case

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this

day of

19

J 14

## APPENDIX H

### MISCELLANEOUS

#### No 1

AGREEMENT OF PARTIES AS TO ISSUES TO BE TRIED (O 14 r 6)

(Title.)

WHEREAS we the parties in the above suit are agreed as to the question of fact [or of law] to be decided between us and the point at issue between us is whether a claim founded on a bond dated the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_ and filed as Exhibit \_\_\_\_\_ in the said suit is or is not beyond the statute of limitation (or state the point at issue whatever it may be)

We therefore severally bind ourselves that upon the finding of the Court in the negative [or affirmative] of such issue \_\_\_\_\_ will pay to the said \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ the sum of Rupees \_\_\_\_\_ (or such sum as the Court shall hold to be due thereon) and I the said \_\_\_\_\_ will accept the said sum of Rupees \_\_\_\_\_ (or such sum as the Court shall hold to be due) in full satisfaction of my claim on the bond aforesaid [or that upon such finding I the said \_\_\_\_\_ will do or abstain from doing etc etc]

Plaintiff  
Defendant

Witnesses

1

2

Dated the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_

#### No 2

NOTICE OF APPLICATION FOR THE TRANSFER OF A SUIT TO ANOTHER COURT FOR TRIAL.  
(Section 21)

In the Court of the District Judge of \_\_\_\_\_  
No \_\_\_\_\_ of 19\_\_\_\_

To

WHEREAS an application dated the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_ has been made to this Court by \_\_\_\_\_ the \_\_\_\_\_ in Suit No \_\_\_\_\_ of 19\_\_\_\_ now pending in the Court of the \_\_\_\_\_ at \_\_\_\_\_ in which \_\_\_\_\_ is plaintiff and \_\_\_\_\_ is defendant for the transfer of the suit for trial to the Court of the \_\_\_\_\_ at \_\_\_\_\_

You are hereby informed that the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_ has been fixed for the hearing of the application when you will be heard if you desire to offer any objection to it

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_  
Judge

#### No 3

NOTICE OF PAYMENT INTO COURT (O 21 r 2)

(Title)

Take notice that the defendant has paid into Court Rs \_\_\_\_\_ and says that that sum is sufficient to satisfy the plaintiff's claim in full

BY Pleader for the Defendant

To 7 pleader for the plaintiff



## Forms—Miscellaneous

App H

No 4

## NOTICE TO SHOW CAUSE (GENERAL FORM)

(Title)

To

WHEREAS the above named  
has made application to this Court that  
You are hereby warned to appear in this Court in person or by a pleader duly instructed  
on the                      day of                      19                      at                      o'clock  
in the forenoon to show cause against the application failing wherein the said  
application will be heard and determined *ex parte*

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this                      day of                      19  
July

No 5

LIST OF DOCUMENTS PRODUCED BY PLAINTIFF  
DEFENDANT

(O 13 r 1)

(Title)

| No | Description of document | Date if any which the document bears | Signature of party or pleader |
|----|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1  | 2                       | 3                                    | 4                             |
|    |                         |                                      |                               |

No 6

NOTICE TO PARTIES OF THE DAY FIXED FOR EXAMINATION OF A WITNESS  
ABOUT TO LEAVE THE JURISDICTION (O 18 r 16)

(Title)

To

plaintiff (or defendant)

WHEREAS in the above suit application has been made to the Court by  
that the examination of                      a witness  
required by the said                      in the said suit may be  
taken immediately and it has been shown to the Court a satisfaction that the said  
witness is about to leave the Court's jurisdiction (or any other good and sufficient cause  
to be stated)

Take notice that the examination of the said witness  
be taken by the Court on the                      day of                      19  
Dated the                      day of                      19                      July

Forms—Miscellan

Ap

No 7

COMMISSION TO EXAMINE ABSENT WITNESS (O 26 rr 4 18 )

(Title )

To

WHEREAS the evidence of \_\_\_\_\_ if required by the \_\_\_\_\_  
 in the above suit and whereas \_\_\_\_\_ you are  
 requested to take the evidence on interrogatories [or viva voce] of such witness  
 and you are hereby appointed Commissioner for that purpose  
 The evidence will be taken in the presence of the parties or their agents if in attendance  
 who will be at liberty to question the witness on the points specified and you are further  
 requested to make return of such evidence as soon as it may be taken

Process to compel the attendance of the witness will be issued by any Court having  
 jurisdiction on your application

A sum of Rs \_\_\_\_\_ being your fee in the above is herewith forwarded  
 GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Judge.

No 8

LETTER OF REQUEST (O 26 r 5 )

(Title )

(Heading — To the President and Judges of etc etc or as the case may be )

WHEREAS a suit is now pending in the \_\_\_\_\_  
 in which A B is plaintiff and C D is defendant And in the said suit the plaintiff  
 claims \_\_\_\_\_

(abstract of claims)

And whereas it has been represented to the said Court that it is necessary for the  
 purpose of justice and for the due determination of the matters in dispute between the  
 parties that the following persons should be examined as witnesses upon oath touching

E F of \_\_\_\_\_  
 G H of \_\_\_\_\_ and  
 I J of \_\_\_\_\_

And it appearing that such witnesses are resident within the jurisdiction of your  
 honourable Court

Now I \_\_\_\_\_ as the \_\_\_\_\_ of the said Court have the honour  
 to request and do hereby request that for the reasons aforesaid and for the assistance  
 of the said Court you as the I resident and Judges of the said \_\_\_\_\_ or some  
 one or more of you will be pleased to summon the said witness (and such other witnesses  
 as the agents of the said plaintiff and defendant shall humbly request you in writing  
 so to summon) to attend at such time and place as you shall appoint before some one or  
 more of you or such other person as according to the procedure of your Court is competent  
 to take the examination of witnesses and that you will cause such witnesses to be ex-  
 amined upon the interrogatories which accompany this letter of request (or viva voce)  
 touching the said matters in question in the presence of the agents of the plaintiff and  
 defendant or such of them as shall on due notice given attend such examination

And I further have the honour to request that you will be pleased to cause the  
 answers of the said witnesses to be reduced into writing and all books letters papers  
 and documents produced upon such examination to be duly marked for identification  
 and that you will be further pleased to authenticate such examination by the seal of  
 your tribunal or in such other way as is in accordance with your procedure and to  
 return the same together with such request in writing if any for the examination of  
 other witnesses to the said Court

## Forms—Miscellaneous

## App H

(Note—If the request is directed to a foreign Court the words through His Majesty's Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs for transmission should be inserted after the words other witnesses in the penultimate line of this form.)

## No 9

COMMISSION FOR A LOCAL INVESTIGATION OR TO EXAMINE ACCOUNTS  
(O 26, r 9 11)

(Title)

To

WHEREAS it is deemed requisite for the purpose of the suit that a commission should be issued, You are hereby appointed Commissioner for the purpose of

Process to compel the attendance before you of any witnesses or for the production of any documents whom or which you may desire to examine or inspect will be issued by any Court having jurisdiction on your application

A sum of Rs being your fee in the above is herewith forwarded

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this day of 19  
J. J.

## No 10

## COMMISSION TO MAKE A PARTITION (O 26 r 13)

(Title)

To

WHEREAS it is deemed requisite for the purposes for this suit that a commission should be issued to make the partition or separation of the property specified in a decree according to the rights as declared in the decree of this Court dated the day of 19 You are hereby appointed Commissioner for the said purpose and are directed to make such inquiry as may be necessary to divide the said property according to the best of your skill and judgment in the shares set out in the said decree and to allot such shares to the several parties You are hereby authorized to award sums to be paid to any party by any other party for the purpose of equalizing the value of the shares

Process to compel the attendance before you of any witness or for the production of any documents whom or which you may desire to examine or inspect will be issued by any Court having jurisdiction on your application

A sum of Rs being your fee in the above is herewith forwarded

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this day of 19  
J. J.

## No 11

## NOTICE TO MINOR DEFENDANT AND GUARDIAN (O 3 r 3)

(Title)

Minor Defendant  
Natural Guardian

To

WHEREAS an application has been presented on the part of the Plaintiff in the above suit for the appointment of a guardian for the suit to the minor defendant you the said minor and you

Here insert the name of guardian.

## Forms—Miscellaneous

are hereby required  
to take notice that unless within \_\_\_\_\_ days from the service upon you of  
this notice an application is made to this Court for the appointment of you\*  
or of some friend of you the minor to act as guardian for the suit the  
Court will proceed to appoint some other person to act as a guardian to the minor for  
the purposes of the said suit

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_  
Judge.

## No 12

NOTICE TO OPPOSITE PARTY OF DAY FIXED FOR HEARING EVIDENCE  
OF PAUPERISM (O 33 r 6)

(Title)

To

WHEREAS \_\_\_\_\_ has  
applied to this Court for permission to institute a suit against \_\_\_\_\_ in forma pauperis  
under Order XXXIII of the Code of Civil Procedure 1908 and whereas the Court sees  
no reason to reject the application and whereas the  
day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_ has been fixed for receiving such evidence as the  
applicant may adduce in proof of this pauperism and for hearing any evidence which may  
be adduced in the proof thereof

Notice is hereby given to you under rule 6 of Order XXXIII that in case you may  
wish to offer any evidence to disprove the pauperism of the applicant you may do so  
on appearing in this Court on the said \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_  
19\_\_\_\_

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_  
Judge

## No 13

## NOTICE TO SURETY OF HIS LIABILITY UNDER A DECREE. (Section 140)

(Title)

To

WHEREAS you \_\_\_\_\_ did on \_\_\_\_\_ become  
liable as surety for the performance of any decree which might be passed against the  
said \_\_\_\_\_ defendant in the above suit and whereas a decree was passed  
on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_ against  
the said defendant for the payment of \_\_\_\_\_ and whereas application  
has been made for execution of the said decree against you

Take notice that you are hereby required on or before the  
day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_ to show cause why the said decree should not  
be executed against you and if no sufficient cause shall be within the time specified  
shown to the satisfaction of the Court an order for its execution will be forthwith issued  
in the terms of the said application

GIVEN under my hand and the seal of the Court this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_  
Judge

---

Here insert the name of guardian.





# THE SECOND SCHEDULE

## ARBITRATION

### *Arbitration in Suits*

1 [S 506] (1) Where in any suit all the parties interested agree that any matter in difference between them shall be referred to arbitration, they may, at any time before judgment is pronounced, apply to the Court for an order of reference

Parties to suit may apply for order of reference

(2) Every such application shall be in writing and shall state the matter sought to be referred

#### Alterations in the rule —

1 The word interested in clause (1) has been added after the word parties See notes below under the head All the parties interested must join in the application

2 The words in person or by their respective pleaders specially authorized in writing in this behalf which occurred in the old section after the word apply and before the words to the Court have been omitted.

Scope of the Schedule—The present Schedule deals with arbitration under three heads (a) —

I Where a suit has been instituted and all the parties interested agree to refer to arbitration any matter in difference between them in the suit In that case all proceedings from first to last are under the supervision of the Court and they are governed by the provisions of paras. 1 to 16 of this Schedule The first step is to apply to the Court for an order of reference under para. 1 If all the parties interested have joined in the application an order of reference will be made under para. 3

II Where parties without having recourse to litigation agree to refer their differences to arbitration and it is desired that the agreement of reference should have the sanction of the Court In that case the parties to the agreement or any of them may apply to the Court under para. 17 to have the agreement filed in Court and to make an order of reference thereon If an order of reference is made all further proceedings will be under the supervision of the Court and they will be governed by the provisions of paras. 3 to 16 so far as they are consistent with the agreement (para. 10). See paras. 1, to 19

III Where the agreement of reference is made and the arbitration itself takes place without the intervention of the Court and the assistance of the Court is only a right in order to give effect to the award In that case any person interested in the award may apply to the Court under para. 20 to have the award filed in Court See paras. 20 & 21.

All the parties interested must join in the application.—In order to give jurisdiction to the Court to make an order of reference under this and para. 3 it is necessary that all the parties interested must apply to the Court (b). If one of the parties is a firm all partners must join in the reference (c) but a reference by a father who is the manager of a joint Hindu family consisting of himself and his sons will bind the sons (d). If all the parties interested do not apply and an order of reference is made

(a) *Gulera Kaa v Muhammad H son* (1907) 9 Cal 16 91 A 51

(b) *Gulera Kaa v Muhammad H son* (1907) 9 Cal 16 91 A 51

(c) *Gulera Kaa v Muhammad H son* (1907) 9 Cal 16 91 A 51

(d) *C. S. 104 v. P. S. 104* (1907) 9 Cal 16 91 A 51

the order is illegal and if an award is made on such reference the award also is illegal (e) and is liable to be set aside in revision (e1). Thus where in a suit for partnership accounts brought by A against B and C A and B alone applied to the Court to refer the matters in dispute to arbitration and an order of reference was made it was held on an objection raised by B to the validity of the award that C not having joined in the application the order of reference as well as the award made in pursuance thereof were illegal (f). But when the part not referred can be separated from the part referred para 12 (a) would apply. So in a suit where some of the defendants were adults and some were minors for whom no guardian ad litem was appointed and the minors were not interested in the dispute of the plaintiff with the adult defendants it was held that the Court was not justified in refusing to file the award made on a reference by all parties for the part which related to the minors and which was invalid could be separated from the other part. The proper procedure was to modify or correct the award under para 12 (a) of this Schedule (g).

The word interested is new. It has been added to give effect to a recent Allahabad decision (h). It refers to the succeeding words any matter in difference between them. A party to a suit who is not interested in a matter in difference between the other parties to the suit need not join in an application under this paragraph for an order of reference. A sues B and C praying as against B for a declaration of his title to certain property and as against C for possession of the property. A and B alone apply to the Court to refer to arbitration the question as to the ownership of the property. The Court has jurisdiction to make an order of reference though C has not joined in the application for the question of ownership is not in issue between A and C. But C not being a party to the reference the award is not binding upon him though it is binding as between A and B (i).

The High Court of Allahabad has held that a defendant who does not put in an appearance and does not contest the suit is not a party within the meaning of this paragraph. The mere fact therefore that such a defendant has not joined in the application for an order of reference will not invalidate an award (j). On the other hand the High Courts of Calcutta (k) and Madras (l) have held that the mere fact that the defendant has not put in an appearance and does not contest the suit is no ground for holding that he is not a party interested within the meaning of this paragraph also a party may be interested though no relief is claimed against him (m). A person however who is not a necessary party to a suit is not a party interested within the meaning of this para (n). See O 1 r 10 (2). The question whether a party is interested within the meaning of this paragraph must be decided on the facts of each particular case (o).

- (e) *Joy Prokash v Sheo Golum* (1885) 11 Cal 3  
(e1) *Tej S. Ghai v Ghani F. m* (1949) 49 All 81  
10 1 C 210 (1) A A 563  
(f) *Jindur S. bharam v F. dadas* (1903) 6  
Mad 4 *Dooly Cha d v M. mny Mus. m*  
(1916) 41 C W N 337 41 1 C 295  
(1) 4 C 337  
(g) *Paghal S. kuli v Pamrup* (1935) - Pat  
77 81 C 3 (1) A P 33  
(h) *Pratim Mal v Sadug Ali* (1907) 4 All - 9  
(i) *Bukha v Anu to* (1899) 4 C L R 65  
*Pratim Mal v Sadug Ali* (1907) 4 All 29  
*Phag. n. lu v Seetharamaswami* (1935) 44  
M d L J 359 31 C 202 (1935) 4 M  
60 *Saroj v Jas Ad a* (1907) 43 Cal L J  
458 1031 C 65 (1907) A C 619  
(j) *Iskand v Aashad Deo* (1910) 2 All 65  
71 C 68 *Ajuda. Pra d v Rad. m*  
*Ilus* (1911) 39 All 499 493 41 1 C 35

- contra *Husse v Mahb b* (1911) 8 All L J  
615 101 C 59 *Saita v Dharam* (1912)  
3 All 10 18 1 C 609  
(k) *Gurup v K. a* (1918) 97 Cal L J 339  
431 C 169 *S. th Dooly Chand v M. m* ji  
(1916) 4 Cal W N 337 41 1 C 295  
(1) 4 C 337 *Laduram. Natamull v*  
*Nandi l* (1900) 47 Cal 555 531 C 747  
[F B]  
(l) *Potter v Varas ga* (1919) 4 Mad 822 51  
1 C 155 *Co t a. Pathanalla v Vaita*  
*h ga* (1915) 18 Mad L J 374 311 C 206  
(m) *Subba oo v Appad a* (1905) 43 Mad L J  
14, 861 C 839 (1905) A M 61  
(n) *S. Ma v Dha m* (1913) 35 All 10 19 L C  
609 *Arudha Prasad v Badar-ul-Hussain*  
(1917) 39 All 499 493 41 1 C 35  
(o) *M. And v Varas* (1925) 50 Bom 408,  
1101 C 343 (1925) A B 45



## Arbitration

Sch II,  
para 1

"Apply —This Section requires that all the parties interested should entirely agree to a reference but that they should all *apply* to the Court for an order of reference (p). Therefore if one of the parties interested agree to a reference but changes his mind subsequently and does not join in the application the application for an order of reference should be refused (q).

Matter in difference —This must be a matter in difference in the suit itself (r). Where an award comprises matters which are not in dispute in the suit and adjudicates upon the rights of a person who was not a party to the suit and who was interested in some of them and the findings with reference to the matters in question in the suit could not be separated from those not so in question the award is otherwise invalid within the meaning of para 15 (1) (c) and it should be set under that para so far as it deals with matters in difference in the suit (s).

Application shall be in writing —The provision requiring the application to be in writing is directory only and not imperative hence an award is not invalid merely because the application for the order of reference was not made in writing (t). In a recent case before the Judicial Committee where the agreement was in writing but it was not signed by one of the parties it was held that para 1 of this Schedule did not require that the writing should of necessity be signed (u) and it has also been held that the record made by the Court of an oral application is sufficient (v). But where a paradeshi lady was a party and the application was signed by her pleader who was not authorized by his vakalatnama to do so the award was held to be invalid (w). For form of application for an order of reference see the Appendix to this Schedule (x) No 1.

Before judgment.—A suit may be referred to arbitration after a reference is made to the High Court (x).

Court. —Section 107 of the Code provides that an appellate Court shall have the same powers as a Court of original jurisdiction. It follows therefore that an appellate Court can act under this paragraph and refer matters in dispute in the appeal to arbitration if all the parties interested agree to a reference (y). But a Court to which certain issues have been referred for trial under O 41 r 25 cannot act under this paragraph as the duty of such Court is to try the issues as directed by the appellate Court and to return to the appellate Court its findings thereon together with the evidence (z). Similarly a Court dealing with petitions under the Provincial Insolvency Act 1907 has no power to refer the proceedings to arbitrators to decide whether the petitioner should or should not be declared an insolvent (a).

Revocation of arbitrator's authority —When a matter is referred to arbitration by an agreement between the parties *without the intervention of a Court of Justice* the agreement to refer to arbitration cannot be revoked by any party without good cause and

- (p) *Dooly Chand v Manoj J Manoj* (1918) 1 C W N 387 411 C 29 (1) A C 387.  
(q) *Misra Baksh v Shree M. Bahadur* (1911) Punj Rec no 17 p 39 91 C 195.  
(r) *Pokhalpalayam v Pochhalpalayam* (1911) 31 W N 7 6 63 C 92, (21) A 31 (19).  
(s) *Chamra v Chamra* (1908) 31 A 1 3 C 1 90 3 C 633 (21) A 1 93.  
(t) *Chama Sundran v Abdul Latif* (1910) 77 Cal 61 *Abdul Hamid v Latifuddin* (1904) 30 All 35.  
(u) *Emad Singh v Mohanji* (1910) 43 C 1 43 Cal 90 32 C 161.

- (v) *Mahabir v Manohar* (1904) 48 All 24 77 C 816 (74) A A 51.  
(w) *Faizuddin v Durratun Naha* (1902) 23 C W N 83.  
(x) *Feroz Lal v Durratun* (1901) 41 All 91 41 C 911 (70) A A 172.  
(y) *Datta v Anand* (1911) 33 All 615 33 C 935 33 Cal 41 *Andar v Ambur Chow* (1911) 35 Cal 41.  
(z) *Yandam v Fakir Chand* (1900) 7 A 1 13.  
(a) *Latha Singh v Phag Singh* (1910) Pun Rec no 60 p 143 31 C 319.

a mere arbitrary revocation will not be permitted by the Court (b) Where a claimant did not proceed with the reference for a period of nine months without any just cause it was held that it amounted to a good cause sufficient to entitle the other party to revoke the submission (c) Similarly if the arbitrator is indebted to one of the parties at the time of the reference or becomes so indebted after the reference and this fact is not disclosed to the other party the non disclosure is a sufficient cause for revoking the submission upon discovery of the fact (d)

But when a matter is referred to arbitration by an order of the Court the Court alone can revoke the authority of the arbitrator and only in the cases specified in paras 5, 8 and 10. The Court has no power to revoke the authority of an arbitrator in any other case. Thus where after an order of reference was made under para 3 the defendant applied to the Court for an order to revoke the authority of the arbitrator and to appoint a new arbitrator in his place on the ground that he had come to know of certain facts which showed that the arbitrator was not worthy of the confidence reposed in him it was held that the Court had no power to make the order as the case did not come either under para 5, 8 or 10. It was further held that the objection raised by the defendant could only be considered after the award was made and filed in Court and only to the extent permitted by para 10 (e). Note the words or being otherwise invalid in para 10 cl (c).

Where a party dies after application but before order of reference—The death of a party to an application made under this rule for a reference to arbitration before the order of reference is made does not operate as a revocation of the authority of the proposed arbitrator therefore if the right to sue survives it is competent to the Court to make an order of reference after substitution of the representative of the deceased party (f). All that is necessary is substantial representation without strict adherence to the rules of the Civil Procedure Code as to legal representatives and guardians ad litem (g).

Withdrawing from suit pending arbitration—See note to O 23 r 1 under the same head.

Execution proceedings—This Schedule does not apply to execution proceedings and a reference to arbitration by an execution Court is without jurisdiction (h).

Form—For form or application for an order of reference see the Appendix to this Schedule form No 1.

**2 [S 507, 1st para]** The arbitrator shall be appointed in such manner as may be agreed upon between the parties.

**3 [S 508]** (1) The Court shall by order, refer to the arbitrator the matter in difference which he is required to determine and

Appointment of arbitrator

Order of reference

- (b) *Fest v Ma ojee* (1864) 10 M I A 11  
113 N. 112 M. A. 112 v. A. Friend  
(1884) 10 All 145 *Perum v Perumalla*  
(1904) 7 Mad 11 *K. J. Lall v B. v. v.*  
*Lall* (1910) 4 Pat. L. J. 324 399 49 I C  
711  
(c) *Cole v Du Costa* (1890) 17 Cal 400  
(d) *Mahomed v Hakim* (1900) 27 Cal 2

- (1) *H. I. m. b. v. S. P. k. a.* (1886) 10 Bom 341  
*Chattani v. Jagh da* (1914) 36 All 354  
23 I C 753  
(f) *D. v. v. K. h. d.* (1911) 33 All 645 11 I C 935  
(g) *B. v. J. d. v. v. B. A. a. n.* (1911) 6 C W N  
104 10 I C 4 9 (22) 1 C 26  
(h) *T. H. a. v. v. a. n. u. p. d.* (1923) 5 C I 39  
17 I C 935 175 A C 81

## Arbitration

Sch II, shall fix such time as it thinks reasonable for the making of  
para 3 the award, and shall specify such time in the order

(2) Where a matter is referred to arbitration the Court shall not save in the manner and to the extent provided in the Schedule, deal with such matter in the same suit.

The word making has been substituted for the word delivery. In this word delivery was construed as meaning making. See notes below under head making of award.

Fixing of time or the making of award — The present paragraph provides that the Court should fix a reasonable time for the making of the award and specifies a time in the order of reference. Paragraph 8 enables the Court from time to time to enlarge the period for the making of the award. Paragraph 13 provides that an award made after the expiration of the period allowed by the Court may be set aside by the Court. The provision contained in this paragraph requiring the Court to fix a reasonable time for the making of the award is not merely directory but imperative. Hence this provision should be strictly followed. At the same time it has been held that if no time is fixed for delivery of the award in the order of reference but the Court subsequently makes an order for enlarging the time (para. 8) and fixes in that order the time within which the award should be made the omission to fix the time in the order of reference is not fatal to the award. (i) Rankin J. has described the provisions as to reasonable time as the main pillar of the scheme of the Schedule. By the reference the Court parts with control of the suit temporarily for the time limit will bring the matter back to the Court and enable it to resume control and either to grant further time or to supersede the arbitration under para. 8. If the Court fixes no time limit it surrenders control and jurisdiction is involved because such an order professes to abrogate jurisdiction. Accordingly a reference which gave the arbitrators leave to extend for such further time as they may allow themselves was held to be invalid and the arbitrators' award superseded. (i) See para. 1, cl. (1)(c) and notes thereto.

**Making of award**—An award is said to be made when it is completed and signed by the arbitrators. Hence it is sufficient if the award is made that is completed and signed by the arbitrators within the period limited under this paragraph. It is not necessary to the making of the award that it should actually reach the hands of the Court within such period. The validity of the award depends upon the making of it within the period allowed and it is immaterial on what date it is actually delivered to the Court. Thus where the time fixed by the Court for the delivery of an award in a suit pending before it was 16th April 1900 and the award was completed and made on the 16th April but did not reach the hands of the Court until the 17th of April it was held that the award was within time (1).

Clause (2) —Where a matter is referred to arbitration the Court shall deal with it in the same suit except in the manner provided in this Schedule. However the Court has no power to grant permission to the plaintiff to withdraw from the suit with liberty to bring a fresh suit for there is no paragraph in this Schedule to the contrary.

- (1) I la Ha. N re n v Chandraha Bhagya t  
Aurk (1921) 12 AH 16 E A 55  
Lachman Das v Abpa Kash (1904) 30 AH  
169 See in III con section 3 m l  
Aurk v A noe Adapa (1916) A C 755
- (2) Fob adra v Jopendra (1913) C W 481  
MIL 49 (23) A.I. 617 See also
- N eraa lee v Meer Alyasder ( )  
8 MIL A 154  
(2) A masen v Arunachalam (1911) 11 W 1  
T- Lavery v Asan (1911) 11 W 1  
Nia Lam v Akura (1914) 14 A-  
105 Asoo-nikah v Mohammad (1914)  
— AH 42

Arbitrator

Sch  
paras

to O 23 r 1 (l) Nor can the Court revoke the authority of the arbitrator and appoint a new arbitrator except in the cases specified in paragraph 5 (m) Nor is it open to the Court to hear the suit on the merits unless the arbitration has been superseded under paras 5 8 or 15 (n) Similarly the Court has no power to confirm an order passed by the arbitrators making payments of their fees a condition precedent to the hearing of the reference there being no paragraph in this Schedule empowering the Court to make an order in that behalf (o) On the same principle where an award is once set aside on any ground as for instance that one of the parties to the reference had died before the termination of the arbitration proceedings the Court has no power to send back the case to the arbitrators for decision (p)

**Form**—For form of order of reference see form No 2 to the Appendix to this Schedule

**4 [S 509]** (1) Where the reference is to two or more arbitrators, provision shall be made in the order for a difference of opinion among the arbitrators—

Where reference is to two or more arbitrators to provide for difference of opinion

- (a) by the appointment of an umpire, or
- (b) by declaring that, if the majority of the arbitrators agree, the decision of the majority shall prevail, or
- (c) by empowering the arbitrators to appoint an umpire, or
- (d) otherwise as may be agreed between the parties or, if they cannot agree, as the Court may determine

(2) Where an umpire is appointed, the Court shall fix such time as it thinks reasonable for the making of his award in case he is required to act

**Decision of majority**—Where the order of reference did not provide that the decision of the majority of arbitrators should prevail and two of the five arbitrators refused to act it was held that an award by the remaining three who constituted the majority was not valid (q)

**Empowering arbitrators to appoint an umpire.**—The arbitrators have no power to appoint an umpire unless they are authorized in that behalf (r)

**Delegation of duty by arbitrator**—An arbitrator cannot delegate his duties to a third person (s) But he may delegate to a third person the performance of acts of a ministerial character Thus where an arbitrator employed his son to take some

(l) *Shoomba v Deodai* (1947) 9 All 163 Debs  
CA 115 L 190 7 Cal W 1 6  
(m) *H Limbhat v Shanker* (14 6) 10 Bom 341  
(n) *J. Mena v S* (1907) 4 All 31  
(o) *Steel v Roberts* (1881) 6 Cal 609

(p) *J. Mena v S* (1907) 4 All 31  
(q) *C. Rupathappa v S. Rangappa* (1884) 7 Mad 14  
(r) *S. M. v. S. M.* (1903) 17 Com 179  
(s) *J. Mena v S* (1907) 4 All 312.





## Arbitration

Sch II,  
paras  
5-8

**Revision**—An order of the Court deciding the question whether the arbitration should be superseded or a new arbitrator should be appointed is a 'case decided' within the meaning of s 115 and is subject to revision (g)

**Form**—For form of order for appointment of new arbitrator see the Appendix to this Schedule form No 3

**6 [S 512]** Every arbitrator or umpire appointed under paragraph 4 or paragraph 5 shall have the like powers as if his name had been inserted in the order of reference

Powers of arbitrator or umpire appointed under paragraph 4 or 5

**7 [S 513]** (1) The Court shall issue the same summonses and processes to the parties and witnesses and default whom the arbitrator or umpire desire to examine, as the Court may issue in suits tried before it

(2) Persons not attending in accordance with such process, or making any other default, or refusing to give their evidence, or guilty of any contempt to the arbitrator or umpire during the investigation of the matters referred, shall be subject to the like disadvantages, penalties and punishments by order of the Court on the representation of the arbitrator or umpire, as they would incur for the like offences in suits tried before the Court

**8 [S 514]** Where the arbitrators or the umpire cannot complete the award within the period specified in the order, the Court may, if it thinks fit, either allow further time, and from time to time, either before or after the expiration of the period fixed for the making of the award, enlarge such period, or may make an order superseding the arbitration, and in such case shall proceed with the suit

Extension of time for making award

**Alteration in the rule**—The words 'either before or after expiration of the period fixed for the making of the award' are new. They give effect to decisions under the old section (h). But they do not abrogate the ruling of the Privy Council in *Raja Har Narain v Chaudhrai* (i) that r 3 is not merely directory but is mandatory (j)

**Extension of time for making award**—If the time originally fixed for making an award has expired and no award is made the Court may extend the time for making the award. It is not necessary that the application to extend the time should be made before the expiry of the period originally fixed for making the award. The application may be made even after the expiry of the time originally fixed (k). Put

(g) *Jagannath v Chh d* (19 9) 51 All 501

(h) 115 I C 411 (19 3) A A 244

(i) *Jama v Nand Ali* (190 ) 24 All 31

(j) (1881) 13 All 300 18 I A 55

(k) *Rohi d v Joge d* (19 3) 7 C. W v 420  
80 I C 459 (19 3) A C 410

(l) *Haras d v Bhagya l* (1888) 10 All 1

it must be made *before* the award is made. The Court has no power to enlarge the time for the making of an award after the time for making it has expired *and after the award has been made* (l). Sec 148 of this Code does not alter the law laid down in this respect (m). An award made after the expiration of the period allowed by the Court may be set aside under paragraph 15 (1) (e). The application for extension of time need not necessarily be in writing (n).

Where by an order of reference power is given to the *arbitrator* to extend the time for making the award, he can only extend the time *before* the time originally fixed for making the award has expired (o).

**Estoppel**—The parties to a reference may be *estopped* by their conduct from impeaching the validity of an award on the ground that it was made after time (p).

**Appeal**—An appeal lies from an order superseding an arbitration where the award has not been completed within the period allowed by the Court [s 104 sub s (1) cl (a)].

**9 [S 515]** Where an umpire has been appointed he may enter on the reference in the place of the arbitrators,—

(a) if they have allowed the appointed time to expire without making an award, or

(b) if they have delivered to the Court or to the umpire a notice in writing stating that they cannot agree

**10 [S 516]** Where an award in a suit has been made, the persons who made it shall sign it and cause it to be filed in Court, together with any depositions and documents which have been taken and proved before them, and notice of the filing shall be given to the parties

Award need not be signed by arbitrators in each others presence—It is sufficient if all the arbitrators agree to the terms of the award and sign it. There is no provision of law requiring them to sign in the presence of each other (q). But the award must be signed by all the arbitrators before it is filed (r) but not necessarily at the same time and place (s). An award signed by one of the arbitrators while it is on the file of the Court is invalid (f).

**Necessity of arbitrator's presence at meetings**—When a case has been referred to arbitration the presence of all the arbitrators at all meetings and above all

- (f) *P. J. Har v. aia v. Cho th. n. Bhajwant*  
A. r. (1801) 13 All 300 18 I A 55  
Lat h. rasmah m. v. S. max. Jara  
(19) 13 M J 384 Nam Ma ohar v. Lal  
I. ch. ri (1827) 14 All 343
- (m) *Sh. b. Arush. d. v. S. I. A. A. nd* (1911) 33 Cal  
5. I. C. 13 doubted in *Little Auma*  
v. L. p. ndra v. th (1919) 4 Iat L. J. 45  
o. 0 50 I C. 3
- (n) *Sulach. d. v. timbo m.* (1911) 6 Bom. L. R.  
-0 80 I C. 60 (4) 3 350
- (o) *Co-operative H. d. da. Be. k. v. Bhola v. th*

- (1914) 19 I. W. v. 165 31 I C. 59
- (p) *Patt. h. m. r. v. l. p. d. v. alh* (1919) 4 Iat  
L. J. 6 - 0 50 I C. 5
- (q) *Murth. k. n. v. Acha v. y. k. n.* (1893) 19  
Mad 2
- (r) *Ay. s. m. J. d. alia v. Appand. n.* (1901) -3  
Mad. L. J. 145 34 I C. 612.
- (s) *Abdul. Rahman v. Shakhad. D.* (1900) 1  
Iat. 4 I 55 I C. 613.
- (f) *Famash. Cho. d. v. Karanamovi* (1900)  
33 Cal. 473 *Kanath. v. Nepalanga*  
(1909) 3. Mad 510 4 I C. 871.



## Arbitration

Sch II,  
paras  
10-12

at the last meeting when the final act of arbitration is done is essential to the validity of the award (u)

Together with any depositions and documents — The Court has jurisdiction to compel arbitrators to give up documents that may have been filed before them as exhibits during the course of the arbitration. Also if the original records of the suit are handed to the arbitrators to enable them to proceed with the arbitration, and they fail to return them the Court can compel them to return the records (r). The arbitrators omission to file with his award the depositions and documents may lead to the inference that he has been guilty of legal misconduct (u)

Notice of the filing shall be given — It is a material irregularity within the meaning of s 115 if the Court gives judgment without issuing notice and judgment so given will be set aside in revision (x)

Delivery of award — The act of an arbitrator in delivering an award to the proper officer of the Court for the purpose of being filed in Court is not an application within the meaning of the Limitation Act. Hence there is no period of limitation within which an award should be delivered by an arbitrator to the Court (y)

Form — For form of award see the Appendix to this Schedule form no 5.

**11 [S 517]** Upon any reference by an order of the Court, the arbitrator or umpire may, with the leave of the Court, state the award as to the whole or any part thereof in the form of a special case for the opinion of the Court and the Court shall deliver its opinion thereon, and shall order such opinion to be added to and to form part of the award

Statement of special case  
by arbitrators or umpire

Special case — The special case must be on a point of law only (z)

Appeal — An appeal lies from an order on an award stated in the form of a special case [s 104 sub s (1) cl (b)] Where the arbitrators differ on certain matters referred to them but instead of referring their differences to an umpire as provided by the order of reference they submit their own opinions in the form of a special case for the opinion of the Court such submission is not an award stated in the form of a special case and no appeal therefore lies from any order made upon such submission (a)

Form — For form of special case see the Appendix to this Schedule form n 4

Power to modify or correct  
award

**12 [S 518]** The Court may, by order modify or correct an award,—

(a) where it appears that a part of the award is upon a matter not referred to arbitration and such part can be separated from the other part and does not affect the decision on the matter referred, or

- (u) *And Ram v P. A. Chand* (1885) 7 All. 53  
(r) *A. S. v. Vuffer* (1890) 17 Cal. 83  
(w) *Jus. Khan v. J. Khan* (1906) 1 Luck. 139  
93 I. C. 446 (3) A. O. 307  
(z) *Ra. go. am. v. M. v. M.* (1888) 11 Mad. 144  
CA 10. *Khaj. v. Ga. v. h.* (1898) 70 All. 43  
I. J. v. *Khaj. v. Ga. v. h.* (1906) 94 I. C. 115 (6)  
A. C. 1018. See also *Ra. v. J. v. Khaj. v. Ga. v. h.*

- (1908) 50 All. 51 10 I. C. 608 (7) A. 614  
(y) *Polart v. Harrison* (1881) 7 Cal. 321.  
(z) *Laxman v. Pam. Andra* (1905) 49 Bom. 662.  
84 I. C. 35 (3) A. D. 11  
(a) *P. v. Kottamdas v. J. v. M.* (1910) 35 Bom. 130 81 C. 171



## Arbitration

Sch II,  
para 14

unless such matter can be separated without affecting the determination of the matters referred,

- (b) where the award is so indefinite as to be incapable of execution,
- (c) where an objection to the legality of the award is apparent upon the face of it

Remission of award when the award has left undetermined any of the matters referred to arbitration—The reason why an award which does not dispose of all matters referred is invalid seems to be that there is an implied condition in the submission of the parties to the arbitration that the award shall dispose of all. This implied condition may be waived by the consent of all the parties before the arbitrators (A)

Where the issues in a suit were referred to arbitration and there was no distinct and separate finding by the arbitrators on each of the issues but there was a decision on the whole matter in controversy between the parties it was held that the award could not be said to have left undetermined any of the matters referred to arbitration and it should not therefore be remitted to the reconsideration of the arbitrator (1) A separate finding on each issue is not necessary when the whole matter in issue between the parties is decided by the arbitrators (2) But where several issues in a suit are referred to arbitration and the arbitrator decides by the award only one issue the award must be remitted to his reconsideration (3) If the arbitrator fails to reconsider the award the award becomes void see paragraph 15 Even if parties come to an agreement as regards some of the matters referred to arbitration the award should contain a determination of those matters though it be in terms of the agreement otherwise the award would be open to the objection that it has left those matters undetermined (4)

Award patently illegal—This is the rule in *Hodgkinson v Fernie* (m) which limits the right of interference by the Court to the case where a question of law necessarily arises on the face of the award or upon some paper accompanying and forming part of the award This rule was extended in *Sandaner v Asser* (n) to a case where an award referred to a contract and construed it The Court of Appeal held that they were entitled to look at the contract and come to the conclusion that it was wrongly construed. *Sandaner v Asser* has been doubted and in *Champrey Bhara d Co v Jirraj Balloo* (o) the Privy Council said An error of law on the face of the award means in their Lordships' view that you can find in the award or a document actually incorporated therein, as for instance a note appended by the arbitrator stating the reasons for his judgment some legal proposition which is the basis of the award and which you can say is erroneous. In this case cotton had been rejected by a buyer on a final award that it was of inferior quality under Rule 22 of the Rules of the Bombay Cotton Trade Association. This rule gave the buyer the option of invoicing rejected cotton back at the market rate—an option which he would of course only exercise if the market rate had risen. But here the

(1) *Makind Farm v S I q P m* (1894) 1 Cal 90 11 A 4 11 *quon D v Sh v* Di I (1913) Punj It c no 9 p 3... at p 33 17 I C 284 *Janend v D s* (hant a (19 ) 6 lat 556 109 I C 81 (-S) A 1 7

(i) *Ge rye v East an So rj* (1899) 2 Mad 20...

(j) *Ghila J h n v M h mmed Has an* (190 ) 29 Cal 167 188 Cal I 4 51

(k) *Jonnardon v Sambhu Nath* (1489) 18 Cal 806

(l) *Hari Kunw v Lakshmi Firm* (1916) 33 17 350 39 393 31 I C 633

(m) (1857) 3 C B 114 187

(n) [190 ] A. B. 184

(o) (1973) 47 10m 578 50 I A 34 3 I C 436 ( 3 ) A PC 66 followed in *World Mogul v Madan* (19...) 6 Cal 170 68 I C 49 (-S) A L 599

Arbitr

Sch  
par  
14,

market rate was below the contract rate and the defaulting seller claimed to recover the difference. The award allowed the claim and in the preamble of the award narrating the events which led up to the dispute and the reference to arbitration mention was made of the contract and the letter of rejection for inferiority. The Bombay High Court seized upon this recital and said that as the contract referred to the Pules and as the rejection was under Rule 52 the arbitrators must have wrongly construed the option in the rule as an obligation and that this was an error patent on the face of the award. The Privy Council however said that the rule in *Hodgkinson v Fennie* (p) does not mean that if in the narrative a reference is made to the contention of one party that opens the door to seeing first what that contention is and then going to the contract on which the parties depend to see if that contention is sound. They also observed that the arbitrators were entitled to put their own construction on Rule 52. In another similar case the error was said to be in the construction of a contract which was referred to in the award but their Lordships pointed out that the contract was not incorporated in the award which only made a guarded allusion to it for the purpose of earmarking the origin of the dispute (q). Where the only question in a suit was whether a Hindu was born blind and therefore not entitled to inherit and the suit was referred to arbitration and the arbitrator made an award whereby the blind man was declared to be entitled to a life interest in a certain portion of the property it was held on an objection to the award under cl (c) of this paragraph that the award was not so patently illegal that it could not be remitted to the reconsideration of the arbitrator (r).

**Appeal**—No appeal lies from an order under this paragraph remitting an award to the reconsideration of arbitrators. Where an award is remitted to the reconsideration of the arbitrator and the arbitrator submits a fresh award and a decree is passed in accordance with the revised award no appeal lies from the decree on the ground that the order of remittal was wrong (r 16) and that the original award ought to have been accepted and acted upon (s). But where an award is remitted to the reconsideration of the arbitrator and the arbitrator refuses to reconsider the award (which consequently becomes void under paragraph 15) and the Court proceeds to try the case and passes a decree in the ordinary way [para 15 sub para (—)] the legality of the order remitting the award may be challenged on appeal from such decree (t) see sec 103.

## 15 [S 52] (1) An award remitted under paragraph

14 becomes void on failure of the arbitrator or umpire to reconsider it. But no award shall be set aside except on one of the

Ground for setting  
aside award

following grounds, namely —

- (a) corruption or misconduct of the arbitrator or umpire,
- (b) either party having been guilty of fraudulent concealment of any matter which he ought to have disclosed, or of wilfully misleading or deceiving the arbitrator or umpire,

(p) (1857) 5 C B N 8 187  
(q) *Wick v. M. Amond v. M. Amond* (10) 54  
I A 47 104 I C. 46 55 (al) 176  
(\*) A P.C. 164

(r) *Maderpal v. Maderpal* (1914) 41 M.L.  
10 411 C 614  
(s) *S. 16 al v. drama* (1901) 31 M.L. 470  
(t) *George v. I. at an* (1901) 22 M.L. 27

## Arbitration

Sch II,  
para 15

(c) the award having been made after the issue of an order by the Court superseding the arbitration and proceeding with the suit or after the expiration of the period allowed by the Court, or being otherwise invalid

(2) Where an award becomes void or is set aside under clause (1), the Court shall make an order superseding the arbitration and in such case shall proceed with the suit

Points of distinction between s 521 of the Code of 1882 and this paragraph —

- 1 Award made after expiration of period allowed by Court See notes below under the same head
- 2 When the award is otherwise invalid See notes under the same head
- 3 Clause (2) is new

Misconduct—The term misconduct does not necessarily imply moral turpitude it includes neglect of the duties and responsibilities of the arbitrator and what Courts of Justice expect from them before allowing finality to their awards (1). Nor does it necessarily imply corruption (2)

Acts amounting to misconduct—The following acts have been held to amount to misconduct on the part of an arbitrator affording a ground for setting aside an award —

- 1 Irregularities in procedure which amount to no proper hearing of the matter in dispute (1) e.g. hearing and receiving evidence from one side in the absence of the other side without giving the other side affected by such evidence the opportunity of meeting and answering it (2)
- 2 Proceeding with arbitration in the absence of one of the arbitrators (3)
- 3 Refusing to hear witness produced by the parties (2)
- 4 Arbitrators improperly adding another to their number (4)
- 5 Where three out of five arbitrators were not present at the time the award was made and did not sign the award although it purported to be signed by all of them it was held that this amounted to misconduct and the award was set aside (5)
- 6 Making inquiries about the matters in reference from outside sources in the absence of the parties (6)
- 7 An unexplained delay of 5 years in making the award has been held to amount to misconduct (7)

|   |   |
|---|---|
| (a) <i>Chitra S. P. v. Leikray</i> (1907) 9 All 253<br>Am. Dig. on Ind. Arb. n (1914)<br>6 All 362 I C 82 [P. C. 1] 2nd edn.<br>v. 46d I H. in (1913) 2d Edn. L. L.<br>29—8 I C 41 (1914) A I 149 | (j) <i>T. M. M. v. P. M. v. P. M.</i> (1911) 1 All<br>113 v. d. I v. 1st ed. (1911)<br>7 All 523  |
| (c) <i>B. H. v. A. H.</i> (1903) 40 Cal<br>297  | (k) <i>P. M. v. P. M.</i> (1913) 1 C. L.  |
| (u) <i>Am. P. M. v. P. M.</i> (1914) 46 All<br>35 313 232 C. 6—(1 C)  | (l) <i>P. M. v. P. M.</i> (1913) 1 W. P. 24   |
| (e) <i>C. M. v. B. M.</i> (1914) 19 Indo 203<br>2d edn. 1st ed. 46d I H. d. (1914)<br>7 All. L. J. 463 47 C. 161 (1914) A L. 50   | (m) <i>P. M. v. P. M.</i> (1914) 1 W. P. 24<br>(n) <i>P. M. v. P. M.</i> (1914) 1 W. P. 24<br>(o) <i>P. M. v. P. M.</i> (1914) 1 W. P. 24<br>(p) <i>P. M. v. P. M.</i> (1914) 1 W. P. 24<br>(q) <i>P. M. v. P. M.</i> (1914) 1 W. P. 24<br>(r) <i>P. M. v. P. M.</i> (1914) 1 W. P. 24<br>(s) <i>P. M. v. P. M.</i> (1914) 1 W. P. 24<br>(t) <i>P. M. v. P. M.</i> (1914) 1 W. P. 24<br>(v) <i>P. M. v. P. M.</i> (1914) 1 W. P. 24<br>(w) <i>P. M. v. P. M.</i> (1914) 1 W. P. 24<br>(x) <i>P. M. v. P. M.</i> (1914) 1 W. P. 24<br>(y) <i>P. M. v. P. M.</i> (1914) 1 W. P. 24<br>(z) <i>P. M. v. P. M.</i> (1914) 1 W. P. 24 |

**Acquiescence in acts amounting to misconduct**—It is misconduct if some of the arbitrators are not present at some of the meetings. But if this procedure is adopted with the concurrence of all the parties or acquiesced in by them it is not open to any of the parties to impeach the award on that ground (e)

**Acts not amounting to misconduct**—An arbitrator is not bound by technical rules of procedure. Therefore it is not a valid objection to an award that the arbitrator did not act in strict conformity with the rules of evidence (f). But he should not make private inquiries behind the backs of the parties (g) unless authorized by the wide terms of the reference (h). Again the rule of evidence which declares that letters written without prejudice should not be admitted in evidence being a rule founded upon natural justice is as binding upon arbitrators as upon Courts of Justice and an arbitrator is wrong in receiving and acting upon such a letter. But if no objection is taken by the other side to the admissibility of such letter and an award is made the award will not be set aside on the ground of misconduct (i). If it is provided in an agreement for reference that an adjustment relied upon by the plaintiff should not be taken into consideration by the arbitrator a bona fide mistake on the part of the arbitrator in admitting the adjustment in evidence does not amount to misconduct. Such a stipulation is nothing but a rule of evidence introduced *pro hac vice* (j). If the arbitrator is selected on account of his special knowledge of the matter in dispute it is not misconduct for him to use his special knowledge (k). But otherwise it is misconduct for an arbitrator to ignore the evidence and decide on his special knowledge (l).

It is not misconduct on the part of the arbitrator to delegate to a third party the performance of acts of a ministerial character so long as he exercises his own judgment on the matters referred (m). Misconduct cannot be presumed from the mere fact that the arbitrator is the relative of one of the parties (n). The mere fact that the arbitrator has failed to account for the delay in making the award is no ground for presuming fraud (o).

In *Duta v. Municipal Committee of Lahore* (p) certain matters in dispute between A and B were referred to arbitration. The agreement of reference was drawn up by A's counsel. The arbitrator feeling doubtful as to the meaning of a certain clause in the agreement wrote to A to obtain his counsel's opinion on the meaning of that clause. A obtained the opinion and sent it on to the arbitrator. B was not informed of this until after the award was made. It was held that though it would have been prudent and discreet for the arbitrator to have written to A with B's knowledge and informed B of the opinion the omission to do this did not amount to misconduct as there was no ground for impeaching the good faith of any of the parties concerned.

**Evidence of arbitrator**—Where a charge of dishonesty or partiality is made against an arbitrator any relevant evidence he can give is fully admissible. It is however necessary to take care that evidence admitted as relevant on such charges is not used for a different purpose namely to criticize the decision of the arbitrator on matters within his jurisdiction and in which his decision is final (q).

- (1) *J. J. H. v. J. J. H.* (1919) 41 T. 1 J. 334 40 104 34 T. 711 C. 13  
v. (1914) 14 T. 11 n. 109  
(f) *C. J. v. C. J. J. J. J.* (1914) 11 M. d. 153 154 155 156 157 158 159 160 161 162 163 164 165 166 167 168 169 170 171 172 173 174 175 176 177 178 179 180 181 182 183 184 185 186 187 188 189 190 191 192 193 194 195 196 197 198 199 200  
(g) *C. J. v. C. J. J. J. J.* (1914) 11 M. d. 153 154 155 156 157 158 159 160 161 162 163 164 165 166 167 168 169 170 171 172 173 174 175 176 177 178 179 180 181 182 183 184 185 186 187 188 189 190 191 192 193 194 195 196 197 198 199 200  
(h) *H. J. v. B. J. J. J. J.* (1914) 11 M. d. 153 154 155 156 157 158 159 160 161 162 163 164 165 166 167 168 169 170 171 172 173 174 175 176 177 178 179 180 181 182 183 184 185 186 187 188 189 190 191 192 193 194 195 196 197 198 199 200  
(i) *H. J. v. B. J. J. J. J.* (1914) 11 M. d. 153 154 155 156 157 158 159 160 161 162 163 164 165 166 167 168 169 170 171 172 173 174 175 176 177 178 179 180 181 182 183 184 185 186 187 188 189 190 191 192 193 194 195 196 197 198 199 200  
(j) *A. J. v. B. J. J. J. J.* (1914) 11 M. d. 153 154 155 156 157 158 159 160 161 162 163 164 165 166 167 168 169 170 171 172 173 174 175 176 177 178 179 180 181 182 183 184 185 186 187 188 189 190 191 192 193 194 195 196 197 198 199 200

- (1) *C. J. v. C. J. J. J. J.* (1914) 11 M. d. 153 154 155 156 157 158 159 160 161 162 163 164 165 166 167 168 169 170 171 172 173 174 175 176 177 178 179 180 181 182 183 184 185 186 187 188 189 190 191 192 193 194 195 196 197 198 199 200  
(k) *A. J. v. B. J. J. J. J.* (1914) 11 M. d. 153 154 155 156 157 158 159 160 161 162 163 164 165 166 167 168 169 170 171 172 173 174 175 176 177 178 179 180 181 182 183 184 185 186 187 188 189 190 191 192 193 194 195 196 197 198 199 200  
(l) *C. J. v. C. J. J. J. J.* (1914) 11 M. d. 153 154 155 156 157 158 159 160 161 162 163 164 165 166 167 168 169 170 171 172 173 174 175 176 177 178 179 180 181 182 183 184 185 186 187 188 189 190 191 192 193 194 195 196 197 198 199 200  
(m) *B. J. v. C. J. J. J. J.* (1914) 11 M. d. 153 154 155 156 157 158 159 160 161 162 163 164 165 166 167 168 169 170 171 172 173 174 175 176 177 178 179 180 181 182 183 184 185 186 187 188 189 190 191 192 193 194 195 196 197 198 199 200  
(n) *A. J. v. B. J. J. J. J.* (1914) 11 M. d. 153 154 155 156 157 158 159 160 161 162 163 164 165 166 167 168 169 170 171 172 173 174 175 176 177 178 179 180 181 182 183 184 185 186 187 188 189 190 191 192 193 194 195 196 197 198 199 200  
(o) *A. J. v. B. J. J. J. J.* (1914) 11 M. d. 153 154 155 156 157 158 159 160 161 162 163 164 165 166 167 168 169 170 171 172 173 174 175 176 177 178 179 180 181 182 183 184 185 186 187 188 189 190 191 192 193 194 195 196 197 198 199 200  
(p) *A. J. v. B. J. J. J. J.* (1914) 11 M. d. 153 154 155 156 157 158 159 160 161 162 163 164 165 166 167 168 169 170 171 172 173 174 175 176 177 178 179 180 181 182 183 184 185 186 187 188 189 190 191 192 193 194 195 196 197 198 199 200  
(q) *A. J. v. B. J. J. J. J.* (1914) 11 M. d. 153 154 155 156 157 158 159 160 161 162 163 164 165 166 167 168 169 170 171 172 173 174 175 176 177 178 179 180 181 182 183 184 185 186 187 188 189 190 191 192 193 194 195 196 197 198 199 200

## Arbitration

Sch II,  
para 15

**Appeal from decree based on an award on ground of misconduct—**No appeal lies from a decree passed in accordance with an award on the ground of misconduct of the arbitrator (r). The only remedy available to the party aggrieved by the award is to apply to have it set aside under this paragraph. See notes to paragraph 16 below under the head Invalid award

**Fraudulent concealment of any matter which ought to have been disclosed—**Where the arbitrator was the retained pleader of the plaintiff and the fact was not disclosed by the plaintiff to the defendant before the arbitrator was appointed the award was set aside on the ground that that fact was one which ought to have been disclosed. Every disclosure which might in the least affect the merits of those who are proposing to submit their dispute to the arbitrament of any particular individual as regards his selection and fitness for the post ought to be made so that each party may have every opportunity of considering whether the reference to arbitration to that particular individual should or should not be made (s).

**Award made subsequent to order superseding arbitration—**If an order is made superseding the arbitration under paragraph 5 or 8 or under cl. (d) of this paragraph or if the period fixed for making the award has expired the arbitrator has no longer *seignior* of the reference and they are *functus officio* and cease to have any more power to make an award than the man in the street (t). Similarly an arbitrator *functus officio* after the award is made and he cannot thereafter add to or alter the award (u).

**Award made after expiration of period allowed by Court—**Clause (c) of s. 521 stopped at the words *the suit which occurs in cl. (1) sub-cl. (c) of this para.* It was followed by another clause which ran thus: And no award shall be valid unless made within the period allowed by the Court. The latter clause has now been amended and in stead thereof we have the words: or after the expiration of the period allowed by the Court added into sub-cl. (c). The effect of this alteration is that the only remedy now open to the party impeaching an award on the ground that it was made after the expiration of the period allowed by the Court is to apply under this paragraph to set aside the award. If no application is made to set aside the award under this paragraph or if the application is made but refused the award becomes final and no appeal will lie from a decree based upon the award (v). [Under the Code of 1887 it was held that an appeal lay from a decree based upon such an award (w).] If the application to set aside the award is granted and an order is made under sub-para. (2) superseding the arbitration the order is appealable under s. 104 sub. (1) cl. (a). See notes to r. 16 below. No appeal lies from a decree based on an award etc. and notes to paragraph 3 above. *Making of award.*

Another consequence of the alteration is that whereas under s. 521 of the old Code an award out of time was a nullity (x) it is not so under the present rule. Under the present rule it is merely voidable and if not sought to be set aside within the period of limitation [Limitation Act 1908 art. 108] it is binding upon the parties.

**When the award is otherwise invalid—**The words or being otherwise invalid at the end of sub-cl. (c) are new. Under the Code of 1882 it was held that when

- (r) *Walt v. Fyfe* (1901) 22 Bom. 23. *Ram Lal v. Karan Singh* (1895) 18 All. 414.  
(s) *Lal v. Chakraborty* (1907) 30 All. 457. *Kombi v. P. N.* (1894) 1 Mad. 40.  
(t) *Kali Prasad v. Rajani Kant* (1899) 22 Cal. 141. *Purush Chandra v. R. S. Ali* (1901) 1 Luck. 159. 93 I. C. 416. (4) A. O. 307.  
(u) *Id. Chandra v. Ali* (1898) 18 All. 4. 4-5.  
(v) *Jasraj Das v. S. D. Ali* (1901) 3 All. 253. 31 I. A. 111.

- (w) *S. B. Kritt. Dow & Co. v. S. & Chandra* (1911) 39 Cal. 8. 18 I. C. 62.  
(x) *Potter v. Aynon* v. *L. Pandey* (1911) 4 Cal. 2. 375. 50 I. C. 5. (1911) 3 Cal. 8-22. 15 I. C. 60. v. *prae* All. 4. 31 Cal. 2. 134 I. C. 1.  
(y) *Ch. An. Mal v. Hari P. N.* (1) 51 All. 56. *Hari P. N. v. Ch. An. Mal* (1911) 12 All. 301. 14 I. A. 5. *Isachman Das* (1908) 10 All. 169.

Arbitration  
and So  
the par

an award was not a valid and legal award an appeal would lie from the decree based upon such award even though the decree might be in accordance with the award. The leading case on the subject was *Kali Prasanno Ghose v. Pajani Kant* (y) decided by the High Court of Calcutta in the year 1898. The object of adding the words or being otherwise invalid into sub cl (c) is to supersede the Calcutta and other decisions which allowed an appeal from a decree based upon an invalid award and to give effect to the principle of finality in cases of arbitration enunciated by their Lordships of the Privy Council in *Gulamkhan v. Muhammad Hassan* ( ) and followed in recent cases (a). The result is that the only remedy now open to a party seeking to impeach an award as being invalid is to apply under this paragraph to have it set aside. If he fails to do so or if an application is made but refused the award becomes final and no appeal will lie from a decree based upon the award. See notes to paragraph 16 under the head Invalid award. It is worth while noting that the Special Committee which introduced these alterations intended to allow an appeal from an order under this paragraph setting aside or refusing to set aside an award (b) but no such provision is contained in s 101. The words or being otherwise invalid do not include the question whether there was or was not a valid reference to arbitration. An application in revision will therefore lie on the ground of the initial invalidity of the reference (c).

An award is not illegal merely because it is based on evidence given by one of the parties on a special oath administered under the Indian Oaths Act with the consent of the other party (d)

An award is invalid if the arbitrators go beyond the scope of the suit and decide matters which are not in suit and which concern persons who are not parties to the suit. Panel in J said such an award cannot be treated partly as an award on a reference by the Court and partly as an award by private agreement for there is no provision for such simultaneous arbitration and the jurisdiction for the different types of arbitration must not be confused (e). The Privy Council reserved their opinion as to whether there may not be an exception to this comprehensive statement as to simultaneous arbitration but held that such an award was not in accordance with the terms of reference and therefore otherwise invalid under para 15 (f). In a subsequent case the parties to a suit applied for a reference as to matters in dispute in the suit and other matters as well. The Court referred to arbitration the matters in dispute in the suit only. The parties then made a reference without the intervention of the Court of these other matters to the same arbitrators who made two awards. The Court held that as the arbitrators had kept the two matters distinct the award on the reference was valid (g).

Appeal from order under this paragraph—Except in the case of an award made by a local authority or a body of persons appointed by it, no appeal lies from an order under this paragraph setting aside or varying an award. If the objecting party does not apply for such an order, the Court has no option but to pronounce judgment in favor of the award, and the decree made thereon cannot be set aside unless it is shown to be an ex parte decree.

- (y) (189) 3 Cal 141  
(1) (190) 1 Cal 16 143 99 Y A 51  
(a) See *A rman of the Furna M* pol ty v  
u arler I m (1906) 33 Cal 292 90  
(10)  
(b) See *C ette of f d a* 190 F rt v p 183.  
(c) *J f* p v t A I m (1 149 Mh 81  
10\* 14 \*36 ( ) A A 63 Mh dec  
Pr m I aders De (11 ) 0 Mh 95  
110 I C a ( ) A A 40  
(d) *P A g rnt v f m k lam* (1 1) 4 Mh - 3  
(f) *I mprotav v Dury pu* (19 d) 44 Y

- (f) CH<sub>3</sub>COOH (Acetic acid) 100 g  
(g) CH<sub>3</sub>COONa (Sodium acetate) 100 g  
(h) CH<sub>3</sub>COOH (Acetic acid) 100 g  
(i) CH<sub>3</sub>COONa (Sodium acetate) 100 g



## Arbitration

Sch II,  
paras  
15, 16

Chartered High Court it amounts to a judgment within the meaning of cl 15 of the Letter Patent and is appealable under that clause See notes to s 104 under the head Letters Patent appeal See also notes to paragraph 21 below under the head Appeal

It has been held by the High Courts of Calcutta Madras and Bombay and by the Chief Court of the Punjab that though no appeal lies from an order setting aside an award the legality of the order may be challenged on appeal from the decree that may be ultimately passed in the suit (L) [s s 10.] A different view has been taken by the High Court of Allahabad (l)

Revision—An order under this paragraph setting aside or refusing to set aside an award is not subject to revision (m) But an order superseding arbitration may be attacked under s 105 in appeal from the decree in the suit (n)

16 [s 522] (1) Where the Court sees no cause to remit the award or any of the matters

Judgment to be according to award

referred to arbitration for re-consideration in manner aforesaid, and no application has been made to set aside the award, or the Court has refused such application, the Court shall, after the time for making such application has expired, proceed to pronounce judgment according to the award

(2) Upon the judgment so pronounced a decree shall follow, and no appeal shall lie from such decree except in so far as the decree is in excess of, or not in accordance with the award

After the time for making such application has expired—That is after 10 days from the date on which the award is filed in Court and notice of the filing has been given to the parties see Limitation Act 1908 sch 1 art 158 as amended by Act IV of 1919 Before the amendment the period of 10 days commenced from the date on which the award was submitted to the Court See the preamble to Act 18 of 1919 The amendment seems to have been suggested by the judgments of the learned judges in the undermentioned Calcutta case (o)

No appeal lies from a decree based on an award except in so far as such decree is in excess of or not in accordance with the award—In reference to arbitration the general rule is that as the parties choose their own arbitrator to be the judge in the dispute between them they cannot object to his decision either upon the law or upon the facts It is now well established that where a matter is referred to an arbitrator he is the sole and final judge of all questions not only of fact but of law (p)

(l) *Anb v Nodj r* (1895) 21 Cal 17—1  
A h thajy v 21 amm gya (1908) 31  
Mad 34 *Damod r v J sh nath* (190 )  
20 Bom 51 *Juna v M bar k hla*  
(191 ) Pun. Rec no 97 p 33 1 1 C

(l) *Gang Prasad v Kura* (1906) 3 All 408

(m) *Damod r v Pugh ath* (190 ) 6 Bom 551  
*Kali Charan v Sarai Chande* (1903) 30  
Cal 307 *P = Jantava Mal v De*  
*l lta Mal* (1916) Punj Rec no 117

p 361 34 I C 19 Ch nath v  
A sha lat (10 3) 4 I m 1 1 1 C  
404 (—) A 21 40 *Ash Jf kumad*  
*Ish Uah* (19—) 47 All 1 1 1 C  
50 (—) A A 4 4  
(n) *P d a Pr ad v Nath ra Pr* (1922) 4  
All 916 53 I C 1 1 1 (—) A A 504  
(o) *Sp a h d v Jf rry Jwz* (1919) 48 Cal. —  
53 I C 46  
(p) *Ad s v Cr t North of Scotland Fy C*  
[1891] A C 51 31 *Agnew & Co v*  
[1893] 3 L T 406

Thus where an award was impeached on the ground that it was against law their Lordship of the Privy Council said: "They [arbitrators] may have erred in law but arbitrators may be judges of law as well as judges of fact and an error in law certainly does not vitiate an award (q). And this principle has been carried so far that if parties submit to an arbitrator the decision of a bare point of law and he gives an erroneous decision his award is binding notwithstanding (r). In all the cases the Court would say to the party seeking to set aside the award: 'You have constituted your own tribunal you are bound by its decision (s). The present paragraph gives effect to the principle of finality of awards by declaring that no appeal shall lie from a decree based on an award except in so far as the decree is in excess of or not in accordance with the award (t). The only cases in which the Code allows an appeal from a decree based on an award are—

- (1) where the decree is in excess of the award as where the decree gives interest which the arbitrators have not awarded (u) or
- (2) where the decree is not in accordance with the award

In this respect there is no difference between a decree based upon a private award (para. 21) and a decree based upon an award made through the intervention of the Court (1).

Is a decree based on an award which has been modified by the Court under paragraph 12 a decree in accordance with the award? It has been held by the High Court of Allahabad that it is not and hence an appeal lies from the decree. Thus where an award directed the defendant to make certain payments to the plaintiff by instalments and the award was modified by the Court under paragraph 12 by omitting the direction as to payment by instalments and a decree was passed on the award as so modified it was held that an appeal would lie from the decree (iv). The soundness of this decision is open to question. It is submitted that a decree is in accordance with an award within the meaning of this paragraph if it is in accordance with the award as modified under paragraph 12, though it may not be in accordance with the original award. Paragraph 16 says "The Court shall proceed to pronounce judgment according to the award." It is clear that when an award is modified under paragraph 12, the only award in accordance with which judgment can be pronounced is the modified award. Moreover the decision runs counter to the principle of finality which finds expression in the Code.

Where an application made under para 13 cl (c) to set aside an award on the ground that it was made after the expiration of the period allowed by the Court has been refused and a decree is subsequently passed in accordance with the award no appeal lies from the decree if it is in accordance with the award. Nor does any appeal lie from the decree under the Letters Patent (r). See notes to paragraph 13 above. Award made after expiration of period allowed by Court and notes

|  |       |                         |         |
|--|-------|-------------------------|---------|
| Appeal from order under this paragraph | above | See also notes to § 104 | Letters |
| Patent appeal above                    |       |                         |         |

**Invalid award**—Under the old section it was held by the Courts in India that though a decree might be in perfect accordance with an award an appeal would lie from the decree if the award upon which the decree was based was *invalid*. The reason

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| (f) Ch I m A k v M hama n a f H r a (19C )<br>J Cal 16    9 3 4 51 K o l i n g h<br>I m r a (19 4 ) 3 1 at 443 R I C 994<br>(w) A 1 4 s | (g) Lal (1948) 33 c 1 614 33 I A 84<br>( ) Msh Lail v J y n : (15 4 ) 3 3 E.<br>105  |
| ( ) S i f     d r e s s e s (1816) * Mall-ock 6   | ( ) B had s g h v V e p t P u r a n    n g h (19 )<br>30 4H 151 K u l t r a m v d i A b a (1917)                                 |
| ( ) F e r W i l l i n J 1 i H o l i k s o m v F e r n e<br>(1572) 3 C 1    5 s 189  | 9 All 401 411 321 L C 70   |
| (t) Ch I m A k v M h a m d h l l a n n (190 )<br>9 Cal 16    9 2 4 51 H a m a n d h d e v   | (w) J n a h a v M I I j (1K 6 ) 8 All 449<br>(x) N b A r a t H a w d C    v    S a t s h ( h a n d r a<br>1291 329 Cal 6    18 C |

## Arbitration

Sch II,  
para 16

given was that that section presupposed a valid and legal award and not an award upon which no decree could be passed (y) A different view however was taken by the Lordships of the Privy Council in *Ghulam Akhan v Muhammad Hussain* ( ) decided in the year 1902 After that expression of opinion two of our High Courts held that an appeal lay under a 522 from a decree passed on an award on the ground that the award was invalid (a) Under the present Code it is quite clear that no appeal lies from a decree where such decree is passed in accordance with the award though the award may be invalid. But the party aggrieved by the award may apply under para. 13 cl. (1), sub-cl (c) to have the award set aside. If he does not avail himself of that remedy the award becomes final and no appeal lies from the decree based upon the award. This change has been introduced by the insertion of the words "or the award be otherwise invalid" in para 1 cl. (1) sub-cl (c). The object is to give finality to awards as stated in the notes to paragraph 15 under the head "Where the award is otherwise invalid." The effect of this alteration is that no appeal lies under this Code when a decree has been passed under the present paragraph upon an award except in so far as the decree is in excess of or not in accordance with the award (b) The result is that all those cases in which it was held under the Code of 1852 that a decree though it be in accordance with the award may be challenged by way of appeal on the ground that there was no valid and legal award are no longer law. In a Lahore case sons of one of the parties interested in the property were joined as parties after the award was filed, and made detailed objections to the award. When their objections were disallowed and a decree passed in terms of the award, the Court held that they had by their conduct submitted to the arbitration proceedings and had no right of appeal although they had not actually been parties to the reference (c)

## Illustrations

(a) An order of reference made on the application of some only of the parties interested is illegal [see paragraph 1]. Therefore an award made in pursuance of such order is also illegal. According to the old section an appeal would lie from a decree upon such an award (d). But no appeal lies under this paragraph and the only remedy open to the party aggrieved by the award is to apply to the Court under paragraph 13, cl. (1) sub-cl (c) to set aside the award. Such an application should be made within 10 days from the date on which the award is submitted to the Court (e) under paragraph 1.

(b) An award made after the expiration of the period fixed by the Court under paragraph 3 or enlarged by the Court under paragraph 8 is invalid. According to the old section an appeal would lie from a decree based on such award (e). No appeal lies

- (y) *Lachman v. Brijpal* (1881) 6 All 174; *Sham Lal v. Mersi Kumar* (1907) 9 All 46; *Kali Prasa na Ghose v. Jayanti Kant* (1894) 3 Cal 161; *Vand m v. Venkatarud* (1893) 17 Bom 357; *Shib Lal v. Chaturbhuj* (1909) 31 All 450; 1 C 363.
- (a) (1897) 42 Cal 387; 29 I A 51.
- (a) See *Chairman of the P. r. n. Municipal ty v. Dira Sand Jam* (1906) 31 Cal 699; 90° 903; *Kanakkia v. Galanga* (1909) 3 Mad 510; 41 C 871.
- (b) *Mah med v. Tell* (1941) 26 Bom L. R. 171; 91 C. 3 (1) 4 D 34; *Guran Ditta v. Jolhar Fom* (19 ) 8 Lab. 693; 104 I C Or ( ) A L. 36; *Lalawan v. Lachya* (1914) 36 All 63; 1 I C 989; [1] 11; *L. tika v. tal* (1915) 38 M d 50; 1 I C 304; *Ka d ram v. Cha d cha an* (1916) 1 I L J 306; 35 I C 38; *Kanha ya Lal v. Jagan ath Prasad*

- (10 1) 43 All 30; 60 I C 8 (1); 4 A 16; *Hari SH nt v. J m Poon* (19 3) 45 All 441; 2 C 84; (1) 1 A 50; *Mahomed v. Tell* (1911) 6 P m L. P 11; 91 C 3 (1) 1 A 321; See also *Shib Krido Das v. C v. C v. C*; *Cha d a* (1911) 39 Cal 8; 15 I C 4; *Balkshan v. Sultan v. agi* (1911) 10 Lab. 8; 118 I C 359 (1911) 1 A 4; *Mam Tun v. Mow g Tun* (1919) 7 Lab. 100; (9) A R. 2.
- (c) *Guran Ditta v. Pokhar Fom* (1907) 8 Lab. 67; 104 I C 20; (1911) A L. 36.
- (d) *Ind v. Kandadai* (1903) 2 M J 4; 39; *Prokash v. Naro Colam* (14 5) 11 Cal. 3; *Sh d Lal v. Chaturthi* (1909) 31 All 41; 1 I C 563.
- (e) *Ch ha Jital v. Hari Fom* (14 6) 8 All 344; *Lachman Lax v. Abprakash* (1911) 21 All 167.

under the present paragraph but the party aggrieved by the award may apply to have it set aside under paragraph 10. See notes to para 15. Award made after expiration of period allowed by Court.

(c) An award must be signed before it is filed and it must be signed by all the arbitrators. An award signed by *some* only of the arbitrators is illegal. Similarly, an award signed by an arbitrator *after* the same has been filed in Court is illegal. According to the old section an appeal would lie from a decree based on such award. (f) No appeal lies under this paragraph but the party aggrieved by the award may apply under paragraph 10 to have it set aside. (n)

(d) The matters in difference in a suit between *A* and *B* are referred to the arbitration of *C*. *C* is the retained pleader of *A* but this fact is not disclosed to *B* [see para 16]. *C* makes an award. The award is illegal. According to the old section an appeal would lie from the decree (*A*). No appeal lies under the present paragraph but *B* can apply to have the award set aside under paragraph 15.

An appeal lies from a decree based upon a judgment pronounced in contravention of the provisions of this paragraph though the decree may be in accordance with the award—It has been held by the High Court of Allahabad that if a decree is passed on an award *before the time for making the application to set aside the award has expired* an appeal will lie from the decree though the decree may be in accordance with the award (i) But in such cases the Bombay and Lahore High Courts interfere by way of revision (j) The Allahabad High Court has held that where an application to set aside an award has been refused by the Court *without considering it* and a decree is passed on the award an appeal will lie from the decree though the decree may be in accordance with the award. The reason given is that the word *refused* in this paragraph means *refused after judicial consideration* (k)

Second appeal—A second appeal will lie to the High Court where the decree of the Court of first instance is in accordance with the award and such decree is set aside by the first appellate Court. The reason is that no appeal lies from a decree passed in accordance with an award and the first appellate Court acts *without jurisdiction* in entertaining the appeal and setting aside the decree passed in accordance with the award (i). In a similar case the High Court of Calcutta held that no second appeal lies but that the High Court may *revoke* the order under s. 115 (m).

A second appeal will arise where the Court of first instance sets aside the award and passes a decree on the merits and the first appellate Court sets aside the decree and passes a decree in accordance with the award. The mere fact that the decree of the first appellate Court is in accordance with the award is no ground for refusing the appeal (n).

Revision.—We have seen that no appeal lies from a decree passed in accordance with an award. Section II, provides that where no appeal lies from a decision, an application may be made to the High Court for a revision of the decision. No such

- (f) Ya d am v Nem Land (1903) 17 Rom 357  
I me h (Land a v A ren moy) (1906) 33  
Cal 408
- (g) A h u l a v C'ia d h a r a n (1916) Pat L-  
3130 35 I 3 8
- (h) A i l r o s a o L o s e v I l y a K a n t (1922)  
5 Cal 141
- (i) Y m J d v H e r t F u e r h (190 ) 29 AU  
384
- (j) F a y d h v D a h u d h a (19 1) 45 L o m 83  
53 I 811 ( 1 ) A R 5 E h p a t  
D a r b a v J d d (19 1) 3 L a h 1 E h d  
64 I C 394 ( 2 ) A L 49 E h d a l o  
v A A H I (19 5) 49 L o m 535 87 I C  
910 ( - 5 ) A I 311
- (k) I b r a h m v M h a ( 1 9 6 ) 14 AU 422 C a l d o  
9 h v I A 2 h (19 ) 47 AU 1 5  
98 I C 933 ( ) A A 1 )
- (l) K r a n a v M i t a (1 99 ) 2 I C 1 - 12  
(m) L e s t a n a v M v L e n t a (1911) 1 Cal 1  
91 I C - 16
- (n) S h u m C h a r v F r o l h a d (1903) 8 C W v  
390 G n p F r a n s v A n r a (19 5 ) 4 AU  
404 C n e a h n y v L A h a m n y  
(19 - ) 3 L a k 2 2 I C 2 4 5 ( 2 9 A U  
1 2 B

## Arbitration

Sch II,  
para 16

application, however should be admitted in the case of an award. In the case of an award revision would be more objectionable than an appeal. If an application for revision were admissible in a case where the decree is in accordance with the award, the finality of any award would be open to question (o). Thus where an application was made for revision on the ground that there was no valid order of reference and that the award was therefore a nullity and that no decree ought to have been passed on such an award the High Court of Allahabad refused to entertain the application (p). But in a later case where the lower Court dealing with the objections set aside the award because of a supposed defect in the reference the Allahabad High Court interfered in revision on the ground that the Court had acted without jurisdiction (q). The latter opinion seems to be that revision is admissible for the purpose not of interfering with the arbitrator but with the exercise of jurisdiction by the Courts below in the procedure and order of the judgment along with the objections (r). See notes above. An appeal lies from a decree based upon a judgment etc.

**Enforcement**—When a decree is passed in terms of the award the only mode of enforcing the award is by execution of the decree no separate suit will lie to enforce the award (s).

**Where the Court acts as arbitrator**—Where a reference is made to the presiding Judge the parties must be deemed to have agreed to accept his decision as final. Hence no appeal lies from the decision of the judge in such a case (t). Nor is the decision subject to the provisions of the present Schedule so as to entitle either party to object to the decision as if it was an award under this schedule. A decree passed in accordance with such a decision must be regarded as a consent decree and it comes within the purview of O 23 r 3. The same principle applies even if the reference is made to the presiding Judge and another person jointly (u). A Judge to whom a reference is made has no power to alter his decision once it is given. In this respect his position is that of an arbitrator who has no power to alter an award once it is made by him (v). See notes to s 21 above.

**Distinction between valuer and arbitrator**—A sue B for a declaration that he is entitled to one half share of certain property. An order is made by consent that A should pay B a quarter of the value of the property to be valued by a certain referee nominated by the parties. The order is not one passed under para 2 and 3 and the decision of the referee is not an award on which a judgment could be pronounced under the present paragraph (w). But the terms of the agreement between the parties may be such that the valuer may be invested with the power of an arbitrator in which case the valuation made by him may operate as an award. In *Jackson v Barry Railway Co* (x) the building contract contained the following clause. In the event of any question or dispute arising between the company and the contractor as to [then

- (o) *Ghulam Khan v Mubham ad Hassan* (1902) 9 Cal 167 91 A 51 *Bat ha v Adul* (1915) 34 Mad 1 256 11 C 03  
(p) *Aj dha Pra d v B da I Hu* (1917) 39 All 489 493 49 41 C 357  
(q) *Kanhaya Lal v Jaganath Prasad* (1911) 43 All 305 60 C 857 (1) A A 16  
(r) *Patel D v Rij Nath* (1906) 48 All 33 91 C 930 (28) A A 34 *Taj Singh v Anu Pannu* (1919) 49 All 81 10 C 236 (7) A A 563  
(s) *Mervat v Sheriff* (1911) 36 Bom 19 1 C 697 *K. Kaya Lal v J. J. Athir* d s pro (b) *Band Singh v Bhagvath* (1911) 46 All 640 81 C 16 (1) A A 783  
*Bh. Chaudhary v Archa Lal* (1911) 43 Bom 535 87 C 910 (23) A A 341 *See also A. K. Lal v Anant Singh* (1916) Punj

- He no 23 p 7531 C. 700 F. Maroon v Venkataswami* (1906) 49 Mad 1 322 91 C 71 (1) A A 791  
(t) *Sa. Vekha Aravai Lal v Mahon* (1921) 51 A 95 (al 314 86 C 15 (21) A A 34  
(u) *Velam rishi Thammam* (1903) 6 Mad 16 54 d Z n v Kalabhat (1909) 31 M  
(v) *Ch. d. v. Venk. v. Ann* (1919) 4 Mad 423 64 51 C 181  
(w) *B. Sankar Nath v. Sita Nath* (1911) 34 Cal 41 91 C 94  
(x) *Chow. v. Mo. v. Pann K. d. r.* (1911) 49 Cal 155 *M. Aravai v. Pann K. d. r.* (1911) 30 Cal 831  
(y) [1925] 1 Ch 235 *Teet v. B. Maroon* [1924] Ch 479

followed the enumeration of several questions] such questions or disputes shall be referred to the engineer whose decision shall be conclusive and binding on both parties. It was assumed that the above clause was an agreement to refer to arbitration and the only question argued was whether in view of a letter written by the engineer to the contractor *after* intimation to the parties to proceed with the arbitration the engineer had rendered himself incapable of acting as an arbitrator. It was contended on behalf of the contractor that the true inference from the letter was that the engineer had so completely made up his mind against him that he would not be patiently listened to and receive an honest decision but this contention was overruled.

*Order of reference on agreements to refer*

17 [S 523] (1) Where any persons agree in writing that any difference between them shall be referred to arbitration, the parties to the agreement or any of them, may apply to any Court having jurisdiction in the matter to which the agreement relates that the agreement be filed in Court

Application to file in Court agreement to refer to arbitration

(2) The application shall be in writing and shall be numbered and registered as a suit between one or more of the parties interested or claiming to be interested as plaintiff or plaintiffs and the others or other of them as defendants or defendant, if the application has been presented by all the parties or, if otherwise, between the applicant as plaintiff and the other parties as defendants.

(3) On such application being made the Court shall direct notice thereof to be given to all the parties to the agreement other than the applicants requiring such parties to show cause, within the time specified in the notice why the agreement should not be filed.

(4) Where no sufficient cause is shown, the Court shall order the agreement to be filed, and shall make an order of reference to the arbitrator appointed in accordance with the provisions of the agreement or, if there is no such provision and the parties cannot agree, the Court may appoint an arbitrator.

**Alteration in the paragraph**—In cl 4 the words and shall make an order of reference to the arbitrator appointed in accordance with the provisions of the agreement or if there is no such provision and the parties cannot agree the Court may appoint an arbitrator are substituted for the words and shall make an order of reference thereon and may also nominate the arbitrator when he is not named therein and the parties cannot agree as to the nomination.

## Arbitration

Sch II,  
para 17

Does not apply—The procedure prescribed by this paragraph does not apply to cases to which the Arbitration Act applies. See notes to s 89

Scope of the paragraph—Paras 1 to 16 deal with cases in which the parties to a suit agree to refer the matters in difference between them in the suit to arbitration and apply to the Court for an order of reference. The application in such a case may be made by all the parties to the suit interested in the matters in difference proposed to be referred to arbitration. Thus and the subsequent paragraph refer to cases in which persons themselves agree independently of the Court to refer the matters in difference between them to arbitration (y). In such a case any party to the agreement may apply to the Court to have the agreement filed and to have an order of reference made thereon. Where such an order is made the provisions of paras 2 to 16 apply to the proceedings in so far as they are consistent with the agreement so filed ( ) [para 19]. When a submission is filed in Court under this paragraph the submission is said to be made a rule of the Court.

Agreement to refer to arbitration matters in difference in a pending suit—An agreement to refer to arbitration matters in difference between the parties to a pending suit without the order of the Court under paras 1 to 3 above is illegal and cannot be filed under this paragraph (a). Whether an award made on such a reference is an adjustment within the meaning of O 23 r 3 has been discussed in the notes on that rule under the heading submission and award.

Though an agreement to refer matters in dispute in a pending suit without an order of the Court is invalid there is nothing to prevent parties compromising their suit on the terms of an award made on such an agreement. Thus in a Patna case (b) parties came to an agreement to arbitrate in a pending suit and applied the same day to the Court to withdraw the suit. The suit was allowed to be withdrawn and the award made and filed under paras 20 and 21. This was quite correct for the agreement was virtually conditional on the Court surrendering its jurisdiction by allowing the suit to be withdrawn. An agreement to refer to arbitration the partition of a testator's estate does not encroach upon the jurisdiction of the Court in which proceedings for the probate of the will are pending and is therefore valid (c).

The agreement must be in writing—This paragraph does not apply unless the agreement to refer is in writing (d).

Agreement to refer future differences to arbitration—Where a charter party contains a clause that any disagreement that may arise [i.e. arise in future] between the contracting parties as to the proper interpretation of the charter should be referred to arbitration the agreement though it refers to future differences can be filed under this paragraph (e). Agreements to refer future differences are not outside the scope of this section.

Numbered and registered as a suit.—It has been held that in spite of those words a proceeding under this para is not a suit for a suit is commenced by filing a plaint (f). The High Court of Calcutta has held that a proceeding under para 17 is a suit (g). It is submitted however that these words make it a statutory suit otherwise the words would have been numbered and registered as if it were a suit.

(y) *Ghulam Ali v. J. Ahmad Hassan* (1907) 3 Cal 107 9 I.A. 51

(z) *Sho Dat v. Shro Shaker* (1901) 7 All 53 56

(a) *D. Kari v. Yashwanth* (1909) 31 Bom L.R. 1403

(b) *Kohli S. G. v. Farnsey* (1901) 3 Pat 44 81 I.C. 921 (1911) 4 I.A. 484

(c) *Sharma v. Ramchand* (1903) 3 Bom L.R. 437 23 I.C. 415 (1913) A.B. 36

(d) *T. N. G. v. F. R. Chand* (1912) 20 Cal 218

(e) *Fa. Ishov v. The Bombay and Persia Co.* (1904) 10 I.L.R. 111

(f) *P. J. v. J. J.* (1901) 10 I.L.R. 111

(g) *G. R. v. J. J.* (1911) 10 I.L.R. 111

(h) *G. R. v. J. J.* (1911) 10 I.L.R. 111

**Sufficient cause** —Where an agreement is to refer to several specified arbitrators and one of the arbitrators dies before the application is made under this paragraph the Court should not make an order of reference under this paragraph (k). But it is otherwise if the agreement contains an express provision that in case of death of any arbitrator another arbitrator may be appointed in his place (i). During the pendency of a private arbitration one of the parties died and the arbitrator thinking he had no power to join the legal representative refused to go on. On an application to file the agreement it was held that the Court had no power to order the arbitrator to proceed (j). In another similar case (k) the Court appointed a new arbitrator under para 5 which is made applicable by para 19 if its exercise is not inconsistent with the agreement of reference.

**Arbitrator appointed in accordance with the provisions of the agreement** —Thus where an agreement provides for a reference to a European merchant the Court has no power to appoint an Indian merchant (l). If the agreement is for reference to three arbitrators the Court cannot add a clause that in case of disagreement the opinion of the majority shall prevail (m).

Where the agreement to refer has been duly revoked —Where an agreement to refer has been revoked for good cause by one of the parties thereto the Court is not competent to order it to be filed under this paragraph (n). See notes to para 1 under the head Evocation of arbitrator's authority.

**Umpire** —If an agreement filed under this paragraph does not contain any provision for the appointment of an umpire in the event of the arbitrators being unable to agree the Court has no power under this paragraph to appoint an umpire (o).

**Appeal** —An order under this paragraph filing or refusing to file an agreement to refer to arbitration is now appealable as an order [s 104 sub s (1) cl (d)]. Under the Code of 1890 it was appealable as a decree (p).

**Revision** —The mere fact that the application is not numbered and registered as a suit as required by cl (2) of this paragraph is no ground for interfering in revision such an irregularity is not a material irregularity within the meaning of s 110 (q).

## 18 [New Cf Arbitration Act 9 of 1899 s 19] Where

Stay of suit where there is an agreement to refer to arbitration

any party to any agreement to refer to arbitration or any person claiming under him, institutes any suit against any other party to the agreement, or any person claiming under him, in respect of any matter agreed to be referred any party to such suit may, at the earliest possible opportunity and in all cases where issues are settled at or before such settlement, apply to the Court to stay the suit, and the Court, if satisfied that there is no sufficient reason why the

(k) *Mohan Lal v Damoda Das* (1918) Punj Rec n 71 p 38 48 I C 806

(l) *Sai m v S. S.* (1919) Punj Rec no 155 p 414 51 I C 636

(j) *Admad Noor Khan v Abd r Rahim* (1900) 4 All 191 54 I C 366

(k) *Fa I Husai v Prag Nandan* (1900) 44 All 5 3 67 I C 30 22 A A 133

(n) *Dreyfus & Co v G. Nidra* (1911) Punj R c no 35 p 1 3 91 I C 655

(m) *Pamaye v P. Panya* (1906) 51 Mad L J 440 97 I C 5 1 226 A 31 1195

(o) *Colley v De Costa* (1905) 17 Cal 200

(p) *M. Muhammad Asid v Muhammad Arha* (1906) 8 All 64

(q) *Gh. Iqbal Khan v Muhammad Hassan* (1900) 29 Cal 167 91 A 51 See also *Entas chala v I. Ghah* (1916) 46 Mad 2-3, 354 3 5 12 I C 57

(r) *W. I. M. Hassan v Zakaral Zakhar* (1914) Punj Rec no 3 p 101 1 I C 92





for an order of discovery and the order asked for was made it was held that he had taken a step in the proceedings and therefore was not entitled to a stay (w)

**Institutes any suit**—These words show that the present rule refers only to suits instituted *after* the agreement to refer to arbitration has been made. *A* sues *B* in respect of certain matters. The parties then agree to refer the matters to arbitration. Subsequently *A* declines to proceed with the arbitration and writes to *B* that he will proceed with the suit. *B* applies for an order staying the suit. The Court has no power under this paragraph to stay the suit for the suit was instituted *prior* to the agreement (x).

**No sufficient cause** —The burden lies on the plaintiff to show that some sufficient reason exists why the matter should not be referred to arbitration and not on the defendant to show that no such reason exists (9)

May make an order staying the suit —The Court has a discretion under this paragraph as to staying a suit instituted by one party to a submission against the other party. At the same time it must be remembered that it is the *prima facie* duty of the Court to act upon the agreement between the parties (1). If parties choose to determine for themselves that they will have a domestic forum instead of resorting to the ordinary Court then since that Act of Parliament [that is the Common Law Procedure Act 1854 s. 11 which corresponds to the present paragraph] was passed a *prima facie* duty is cast upon the Courts to act upon such an agreement (2). If however the arbitration proves abortive the Court may remove the stay and proceed with the trial of the suit (3).

**Denial of agreement**—Where one of the parties denies the agreement to refer set up by the other party it is within the province of the Court to decide whether there is or is not an agreement (c).

Validity of agreement to refer.—To bring a case within this paragraph there must be a subsisting agreement to refer capable of being carried into effect. A suit therefore cannot be stayed under this paragraph if the submission has been revoked for good cause (1). Nor can it be stayed if the original contract containing the arbitration clause is followed by another agreement *materially* altering the original contract for in that case the arbitration clause ceases by virtue of the alteration to have any effect. But a mere extension of time for the performance of that which a party under the original contract is bound to perform does not amount to a *material* alteration and the arbitration clause does not cease to operate in such a case (e). See Lall Ch. and Mulla's Indian Contract Act, notes to s. 28.

**Stay refused**—Where an arbitration clause does not cover all the matters in respect of which the suit is brought the Court will not as a rule split the suit into two parts, one to be tried by the arbitrator and the other to be tried in Court; the Court will in such a case try the whole suit (f). Where fraud is charged the Court will in

- (w) *Ta ler C. erd Co v Turp* [1918] 1 K. 1  
34
- (x) *Ta d v H use* (1904) 55 C. 1 19. Peru s  
s (ull) f<sub>1</sub> (1910) 31 Hu 1 3 41 C  
133 11 cases un r dec 19 of the Arbi  
trati n Act
- (y) *D ba H. D r ypaned* (1919) 46 Cal  
1011 511 (4) *Hodjain v Jurgin*  
s per 4 new (194) 9 Q R D  
1 4 (s) *A fha f h Do D r ypa* (1919)  
\* 1 sh 19 1611 1 6 (s) 4 1 9
- (z) *In r. l le (leg)* (1920) 41 C. 19  
430 *Le v f h an* (199) 41 C. 19 5 9  
1011 511 10 *leg* and (1919) 46
- (a) *Cal 1011 511 (s)*
- (b) *Hall fud H t* (14 3) L. 1 8 Ch 4 3  
4 9 per *Isrl* *Will* re
- (c) *L ama v M J mth* (19 1) 45 1 m 1191  
64 1 (2 3) 1 4 454
- (d) *Shoo l had v f do* *M lora l* *1 ed Mill*  
(191) *Punj Rec no 6*, p 59 1 (s)  
504
- (e) *I ndell Thompson* (1916) 1 Q B 1 14  
*Isndrah pringd ff* *act en* ( *ursh* *heft* )  
*R use* (1) 1 1 1 1 1 1
- (f) *La m nare v Hoo* *31 Ler d* C (1914)  
61 Cal 35 1 1 1 1
- (g) *T muck v rora* (1 4) 45 C. 1 1 1 1

## Arbitration

Sch II,  
paras  
18-20

general refuse to refer the dispute to arbitration if the party charged with the duty desires a public inquiry (g)

**Presidency Small Cause Court**—The Presidency Small Cause Court Bombay has power to stay a suit under this para. by virtue of rules framed under the Presidency Small Cause Courts Act 1882 by the High Court of Bombay (h)

**Appeal**—An appeal lies from an order staying or refusing to stay a suit when there is an agreement to refer to arbitration see s 104 sub-s (1) cl (e)

**19 [S 524]** The foregoing provisions, so far as they are consistent with any agreement filed under paragraph 17, shall be applicable to all proceedings under the order of reference made by the Court under that paragraph, and to the award and to the decree following thereon

Provisions applicable to proceedings under paragraph 17

**Does not apply**—This paragraph does not apply to cases to which the Arbitration Act applies See notes to s 89

So far as they are consistent with any agreement filed under paragraph 17 —This paragraph provides that where an order of reference is made under paragraph 17 the provisions of paras 3 to 16 shall apply to all proceedings under the order *only so far as they are consistent with the agreement filed under paragraph 17* The order under paragraph 8 the Court has the power to extend the period for the making of the award. But if the agreement filed under paragraph 17 provides that the arbitrators shall make their award within a fixed period and that they shall have no power to enlarge the time for making the award, the stipulation in the agreement will prevail to the exclusion of the provision in paragraph 8 But the words *so far as they are consistent with any agreement filed under paragraph 17* would not preclude the Court from setting aside an award for misconduct of the arbitrators though there may be a clause in the agreement that the award should be accepted as final (i) Nor do they preclude the Court from appointing a new arbitrator under paragraph 5 in place of one who refuses to act provided there is no clause in the submission expressly excluding the power of the Court to make such an appointment (j) If the new arbitrator refuses to act the Court may make an order superseding arbitration and such order is not appealable (k).

### Arbitration without the intervention of a Court

**20 [S 525]** (1) Where any matter has been referred to arbitration without the intervention of a Court, and an award has been made thereon, any person interested in the award may apply to any Court having jurisdiction

Filing award in matter referred to arbitration without intervention of Court

- (g) *Fussell v Russell* (1840) 14 C.D. 471  
(h) *Taty v Hath* 11 A. (1908) 52 Bom 40 111  
1 C. 841 (1883) A B 75  
(i) *Bala v Kalapell* (1883) 6 Mad 468

- (j) *Bala v Seetharama* (1881) 17 Mad 474 17 Mad 474 17 Mad 474 17 Mad 474  
17 Mad 474 17 Mad 474 17 Mad 474 17 Mad 474  
17 Mad 474 17 Mad 474 17 Mad 474 17 Mad 474  
(k) *Zak Ahmed v Talwar* (1883) 11 All. 27 89 I. C. 404 (1883) A. A. 11

over the subject matter of the award that the award be filed in Court

(2) The application shall be in writing and shall be numbered and registered as a suit between the applicant as plaintiff and the other parties as defendants

(3) The Court shall direct notice to be given to the parties to the arbitration, other than the applicant requiring them to show cause, within a time specified, why the award should not be filed

**Old section**—This paragraph corresponds to s 523 of the Code of 1887 except that in cl (1) the word any Court having jurisdiction over the subject matter of the award have been substituted for the words Court of the lowest grade having jurisdiction over the matter to which the award relates See notes below Court to which application should be made under this paragraph

**Does not apply**—This paragraph does not apply to cases to which the Arbitration Act applies see note to s 89

**Pending suit**—See notes to para 17 above under the head Agreement to refer to arbitration matters in a pending suit See also notes to O 23 r 3 above  
**Adjustment submission and award**

**Scope of this and subsequent paragraph**—The present paragraph and paragraph 21 refer to cases where the agreement of reference is made and the arbitration itself takes place without the intervention of the Court and the assistance of the Court is only sought in order to give effect to the award (l)

This paragraph is no bar to a regular suit to enforce an award—Under the corresponding section 523 of the Code of 1887 it was held that a party interested in an award may at his option avail himself of the summary remedy provided by that section to enforce the award or he may bring a regular suit to enforce the award (m) There is nothing in the present Code to preclude such a suit Rather such a suit is saved by s 89 as appears from the words save in so far as is otherwise provided by any other law for the time being in force (n) See notes to para 21 below Res judicata

A valid award constitutes a bar to a suit on the original demand—An award duly issued in accordance with the submission of the parties is equivalent to final judgment Hence if an award is made for a partition of joint property no party to the reference can sue for partition The award is an answer to the suit though no decree may have been passed on the award (o)

**Court to which application should be made under this paragraph**—It is the subject matter of the award and not the subject matter of the reference that determines the jurisdiction of the Court under the present paragraph Under the old section the application to file the award had to be made to the Court of the lowest grade having jurisdiction over the matter to which the award relates and these words were held by the High Court of Calcutta to mean the Court of the lowest grade having jurisdiction over the subject matter of the reference (p) The words subject matter

(l) *Gh / m Ak v Muk mm d H san* (1907) 29 Cal 167 14 231 A 51

(m) *S Marava v Sada ra* (1907) 20 Mad 690  
*Ak v Ak v B k ry Lal* (1906) 33 Cal 841

(n) *Nathu Mal v Muk mmad SA* 4 (1917) Panj

See no 1 p 44 t p 44 32 I C 349

(o) *K Anu v Bala m* (1906) 19 Mad 22  
*Bhujala v L kary Lal* (1907) 33 Cal 841  
*U Hammed v vds Akon v Alam* (1901) 14 Cal 414 16 I A 3

(p) *Ve gh Das v Ajodhya* (1901) 31 Cal 203

## Arbitration

Sch II,  
para 20

of the award have been substituted in this paragraph for the words matter to which the award relates to make it clear that an application under this paragraph may be made to any Court having jurisdiction over the subject matter of the award. So when the subject matter of an award was the management and control of three temples in the district of Berar and the question of the application of the revenue was before members of the founder's family not resident in Berar the Privy Council held that the District Judge of Berar has no jurisdiction to entertain an application to file it (1).

**Limitation**—The application under this paragraph should be made within 6 months from the date of the award. Limitation Act 1908 sch I art 1 § (1). The date of the award means not the date the award bears but the date on which it was given to the parties (2) i.e. the date of publication (3). The application is not a suit and therefore the applicant cannot claim the benefit of section 5 of the Limitation Act (4). See notes to para 17 above. Numbered and registered as a suit.

**Where an award is delivered in parts**—If the agreement to refer provides that the matter in dispute may be taken up and dealt with *seriatim* and that the award may be delivered bit by bit each portion decided may be dealt with as a distinct award under this paragraph (5).

**Lost award**—When an award has been lost the procedure of this rule cannot be resorted to and the parties must be referred to a regular suit (6).

**Where any matter has been referred to arbitration**—*Does any matter refer only to a matter in respect of which a suit can be entertained by a Court under a D of the Code?*—This paragraph provides that when any matter has been referred to arbitration without the intervention of a Court and an award has been made thereon any person interested in the award may apply that the award be filed in Court. Paragraph 21 provides for the passing of a decree on the award. But what if the award referred to arbitration is one as to which a Civil Court has no jurisdiction to entertain a suit under a D of the Code e.g. disputes about *manu* and an award is made thereon. Has the Court jurisdiction to file such an award and pass a decree thereon under paragraph 21? It has been held by the High Court of Bombay that it has and that it is not against the policy of the law to give effect to such awards (7). The result is that rights which are not at all civil rights may be the subject matter of an arbitration award and of the decree of a Civil Court. It would be interesting to know how the decree if disobeyed would be enforced. However this may be it is clear that if a matter is such that on grounds of public policy it can be disposed of only by a Court it cannot be the subject of a reference and if such a matter is referred and an award is made the Courts should refuse to pass a decree thereon. Thus the right to succeed to the trusteehip of a public charitable trust is not a right which can be settled by arbitration. A Court therefore has no jurisdiction to entertain an application to file an award in such a matter under this paragraph (8).

**Numbered and registered as a suit**—See notes to para 17 under the same head. The Bombay High Court has held that the application when numbered and registered as a suit becomes a suit for the purpose of O 34 and the Court has jurisdiction to direct attachment before judgment (9).

- (1) *Imlal v. Aslu ch. I* (1941) 51 C 1 361  
51 A 831 C 574 (4) A 1 C 9  
(2) *Imlal v. Aslu ch. I* (1915) 35 All  
N 91 31 C 899  
(3) *De v. Gh. I* (1943) 9 Cal  
57  
(4) *A. J. Lal v. I. A. v. Lal* (1919) 1 P 1 J  
24 48 C 711  
(5) *M. D. v. M. A. v. J. A. (1933) 3 R 2*  
6 61 C 493 (3) A R 6

- (6) *Shank. Lal v. N. N. (1941) 1 C L*  
R 9  
(7) *M. v. K. Lal v. N. N. (1941) 1 C L*  
Lal 45 55 C 215  
(8) *I. Gh. v. M. C. v. N. (1913) 3 P 1*  
101 C 8  
(9) *M. A. v. I. A. v. N. N. (1913) 12 All*  
N 61 19  
(10) *I. A. v. I. A. (1941) 1 P 1*  
3 101 C 43 (7) A R 6

21 [S 526] (1) Where the Court is satisfied that the

Filing an enforcement of  
such award

matter has been referred to arbitration and that an award has been made thereon, and where no ground such as is mentioned or referred to in paragraph 14 or paragraph 15 is proved the Court shall order the award to be filed and shall proceed to pronounce judgment according to the award

(2) Upon the judgment so pronounced a decree shall follow and no appeal shall lie from such decree except in so far as the decree is in excess of or not in accordance with the award

Points of distinction between s 256 of the Code of 1882 and this paragraph —

- 1 The words "where the Court is satisfied that the matter has been referred to arbitration and that an award has been made thereon" have been added into cl (1) to negative the view held by the High Court of Bombay under the old section that the Court had no power to determine questions relating to the factum and validity of the agreement to refer and of the award and to give effect to the view held by the three High Courts. See notes below. Where the Court is satisfied that the matter has been referred to arbitration &c

The word "proved" has been substituted for the word "shown". In fact it was held under the old section that the word "shown" meant "proved". See notes below under the head "Proved".

Does not apply — This paragraph does not apply to cases to which the Arbitration Act applies. See notes to s 1.

When the Court is satisfied that the matter has been referred to arbitration and that an award has been made thereon — The words are new. In the absence of the words in the corresponding section of the Code of 1882 it was held by the High Court of Bombay that if an application was made under that section to file an award and the other party raised objection to the factum or validity of the submission and award the Court has no jurisdiction to inquire whether the parties had or had not referred the matters in dispute to arbitration and should therefore reject the application and refer the applicant to a *rescissory* suit to enforce the award. (b) On the other hand by the High Court of Allahabad (c) Calcutta (d) and Madras (e) held that the Court had the power under that section to determine all questions relating to the existence and validity of the alleged agreement to refer and of the award and that the applicant must not be referred to a separate suit. The present paragraph supercedes the Bombay decision and gives effect to the decisions of the three High Courts.

Proved — It is not sufficient to allege grounds of objections under paras. 14 and 15. It is necessary that the ground of objection should be *proved*. See notes above under the head "Interference" etc.

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| (c) <i>J. P. v. J. M.</i><br><i>1914</i> 10 All 31 | (d) <i>M. J. v. H. J.</i><br><i>1914</i> 51 M 1   |
| (b) <i>T. J. v. M. J.</i><br><i>1914</i> 508       | (e) <i>C. J. v. T. J.</i><br><i>1914</i> 51 All 1 |

## Arbitration

Sch II,  
para 21

**Grounds of objection under paras 14 and 15.**—Where a matter has been referred to arbitration under an order of the Court the Court has power in the case mentioned in para. 14 to remit the award to the reconsideration of the arbitrator. But if an award determines any matter not referred to arbitration the Court may remit the award under para. 14 and if such matter can be separated without affecting the determination of the matters referred the Court may amend the award by striking out that portion of the award which is in excess of the reference and enforce the award as to the rest of it. In the case however of an arbitration without the intervention of the Court [paras 20-21] the High Courts have held in a series of cases that if the award determines matters outside the scope of the reference the Court must refuse to file the award even when the matter not referred can be separated from that which was referred the reason given being that the Court had under this para. only two courses open to it, namely to file the award or refuse to file it and that it had no power to remit or amend the award (f). This however is incorrect for para. 21 refers to para. 14 where the principle of separation is recognised. The point is concluded by the decision of the Privy Council (g) that the part of the award which is good should be filed and the remainder that is bad rejected.

**An arithmetical error** according to the Allahabad High Court does not render the award invalid (h). But the Lahore High Court has held that the Court has no power to correct an arithmetical mistake even with the consent of the parties affected the reason given being that a Court acting under this paragraph must either file the award as it is or refuse to file it (i). But this is inconsistent with the Privy Council ruling referred to above.

**Award made after long delay.**—Where the agreement to refer was made in 1900 and the award was not made until 1910 and the Court came to the conclusion that it would probably not have been made at all but for one of the parties having brought a criminal complaint against one of the arbitrators the Court refused the application to file the award. The Court presumed from the circumstances of the case that the reference had been abandoned (j).

**Award made after revocation of submission.**—An award made after the agreement to refer has been revoked by one of the parties thereto for good cause cannot be filed under this paragraph (k).

**Appeal.**—An appeal lies from an order under this paragraph filing or refusing to file an award (s 104 sub s (1) cl (f)) even though no express order is made (l). But no appeal lies from the order passed on appeal (m) sro s 101 (n) (n). But s. 104 refers to

- (f) *Allaralia v Jeha gir* (1873) 10 Bom 11 C 391. *U. Jafa Akhon v P. H. Bida* (1900) 27 All 56 D. *d. ka v D. d. l* (1884) 6 Bom 663. *Manna v Malli bery* (1880) 3 Mad 68. *T. H. ru engada Thung v. Jaid nat* (1906) 9 Mad 303. *Dina ba dh v. Ch. i mo i* (1915) 19 C W 476. *A. I. C. 696. A. J. Lal v. Ba. a. J. Lal* (1919) 4 Lat. L. J. 391 401-402 481 C 711. *Bha. pat. P. v. Fak. n. Dey* (1911) Punj Rec no 30 p 108 23 IC 4.
- (g) *B. la v. H. cipal Committee of Lahore* (1907) 29 (al) 854. *A. I. 184. Am. Jeyum v. F. brud n. H. soo* (1916) 36 All 356 23 IC 65. *Followed in Sha. kh. Mahomed v. A. H. kh. Abdul J. ah m* (1905) 41 IC 60 93 IC 61 (2) A. I. 810.
- (h) *Sham Lal v. P. H. bottom Das* (1900) 4 All 754 IC 585.
- (i) *Mohammad Afzal v. Abd. I. Ham d* (1925) 7 Lab L J 463 89 IC 161 (—) A. L.

- 870
- (j) *M. hammad P. a. an. Kha v. S. n. r. Eppa* (1919) Punj Rec no 71 p 17 54 IC 817.
- (k) *Sh. kh. m. d. v. N. ob. n. Ch. d. r. (1907) 1 C. L. R. 9.*
- (l) *Shankar D. s. v. G. m. kh. d. (1925) 9 Lab L J 91 85 IC 513 (3) A. L. 571 J. d. v. N. r. r. J. ande (1916) 16 All 42 42. 85 IC 6 (3) A. A. 431.*
- (m) *Ahm. I. D. v. A. llo. Trad. g. Co* (1915) P. R. no 66 p 47 31 IC 100.
- (n) *Ehretta Nath v. Chabala* (1913) 19 C W 341. *no. I. C. 391. outam. (1914) 19 C W 919. 31 IC 55. H. m. v. Lakshmi (1916) 34 All 34 35 35 IC 835. I. m. D. v. J. m. v. n. g. h. (1916) Punj Rec no 1-3 p 471 30 IC 31. Lakshmi v. S. r. v. A. v. A. d. (1904) 18 All 541 C 445. J. m. d. P. and. v. S. r. v. J. and. (1922) 47 All 712 84 IC 6 (25) A. A. 404.*

appeals within British India and does not take away the right of appeal to Privy Council given by section 103 (o). Again though an appeal lies from an order made under the paragraph no appeal lies from a decree passed on an award except in so far as the decree is in excess of or not in accordance with the award (p) [see sub para (2)]. But is the right of appeal lost if the decree on the award is passed before the appeal is preferred from the order? It has been held that it is not and it has been further held that if the appellate Court sets aside the order it is competent also to declare that the decree based on the order is vacated (q). See notes to para 15 above. Award made after expiration of period allowed by the Court.

The making of a decree is no bar to an application to restore a petition of objection which has been dismissed for default of appearance (r). 4 applies to file an award under para 20. B objects to the filing of the award on certain grounds. On the date fixed for the hearing of the objections B does not appear. Thereupon his objections are disallowed and an *ex parte* decree is passed against B in accordance with the award. B thereupon applies under O 9 r 13 to set aside the *ex parte* decree and to hear his objections to the award. The application is rejected. B then appeals from the order rejecting the application. Is the order appealable? Yes it is appealable under O 43 r 1 (d) by which it is provided that an appeal lies from an order rejecting an application for an order to set aside an *ex parte* decree in a case open to appeal. The case is one open to appeal for the question between the parties was whether or not the award should be filed as a decree of the Court and any order made upon it would be appealable under s 104 sub s (1) cl (f) (s).

**Res judicata**—It has been held by the High Court of Allahabad that the refusal of a Court to file a private award on the ground of misconduct of the arbitrator does not operate as *res judicata* in respect of a suit subsequently brought to enforce the award the reason given being that the doctrine of *res judicata* presupposes a former suit and a decree in that suit and that the order of refusal is not a decree but merely an order (t). This decision has been followed by the Bombay High Court (u). The Calcutta High Court has held that the bar of *res judicata* would only apply to grounds of objection referred to in paras. 14 and 15 heard and finally decided (v).

**Withdrawal of suit**—The fact that an application has been made under para 20 does not preclude the applicant from withdrawing the application under O 23 r 1 at any time prior to the pronouncement of judgment and preparation of the decree.

(o) *Famlat v K h land* (1911) 51 I A 51 Cal 301 83 I C 534 (1) A PC 5

(p) *B Andar S gh v Nays Pu S gh* (1908) 30 All 151 A leum v Ali *Shabar* (1911) 30 All 401 411 39 I C 30 *Ma p Tun v M q Lo* (1913) 1 Rang 65 61 I C 504 (3) A R 199

(q) *Sha kh M hammad v Sha kh Abd I* (1915) 41 I C 60 93 I C 61 (1915) A P 810 *Jas t v ruw* (1915) 47 All 715 23 I C 6 (1915) A A 401 See 19 C W N 948 41 I C 557 and other cases cited in fn (t)

(r) *Maj d Pam v Naubat S gh* (1910) 18 All

L J 56 57 I C 400

(s) *N Sal S gh v Kharakhal S gh* (1916) 23 All 497 53 I C 80 *M Ashi Prasad v Rathi v Du* (1922) 1 Pat 48 6 I C 9 (1922) A P 376

(t) *Kunj Lal v Dya Prasad* (1910) 3 All 434 61 I C 177 *At rath Sam v Lal Ami Lam* (1920) 43 All 108 60 I C 66

(u) *Fazmal v Sharad* (1911) 45 F W 329 52 I C 5 (1911) A B 3 *J Abd I A v v Chaud* (1915) 27 Bom L R 600 49 I C 68 (1915) A R 414

(v) *Guru Ch ran v Em Charan* (1911) 45 C W N 940 70 L L 945



## Arbitration

Sch II,  
paras  
21-23

It is true that a suit alone can be withdrawn under O 23 r 1 but an application under para 20 is numbered and registered as a *suit* (w)

22 [New Cf Arbitration Act 9 of 1899 s 3 ] The last thirty seven words of section 21 of the Specific Relief Act, 1877, shall not apply to any agreement to refer to arbitration or to any award to which the provisions of this Schedule apply

Exclusion of certain  
words in the Specific Relief  
Act 1877

Last thirty seven words of sec 21 of the Specific Relief Act—The said words are— but if any person who has made such a contract [that is a contract to refer to arbitration] and has refused to perform it sues in respect of any subject which he has contracted to refer the existence of such contract shall bar the suit These words have been omitted in view of the provisions of para 18 above

23 [New ] The forms set forth in the Appendix, with such variations as the circumstances of each case require, shall be issued for the respective purposes therein mentioned

Forms

---

(w) *Ga vs Shankar v Maida Hoer* (1904) 31 Cal 516

## APPENDIX

No 1

## APPLICATION FOR AN ORDER OF REFERENCE

(Title of suit)

- 1 This suit is instituted for (*state nature of claim*)
- 2 The matter in difference between the parties is (*state matter of difference*)
- 3 The applicants being all the parties interested have agreed that the matter in difference between them shall have referred to arbitration
- 4 The application therefore apply for an order of reference

A B  
C D

Dated the                      day of                      19

NOTE.—If the parties are agreed as to the arbitrators it should be so stated

No 2

## ORDER OF REFERENCE

(Title of suit)

Upon reading the application presented on the                      day of  
19    it is ordered that the following matter in difference arising in this suit namely —

be referred for determination to A and B or in case of their not agreeing then to the determination of C who is hereby appointed to be umpire and such arbitrators are to make their award in writing on or before the                      day of 19    and in case of the said arbitrators not agreeing in an award the said umpire is to make his award in writing within                      months after the time during which it is within the power of the arbitrators to make an award shall have ceased

I hereby to apply

Given under my hand and the seal of the Court this                      day of 19

Judge

No 3

## ORDER FOR APPOINTMENT OF NEW ARBITRATOR.

(Title of suit)

Whereas by an order dated the                      day of 19  
[*state order of reference and death refusal of arbitrator*] it is by consent ordered that

## Arbitration

**Sch II** Z be appointed in the place of X deceased (or as the case may be) to act as arb'r with Y the surviving arbitrator under the said order and it is ordered that the award of the said arbitrators be made on or before the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_

**IV**

Given under my hand and the seal of the Court this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_

J<sub>1</sub>'

No 4

**SPECIAL CASE.**

(Title of suit)

In the matter of an arbitration between A B of \_\_\_\_\_ and C D of \_\_\_\_\_ the following special case is stated for the opinion of the Court —

[Here state the facts concisely in numbered paragraphs]

The question of law for the opinions of the Court are —

First whether \_\_\_\_\_

Secondly whether \_\_\_\_\_

X  
Y

Dated the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_

No 5

**AWARD**

(Title of suit)

In the matter of an arbitration between A B of \_\_\_\_\_ and C D of \_\_\_\_\_

WHEREAS in pursuance of an order of reference made by the Court of \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ and dated the \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_ the following matter in difference between A B and C D namely \_\_\_\_\_

has been referred to us for determination

Now we having duly considered the matter referred to us do hereby make our award as follows —

We award—

(1) that \_\_\_\_\_

(2) that \_\_\_\_\_

Dated the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_

X  
Y

## THE THIRD SCHEDULE

### EXECUTION OF DECREEES BY COLLECTORS

**1 [S 321]** Where the execution of a decree has been transferred to the Collector under section 68, he may—

Powers of Collector

- (a) proceed as the Court would proceed when the sale of immovable property is postponed in order to enable the judgment debtor to raise the amount of the decree or
- (b) raise the amount of the decree by letting in perpetuity, or for a term on payment of a premium or by mortgaging the whole or any part of the property ordered to be sold, or
- (c) sell the property ordered to be sold or so much thereof as may be necessary

Clause (a).—See O 21 r 83

**Payment by instalments**—A Collector to whom a decree for sale of mortgaged property has been transferred for execution under s 68 is limited to one of the three courses specified in this paragraph and may not depart from them much less may he do what the Court itself could not do in such a case—allow payment of the debt to be made by instalments (a) Nor has the Collector jurisdiction when mortgaged property is sold under O 31 r 12 free of a prior mortgage encumbrance to settle accounts as to what is due on each mortgage (b) When the Collector receives sale proceeds they are assets held by the Court and so an application for ratable distribution must be made before receipt of sale proceeds by the Collector (c)

**2 [S 323]** Where the execution of a decree, not being a decree ordering the sale of immovable property in pursuance of a contract specifically affecting the same but being a decree for the payment of money in satisfaction of which the Court has ordered the sale of immovable property, has been so transferred the Collector, if, after such inquiry as he thinks necessary, he has reason to believe that all the liabilities of the judgment debtor can be discharged without a sale of the whole of his available immovable property, may proceed as hereinafter provided

Provisions of Civil Procedure Code

(a) *Mahadaj v Hari* (1883) 7 B. m. 33.

(b) *Shri Jankar v. M. Ahmed Jafar* (1911) 46 All. 414 73 I. C. 429 (1) A. A. 30

(c) *Dattajy v. Pundit* 2 (1907) 22 Bom. L. R. 1001 53 I. C. 99.

## Execution by Collectors

Sch III,  
paras  
3, 4

3 [ S 322 A ]

Notice to be given to  
decree holders and to per-  
sons having claims on  
property

(1) In any such case as is referred to in paragraph 2, the Collector shall publish a notice, allowing a period of sixty days from the date of its publication for compliance and calling upon—

- (a) every person holding a decree for the payment of money against the judgment debtor capable of execution by sale of his immovable property and which such decree holder desires to have executed, and every holder of a decree for the payment of money in execution of which proceedings for the sale of such property are pending, to produce before the Collector a copy of the decree and a certificate from the Court which passed or is executing the same, declaring the amount recoverable thereunder,
- (b) every person having any claim on the said property to submit to the Collector as statement of such claim, and to produce the documents (if any) by which it is evidenced

(2) Such notice shall be published by being affixed on a conspicuous part of the Court house of the Court which made the original order for sale, and in such other places (if any) as the Collector thinks fit, and where the address of any such decree holder or claimant is known, a copy of the notice shall be sent to him by post or otherwise

Power of Collector to hear objections to execution of decrees referred to him for execution—Where a decree for money is transferred to the Collector under s (9) he is not authorized under this paragraph to hear any objection by the parties interested in the property advertised for sale or of that property, nor is it any part of the Collector's duty to decide whether the property has or has not been properly attached (d)

4 [ S 322 B ]

Amount of decrees for  
payment of money to be  
certified as a claim  
of that party shall for  
their satisfaction

(1) Upon the expiration of the said period the Collector shall appoint a day for hearing any representations which the judgment debtor and the decree holder or claimants (if any) may desire to make and for holding such inquiry as he may deem

Execution by Colle

necessary for informing himself as to the nature and extent of such decrees and claims and of the judgment debtor's immovable property, and may from time to time, adjourn such hearing and inquiry

(2) Where there is no dispute as to the fact or extent of the liability of the judgment debtor to any of the decrees or claims of which the Collector is informed or as to the relative priorities of such decrees or claims, or as to the liability of any such property for the satisfaction of such decrees or claims, the Collector shall draw up a statement specifying the amount to be recovered for the discharge of such decrees, the order in which such decrees and claims are to be satisfied, and the immovable property available for that purpose

(3) Where any such dispute arises the Collector shall refer the same with a statement thereof and his own opinion thereon to the Court which made the original order for sale, and shall pending the reference, stay proceedings relating to the subject thereof. The Court shall dispose of the dispute if the matter thereof is within its jurisdiction or transmit the case to a competent Court for disposal and the final decision shall be communicated to the Collector who shall then draw up a statement as above provided in accordance with such decision

5 [ S 322 C ] The Collector may, instead of himself issuing the notices and holding the inquiry required by paragraphs 3 and 4 draw up a statement specifying the circumstances of the judgment debtor and of his immov-

When the District Court may  
if it is

able property so far as they are known to the Collector or appear in the records of his office and forward such statement to the District Court, and such Court shall thereupon issue the notices hold the inquiry and draw up the statement required by paragraphs 3 and 4 and transmit such statement to the Collector

6 [ S 322 D ] The decision by the Court of any dispute arising under paragraph 4 or paragraph 5 shall as between the parties thereto have the force of and be appealable as a decree

if it is of Court  
as to it

Sch  
par  
4.

## Execution by Collectors

Sch III,  
para 7

7 [S 323]

Scheme for liquidation  
of decrees for payment of  
money

(1) Where the amount to be recovered and the property available have been determined as provided in paragraph 4 of paragraph 5, the Collector may,—

- (a) if it appears that the amount cannot be recovered without the sale of the whole of the property available, proceed to sell such property, or,
- (b) if it appears that the amount with interest (if any) in accordance with the decree and, when not decreed, with interest (if any) at such rate as he thinks reasonable, may be recovered without such sale, raise such amount and interest (not withstanding the original order for sale)—
  - (i) by letting in perpetuity or for a term, on payment of a premium, the whole or any part of the said property, or
  - (ii) by mortgaging the whole or any part of such property, or
  - (iii) by selling part of such property, or
  - (iv) by letting on farm, or managing by himself or another, the whole or any part of such property for any term not exceeding twenty years from the date of the order of sale, or
  - (v) partly by one of such modes, and partly by another or others of such modes

(2) For the purpose of managing the whole or any part of such property, the Collector may exercise all the powers of its owner

(3) For the purpose of improving the saleable value of the property available or any part thereof, or rendering it more suitable for letting or managing or for preserving the property from sale in satisfaction of an incumbrance the Collector may discharge the claim of any incumbrancer which has become payable or compound the claim of any incumbrancer whether it has become payable or not and, for the purpose of providing funds to effect such discharge or composition, may mortgage, let or sell any portion of the property

Execution by Collector

which he deems sufficient. If any dispute arises as to the amount due on any incumbrance with which the Collector proposes to deal under this clause, he may institute a suit in the proper Court, either in his own name or the name of the judgment debtor, to have an account taken, or he may agree to refer such dispute to the decision of two arbitrators, one to be chosen by each party, or of an umpire to be named by such arbitrators.

Sch  
par.  
7-9

(4) In proceeding under this paragraph the Collector shall be subject to such rules consistent with this Act as may, from time to time be made in this behalf by the Local Government.

The words Local Government have been substituted for the words Chief Controlling Revenue Authority which occurred in the corresponding s 323 C I C 1882

8 [S 324] Where, on the expiration of the letting or management under paragraph 7, the amount to be recovered has not been realized, the Collector shall notify the fact in writing to the judgment-debtor, or his representative in interest, stating at the same time that, if the balance necessary to make up the said amount is not paid to the Collector within six weeks from the date of such notice, he will proceed to sell the whole or a sufficient part of the said property, and if on the expiration of the said six weeks, the said balance is not so paid, the Collector shall sell such property or part accordingly.

Re or y of balance (if any) after letting or management

Mortgage—Instead of selling the Collector may mortgage the property (e)

9 [S 324A] (1) The Collector shall, from time to time, render to the Court which made the original order for sale an account of all monies which come to his hands and of all charges incurred by him in the exercise and performance of the powers and duties conferred and imposed on him under the provisions of this schedule, and shall hold the balance at the disposal of the Court.

Collector to render accounts to Court

(2) Such charges shall include all debts and liabilities from time to time due to the Government in respect of the



## Execution by Collectors

Sch III,  
para 9 property or any part thereof, the rent (if any) from time to time due to a superior holder in respect of such property or part, and, if the Collector so directs, the expenses of any witnesses summoned by him

(3) The balance shall be applied by the Court—

- (a) in providing for the maintenance of such members of the judgment debtor's family (if any) as are entitled to be maintained out of the income of the property, to such amount in the case of each member as the Court thinks fit, and,
- (b) where the Collector has proceeded under paragraph 1, in satisfaction of the original decree in execution of which the Court ordered the sale of immovable property, or otherwise as the Court may under section 73 direct, or
- (c) where the Collector has proceeded under paragraph 2,—
  - (i) in keeping down the interest on incumbrances on the property,
  - (ii) where the judgment debtor has no other sufficient means of subsistence, in providing for his subsistence to such amount as the Court thinks fit, and
  - (iii) in discharging rateably the claims of the original decree holder and any other decree holders who have complied with the notice, and whose claims were included in the amount ordered to be recovered

(4) No other holder of a decree for the payment of money shall be entitled to be paid out of such property or balance until the decree holders who have obtained such order have been satisfied, and the residue (if any) shall be paid to the judgment debtor or such other person as the Court directs

Accounts.—The Collector though bound to render accounts under this paragraph cannot be compelled to give up the account books in Court nor does this paragraph require him to pay the balance into Court (f)

## Execution by Collec

**Charges**—In Bombay the Collector is entitled to deduct fees according to the scale prescribed in case of sales by the Land Revenue Code and the Civil Court will make a further deduction on account of poundage from the balance of the sale proceeds (g)

Sch  
par  
9-1

**10 [S 325]** Where the Collector sells any property under this Schedule he shall put it up to public auction in one or more lots, as he thinks fit and may—

Rules how to be on  
lucted

- (a) fix a reasonable reserved price for each lot,
- (b) adjourn the sale for a reasonable time whenever, for reason to be recorded, he deems the adjournment necessary for the purpose of obtaining a fair price for the property,
- (c) buy in the property offered for sale, and re sell the same by public auction or private contract, as he thinks fit

Restrictions to ill n  
atto by judgment ill t  
or or his r free natly  
and p rovision of rem  
lies by l r e holdi ngs

**11 [S 325 A]** (1) So long as the Collector can exercise or perform in respect of the judgment debtor's immovable property, or any part thereof, any of the powers or duties conferred or imposed on him by paragraphs 1 to 10, the judgment debtor or his representative in interest shall be incompetent to mortgage, charge lease or alienate such property or part except with the written permission of the Collector, nor shall any Civil Court issue any process against such property or part in execution of a decree for the payment of money

(2) During the same period no Civil Court shall issue any process of execution either against the judgment debtor or his property in respect of any decree for the satisfaction whereof provision has been made by the Collector under paragraph 7

(3) The same period shall be excluded in calculating the period of limitation applicable to the execution of any decree affected by the provisions of this paragraph in respect of any remedy of which the decree holder has been temporarily deprived

(g) *S. v. Mahomed v. Thakur* (19 6) 48 B. m. 1  
L.R. 590 9 F.C. 365 (6) A.R. 355

*S. v. Mahomed v. Thakur* (19 6) 48 B. m. 1  
1191 991 (6) 2 A.B. 1

## Execution by Collectors

Sch III,  
paras  
11-13

**Incompetent to mortgage**—A mortgage by a judgment debtor of his property while it is under the management of the Collector to whom decrees against the judgment debtor have been transferred for execution is absolutely void and not merely void as against the Collector and those claiming under him (A)

**Alienate**—The word alienate in this paragraph contemplates a transfer which is to take effect immediately and not after death. It does not therefore include a disposition of property by will (i)

**Alienation subsequent to certification of adjustment**—An intimation by a decree holder to the Collector to whom the decree is transferred for execution that his claim under the decree has been satisfied by the judgment-debtor and the receipt of such intimation by the Collector amounts to a due certifying of the adjustment of the decree within the meaning of O 21 r 2. After the adjustment has been so certified the prohibition against alienation imposed by this paragraph no longer subsists, and he is competent to the judgment debtor to mortgage, sell or alienate his property (A)

**Limitation**—When the property of the judgment-debtor was taken under management by the Collector and released more than 12 years after the date of the decree that period was excluded in the computation of limitation both under the Limitation Act and section 48 of the Code (A)

**12 [S 32B]** Where the property of which the sale has been ordered is situate in more districts than one, the powers and duties conferred and imposed on the Collector by paragraphs 1 to 10 shall be exercised and performed by such one of the Collectors of the said districts as the Local Government may by general rule or special order direct

**13 [S 32C]** In exercising the powers conferred on him by paragraphs 1 to 10 the Collector shall have the powers of a Civil Court to compel the attendance of parties and witnesses and the production of documents

(A) *Gourabank v Channarayana* (1918) 45 I A 19 16 Cal 183 49 I C 31, dissenting from *Magniram v Lakshmi* (1911) 36 Bom 510 16 I C 50. *Jankiwan S. Gh v Mahamud* (1924) 3 C W N 1142 169 I C 574 (23) A I C 16. The observation at the end of the judgment in *Cheng Prasad v Gopu Bhabu* (1904) 29 AIL 415 can no

longer be supported since the decision in *Gourabank v Channarayana*.  
(i) *Mahammad Yr d v Mahammad Imam* (1910) 33 AIL 33 8 I C 831.  
(j) *Mahabub d v Chandram* (1911) 33 P W N 114 I C 574.  
(k) *Shayam Karam v Collector of Beary* (1924) 4 AIL 114 3 I C 40.

## THE FOURTH SCHEDULE

(See Section 155 )

### ENACTMENTS AMENDED

| 1    | 2   | 3                       | 4   |
|------|-----|-------------------------|---|
| Year | No  | Short title             | Amendment   |
| 1870 | VII | The Court Fees Act 1870 | <p>In article 1 of Schedule I after the word <i>plaint</i> the words <i>written statement pleading a set off or counter claim</i> and after the word <i>Act</i> the words <i>or of cross objection</i> shall be inserted.</p> <p>From article 11 of Schedule II the words <i>from an order rejecting a plaint or</i> shall be omitted</p> <p>For the entry in the first column of Schedule II relating to article 19 the following entry shall be substituted namely —</p> <p>Agreement in writing stating a question for the opinion of the Court under the Code of Civil Procedure 1908</p> |

## Execution by Collectors

Sch III,  
paras  
11-13

**Incompetent to mortgage**—A mortgage by a judgment debtor of his property while it is under the management of the Collector to whom decrees against the judgment debtor have been transferred for execution is absolutely void and not merely void as against the Collector and those claiming under him (h)

**Alienate**—The word alienate in this paragraph contemplates a transfer which is to take effect immediately and not after death. It does not therefore include a disposition of property by will (i)

**Alienation subsequent to certification of adjustment**—An intimation by a decree holder to the Collector to whom the decree is transferred for execution that his claim under the decree has been satisfied by the judgment-debtor and the receipt of such intimation by the Collector amounts to a due certifying of the adjustment of a decree within the meaning of O 21 r 2. After the adjustment has been so certified the prohibition against alienation imposed by this paragraph no longer subsists, and the Collector is competent to the judgment debtor to mortgage, sell or alienate his property (j)

**Limitation**—When the property of the judgment debtor was taken under management by the Collector and released more than 12 years after the date of the decree that period was excluded in the computation of limitation both under the Limitation Act and section 48 of the Code (k)

**12 [S 325 B]** Where the property of which the sale has been ordered is situate in more districts than one, the powers and duties conferred and imposed on the Collector by paragraphs 1 to 10 shall be exercised and performed by such one of the Collectors of the said districts as the Local Government may by general rule or special order direct

Provision where property is in several districts

**13 [S 325 C]** In exercising the powers conferred on him by paragraphs 1 to 10 the Collector shall have the powers of a Civil Court to compel the attendance of parties and witnesses and the production of documents

Powers of Collector to compel attendance and production

(A) *Gourahankar v CA maw* (1918) 45 I A 219 16 Cal 183 49 IC 31... dissenting from *Majumdar v Bakhshi* (1911) 38 Bom 519 16 I C 60 *Janki son S gh v Majumdar* (1918) 33 C W N 1149 109 I C 574 (28) A IC 16 The observation at the end of the judgment in *G. S. Prasad v G. S. Bakhshi* (1907) 29 All 415 can no

longer be supported where the debt is a *G. S. Bakhshi v S. S. S.*  
(i) *M. Ammal v. S. S. S. v. S. S. S.* (1910) 33 All 33 51 I C 531  
(j) *Kushal Chand v. Chandram* (1911) 35 Bom 111 1 I C 574  
(k) *Shyamaram v. Collector of Erwer* (1911) 4 All 114 5 I C 16

# THE FOURTH SCHEDULE

(See Section 155 )

## ENACTMENTS AMENDED

| 1    | 2   | 3                       | 4   |
|------|-----|-------------------------|---|
| Year | No  | Short title             | Amendment   |
| 1870 | VII | The Court Fees Act 1870 | <p>In article 1 of Schedule I after the word <i>plaint</i> the words <i>written statement pleading a set off or counter claim</i> and after the word <i>Act</i> the words <i>or of cross objection</i> shall be inserted.</p> <p>From article 11 of Schedule II the words <i>from an order rejecting a</i> <i>plaint or</i> shall be omitted.</p> <p>For the entry in the first column of Schedule II relating to article 10 the following entry shall be substituted namely —</p> <p>Agreement in writing stating a question for the opinion of the Court under the Code of Civil Procedure 1908</p> |

## APPENDIX I

## The High Courts Act or the Charter Act, 1861

*An Act for Establishing High Courts of Judicature in India (a)*  
 (24 & 25 Vict., C. 104), [6th August 1861]

[Repealed and re enacted with slight modifications by the  
 Government of India Act 1915]

Be it enacted by the Queen's Most Excellent Majesty by and with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal and Commons in this present Parliament assembled and by the authority of the same as follows —

1 It shall be lawful for Her Majesty by Letters Patent under the great Seal of the United Kingdom to erect and establish a High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal for the Bengal Division of the Presidency of Fort William aforesaid and by like Letters Patent to erect and establish like High Courts at Madras and Bombay for those Presidencies respectively. Such High Courts to be established in the said several Presidencies at such time or respective times as to Her Majesty may seem fit and the High Court to be established under any such Letters Patent in any of the said Presidencies shall be deemed to be established from and after the publication of such Letters Patent in the same Presidency or such other time as in such Letters Patent may be appointed in this behalf.

2 The High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal and at the Presidency of Madras and Bombay respectively shall consist of a Chief Justice and as many Judges not exceeding fifteen as Her Majesty may from time to time think fit and appoint who shall be selected from —

1st Barristers of not less than five years standing or

2nd Members of the Covenanted Civil Service of not less than ten years standing and who shall have served as Zillah Judges or shall have exercised the like powers as those of a Zillah Judge for at least three years of that period or

3rd Persons who have held judicial Office not inferior to that of Principal Magistrate or Judge of a Small Cause Court for a period of not less than five years or

4th Persons who have been Pleaders of a Sudder Court or a High Court for a period of not less than ten years if such Pleaders of a Sudder Court shall have been admitted as Pleaders of a High Court

It is enacted that not less than one third of the Judges of such High Courts respectively including the Chief Justice shall be Barristers and not less than one third shall be Members of the Covenanted Civil Service

(1) By the term of this Act the exercise of jurisdiction in any part of Her Majesty's Kingdom by the High Court was meant to be subject to and not excluded by the general jurisdiction of the Governor-General in Council. An error of interpretation has been pointed out by the Council of the Government of India whereby any statement removed from the jurisdiction of the High Court and was controlled by the Statute and by the Letters Patent issued in this—*Empress v. B. Hall* (1861) 12 C. 185.

## High Courts

3 Provided always that the persons who at the time of the establishment of such High Court in any of the said Presidencies are Judges of the Supreme Court of Judicature and permanent Judges of the Court of Sudder Dewany Adawlut or Sudder Adawlut of the same Presidency shall be and become Judges of such High Court without further appointment for that purpose and the Chief Justice of such Supreme Court shall become the Chief Justice of such High Court

4 All the Judges of the High Courts established under this Act shall hold their offices during Her Majesty's pleasure provided that it shall be lawful for any Judge of a High Court to resign such office of Judge to the Governor General of India in Council or Governor in Council of the Presidency in which such High Court is established

5 The Chief Justice of any such High Court shall have rank and precedence before the other Judges of the same Court and such of the other Judges of such Court as on its establishment shall have been transferred thereto from the Supreme Court shall have rank and precedence before the Judges of the High Court not transferred from the Supreme Court and except as aforesaid all the Judges of each High Court shall have rank and precedence according to the seniority of their appointments unless otherwise provided in their Patents

6 Any Chief Justice or Judge transferred to any High Court from the Supreme Court shall receive the like salary and be entitled to the like retiring pension and advantage as he would have been entitled to for and in respect of service in the Supreme Court if such Court had been continued his service in the High Court being reckoned as service in the Supreme Court and except as aforesaid it shall be lawful for the Secretary of State in Council of India to fix the salaries allowances furloughs retiring pensions and (when necessary) expenses for equipment and voyage of the Chief Justices and Judges of the several High Courts under this Act and from time to time to alter the same Provided always such alterations shall not affect the salary of any Judge appointed prior to the date thereon

7 Upon the happening of a vacancy in the office of Chief Justice and during any absence of a Chief Justice the Governor General in Council or Governor in Council as the case may be shall appoint one of the Judges of the same High Court to perform the duties of Chief Justice of the said Court until some person has been appointed to the office of Chief Justice of the same Court and has entered on the discharge of the duties of such office or until the Chief Justice has returned from such absence and upon the happening of a vacancy in the office of any other Judge of any such High Court and during any absence of any such Judge or on the appointment of any such Judge to act as Chief Justice it shall be lawful for the Governor General in Council or Governor in Council as the case may be to appoint a person with such qualifications as are required in persons to be appointed to the High Court to act as a Judge of the said High Court and the person so appointed shall be authorized to sit and to perform the duties of a Judge of the said Court until some person has been appointed to the office of Judge of the same Court and has entered on the discharge of the duties of such office or until the absent Judge has returned from such absence or until the Governor General in Council or Governor in Council as aforesaid shall see cause to cancel the appointment of such acting Judge



## High Courts Act

8 Upon the establishment of such High Court as aforesaid in the Presidency of Fort William in Bengal the Supreme Court and the Court of Sudder Dewany Adawlut and Sudder Nizamat Adawlut at Calcutta in the same Presidency shall be abolished

And upon the establishment of such High Court in the Presidency of Madras the Supreme Court and the Court of the Sudder Adawlut and Fowjdarry Adawlut in the same Presidency shall be abolished

And upon the establishment of such High Court in the Presidency of Bombay the Supreme Court and the Court of Sudder Dewany Adawlut and Sudder Fowjdarry Adawlut in the same Presidency shall be abolished

And the records and documents of the several Courts so abolished in each Presidency shall become and be records and documents of the High Court established in the same Presidency

9 Each of the High Courts to be established under this Act shall have as hereinafter mentioned all such Civil Criminal Admiralty and Vice Admiralty Testamentary Intestate and Matrimonial Jurisdiction original and appellate and all such powers and authorities for and in relation to the administration of justice in the Presidency for which it is established as Her Majesty may by such Letters Patent as aforesaid grant and direct subject however to such directions and limitations as to the exercise of civil and criminal jurisdiction beyond the limits of the Presidency Towns as may be provided thereby and save as by such Letters Patent may be otherwise directed, and subject without prejudice to the legislative powers in relation to the matters aforesaid of the Governor General of India in Council the High Court to be established in each Presidency shall have and exercise all jurisdiction and every power and authority whatsoever in any manner vested in any of the Courts in the same Presidency abolished under this Act at the time of the abolition of such last mentioned Courts.

Subject and without prejudice to legislative powers of the Governor General in Council—See notes to cl. 44 of the Letters Patent *infra*

10 Until the Crown shall otherwise provide under the powers of this Act all jurisdiction now exercised by the Supreme Courts of Calcutta Madras and Bombay respectively over inhabitants of each Presidency of India as may not be comprised within the Local Limits of the Letters Patent to be issued under this Act shall be exercised by each High Court at Fort William Madras and Bombay respectively

Repealed by 29 Act c 15 s 2

11 Upon the establishment of the said High Courts in the said Presidencies respectively all provisions then in force in India of Acts of Parliament or of any Orders of Her Majesty in Council or of any Charters or of any Acts of the Legislature of India in force at the time or respective times of the establishment of the said High Courts are respectively applicable to the Supreme Courts at Fort William Madras and Bombay respectively and the Judges of those Courts shall be taken to be subject to the said Acts and the Judges thereof respectively shall be taken to be consistent with the provisions of this Act and the Letters Patent to be issued in pursuance thereof and subject to the legislative powers in relation to the matters aforesaid of the Governor General of India in Council.

## High Courts A

12 From and after the abolition of the Courts abolished as aforesaid in any of the said Presidencies the High Court of the same Presidency

Provisions as to pending proceedings in abolished Courts

shall have jurisdiction over all proceedings pending in such abolished Courts at the time of the abolition thereof and such proceedings and all previous proceedings in the said last mentioned Courts shall be dealt with as if the same had been had in the said High Court save that any such proceedings may be continued as nearly as circumstances permit under and according to the practice of the abolished Courts respectively

13 Subject to any laws or regulations which may be made by the Governor General in Council the High Courts established in any Presidency

Power to High Courts to provide for exercise of jurisdiction by original Judges or Division Courts

under this Act may by its own rules provide for the exercise by one or more Judges or by Division Courts constituted by two or more Judges of the said High Court of the original and appellate jurisdiction vested in such Court in such manner as may appear to such Court to be convenient for the due administration of justice

14 The Chief Justice of each High Court shall from time to time determine what

Chief Justice to determine what Judge or Judges sit alone or in the Division Courts

Judge in each case shall sit alone and what Judges of the Court whether with or without the Chief Justice shall constitute the several Division Courts as aforesaid.

15 Each of the High Courts established under this Act shall have superintendence

High Court to superintend and frame rules of practice for subordinate Courts

over all Courts which may be subject to its appellate jurisdiction and shall have power to call for returns and to direct the transfer of any suit or appeal from any such Court to any other Court of equal or superior jurisdiction and shall have power to make and issue general rules for regulating the practice and proceedings of such Courts and also to prescribe forms for every proceeding in the said Court for which it shall think necessary that a form be provided and also for keeping all books entries and accounts to be kept by the officers and also to settle tables of fees to be allowed to the Sheriff Attorneys and all clerks and officers of Courts and from time to time to alter any such rule or form or table and the rules so made and the forms so framed and the tables so settled shall be used and observed in the said Courts provided that such general rules and forms and tables be not inconsistent with the provisions of any law in force and shall before they are issued have received the sanction in the Presidency of *Fort William* of the Governor General in Council and in *Madras* or *Bombay* of the Governor in Council of the respective Presidency

16 It shall be lawful for Her Majesty if at any time hereafter Her Majesty sees fit

Her Majesty may establish a High Court in the North Western Province

so to do by Letters Patent under the Great Seal of the United Kingdom to erect and establish a High Court of Judicature in and for any portion of the territories within Her Majesty's dominions in *India* not included within the limits of the

local jurisdiction of another High Court to consist of a Chief Justice and of such number of other Judges with such qualifications as are required in persons to be appointed to the High Courts established at the Presidencies hereinbefore mentioned as Her Majesty from time to time may think fit and appoint and it shall be lawful for Her Majesty by such Letters Patent to confer on such Court any such jurisdiction powers and authority as under this Act is authorized to be conferred on or will become vested in the High Court to be established in any Presidency hereinbefore mentioned, and subject to the directions of such Letters Patent all the provisions of this Act having reference to the High Court established in any such Presidency and to the Chief Justice and other

## High Courts Act

Judges of such Court and to the Governor General or Governor of the Province in which such High Court is established shall as far as circumstances may permit be applicable to the High Court established in the said territories and to the Chief Justice and other Judges thereof and to the person administering the Government of the said territories

17 It shall be lawful for Her Majesty if Her Majesty shall so think fit at any time within three years after the establishment of a High Court under this Act by her Letters Patent to revoke or alter any such parts or provisions as Her Majesty may think fit in any Letters Patent by which such Court was established and to grant and make such other powers and provisions as Her Majesty may think fit and as might have been granted or made by such Letters Patent or without any such revocation as aforesaid by like Letters Patent to grant and make any additional or supplementary powers and provisions which might have been granted or made in the first instance

18 It shall be lawful for Her Majesty from time to time by Her Order in Council to transfer any territory or place from the jurisdiction of one of the High Courts established under this Act and generally to alter and determine the territorial limits of the jurisdiction of the said several Courts as to Her Majesty with the advice of Her Privy Council may seem meet

Repealed by 28 Vict. c. 12 s. 2

19 The word Barrister in this Act shall be deemed to include Barristers in England or Ireland or members of the Faculty of Advocates in Scotland and the words Governor General and Governor shall comprehend the officer administering the Government

## GOVERNMENT OF INDIA ACT, 1915

*An Act to consolidate enactments relating to the Government of India*

29th July 1915

BE it enacted by the King's most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows

\* \* \* \*

## PART IX

## THE INDIAN HIGH COURTS

*Constitution*

**101** [Ch Act sec 2 19]—(1) The high courts referred to in this Act are the high courts of judicature for the time being established in British India by letters patent

(2) Each high court shall consist of a chief justice and as many other judges as His Majesty may think fit to appoint  
Provided as follows —

- (i) the Governor General in Council may appoint persons to act as additional judges of any high court, for such period not exceeding two years as may be required, and the judges so appointed shall, whilst so acting have all the powers of a judge of the high court appointed by His Majesty under this Act,
- (ii) the maximum number of judges of a high court, including the chief justice and additional judges shall be twenty
- (3) A judge of a high Court must be—
  - (a) a barrister of England or Ireland or a member of the Faculty of Advocates in Scotland of not less than five years standing or

## Government of India Act

Ss  
101-104

- (b) a member of the Indian Civil Service of not less than ten years' standing, and having for at least three years served as, or exercised the powers of a district judge, or
- (c) a person having held judicial office, not inferior to that of a subordinate judge or a judge of a small cause court, for a period of not less than five years, or
- (d) a person having been a pleader of a high court for a period of not less than ten years

(4) Provided that not less than one third of the judges of a high court, including the chief justice but excluding additional judges, must be such barristers or advocates as aforesaid and that not less than one-third must be members of the Indian Civil Service

(5) The high court for the North Western Provinces may be styled the high court of judicature at Allahabad, and the high court at Fort William in Bengal is in this Act referred to as the high court at Calcutta

102 [Ch Act s 4]—(1) Every judge of a high court shall hold his office during His Majesty's pleasure

T nature of office of judges of high courts

(2) Any such judge may resign his office, in the case of the high court at Calcutta, to the Governor General in Council and in other cases to the local Government

103 [Ch Act s 5]—(1) The chief justice of a high court shall have rank and precedence before the other judges of the same court

Precedence of judges of high courts.

(2) All the other judges of a high court shall have rank and precedence according to the seniority of their appointments unless otherwise provided in their patents

104 [Ch Act s 6]—(1) The Secretary of State in Council may fix the salaries allowances furloughs retiring pensions, and (where necessary) expenses for equipment and voyage, for the chief justices and other judges of the several

Salaries &c of judges of high courts.

high courts, and may alter them, but any such alteration shall not affect the salary of any judge appointed before the date thereof

SS  
104,

(2) The remuneration fixed for a judge under this section shall commence on his taking upon himself the execution of his office, and shall be the whole profit or advantage which he shall enjoy from his office during his continuance therein

(3) If a judge of a high court dies during his voyage to India, or within six months after his arrival there, for the purpose of taking upon himself the execution of his office, the Secretary of State shall pay to his legal personal representatives, out of the revenues of India, such a sum of money as will, with the amount received by or due to him at the time of his death on account of salary, make up the amount of one year's salary

(4) If a judge of a high court while in possession of his office and after the expiration of six months from his arrival in India for the purpose of taking upon himself the execution of his office, the Secretary of State shall pay to his legal personal representatives out of the revenues of India, over and above the sum due to him at the time of his death, a sum equal to six months' salary

105 [Ch Act 7]—(1) On the occurrence of a vacancy in the office of chief justice of a high court, and during any absence of such a chief justice, the Governor General in Council in the case of the high court at Calcutta

Provision for a judge in the office of chief justice of a high court.

and the local Government in other cases shall appoint one of the other judges of the same high court to perform the duties of chief justice of the court, until some person has been appointed by His Majesty to the office of chief justice of the court and has entered on the discharge of the duties of that office or until the chief justice has returned from his absence as the case requires

(2) On the occurrence of a vacancy in the office of any other judge of a high court and during any absence of any such judge, or on the appointment of any such judge to act as chief justice the Governor General in Council in the case of the high court at Calcutta and the local Government in other



## Government of India

Court of Bombay 1823 There was no such provision in the High Courts Act 1861 nor in any of the High Courts charters See Despatch from Secretary of State 106, cl 17

The High Court has power under the Specific Relief Act 1 of 1877 s 45 to make an order requiring the Chief Revenue authority to state a case and refer it to the High Court under s 51 of the Income Tax Act 7 of 1918 the power not being the exercise of original jurisdiction in any matter concerning the revenue so as to be excluded by sub sec (2) (b)

Revenue—Income tax is revenue within the meaning of this section (c) And so money derived from the sale of smuggled goods which have been seized and confiscated (d)

107 [Ch Act s 15]—Each of the high courts has superintendence over all courts for the time being subject to its appellate jurisdiction, and may do any of the following things, that is to say,—

Powers of high court with respect to subordinate courts

- (a) call for returns,
- (b) direct the transfer of any suit or appeal from any such court to any other court of equal or superior jurisdiction,
- (c) make and issue general rules and prescribe forms for regulating the practice and proceedings of such courts,
- (d) prescribe forms in which books, entries and accounts shall be kept by the officers of any such courts, and
- (e) settle tables of fees to be allowed to the sheriff, attorneys, and all clerks and officers of courts

Provided that such rules forms and tables shall not be inconsistent with the provisions of any Act for the time being in force, and shall require the previous approval in the case of the high court at Calcutta of the Governor General in Council, and in other cases of the local Government

Power of superintendence Civil proceedings—The High Courts have under this section not only administrative but judicial power In the exercise of its power of superintendence a High Court may direct a subordinate Court to do its duty and this power is not limited to cases in which the subordinate Court declines to hear or determine a suit or application within its jurisdiction. But a High Court is not competent in the exercise of this power to interfere with and set right the orders of a subordinate

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>(b) <i>Block and v. A. Co. Ltd.</i> (1931) 50 T. A. 478<br/> <i>Block v. A. Co. Ltd.</i> (1931) 50 T. A. 478<br/> <i>The Commissioner of Income Tax v. A. Co. Ltd.</i> (1931) 50 T. A. 478<br/> <i>A. Co. Ltd. v. The Commissioner of Income Tax</i> (1931) 50 T. A. 478</p> | <p>718 681 C 6 (1914) 34 M. J. 1 no<br/> <i>In good law</i><br/>         (c) <i>B. v. C.</i> <i>Lit. v. Collector of M. S. S.</i><br/>         (1918) 35 Mad. L. J. 3<br/>         (d) <i>G. v. S. S. S.</i> <i>Secretary of State</i> (1914)<br/>         50 Mad. 449 105 I.C. 56 (1914) A.M. 6.2</p> |
|---|--|





## Government of India

**Defence of India Act 1915**—The High Court has no jurisdiction to superintend the proceedings of commissioners appointed under the Defence of India Act 1915 (g)

**Rent Act**—It has been held by the High Court of Calcutta that it has power under this section to revise the orders of the Rent Controller under the Calcutta Rent Act (r). The High Court of Rangoon has held that it has no power to interfere with the orders of the Rent Controller under the Rangoon Rent Act (s).

**Land Acquisition Act**—The High Court has no power under s 115 of the Civil Procedure Code or this section to interfere with an order of the Collector refusing to make a reference under s 18 of the Land Acquisition Act (t). See notes to s 115 above Subordinate Court.

**Municipal Commissioner**—A Municipal Commissioner sitting as an Election Court is not subject to the superintendence of the High Court under this section nor is he subject to the appellate jurisdiction (u).

When present section to be resorted to.—The special power of superintendence conferred by this section is not as a rule to be exercised in cases where there is an adequate remedy by other proceedings such as appeal or revision (v). That power is as a rule exercised in the following cases—

- (1) where there is no remedy by revision or appeal (w)
- (2) where it is doubtful whether the High Court has the power to revise under s 115 of the Code of Civil Procedure (x)
- (3) where the order passed is of an extraordinary character and there has been a gross failure on the part of the Subordinate Court to do its duty (y).

**Appeal**—No appeal lies under cl 15 of the Letters Patent from an order made by a High Court in the exercise of the power of superintendence under this section. See cl 15 of the Letters Patent as amended in 1919.

**108 [Ch Act ss 13-14]**—(1) Each high court may by its own rules provide as it thinks fit for the exercise, by one or more judges, or by division courts constituted by two or more judges of the high court of the original and appellate jurisdiction vested in the court.

(2) The chief justice of each high court shall determine what judge in each case is to sit alone and what judges of the

- (g) *Sheela v. H. G. F. Per (1915) 3 Pat. L.J. 541 461 C 9*  
 (r) *A. Herry v. T. B. D. (1911) 49 Cal. 59 C 5*  
 (s) *Calcutta v. The Collector of Calcutta (1911) 42 Cal. 971*  
 (t) *Calcutta v. The Collector of Calcutta (1911) 42 Cal. 971*  
 (u) *Calcutta v. The Collector of Calcutta (1911) 42 Cal. 971*  
 (v) *Calcutta v. The Collector of Calcutta (1911) 42 Cal. 971*  
 (w) *Calcutta v. The Collector of Calcutta (1911) 42 Cal. 971*  
 (x) *Calcutta v. The Collector of Calcutta (1911) 42 Cal. 971*  
 (y) *Calcutta v. The Collector of Calcutta (1911) 42 Cal. 971*

- (1) *Sol. G. F. m. F. m. J. Lal (1906) 3 Pat. L.J. 541 461 C 9*  
 (2) *Calcutta v. The Collector of Calcutta (1911) 42 Cal. 971*  
 (3) *Calcutta v. The Collector of Calcutta (1911) 42 Cal. 971*  
 (4) *Calcutta v. The Collector of Calcutta (1911) 42 Cal. 971*  
 (5) *Calcutta v. The Collector of Calcutta (1911) 42 Cal. 971*  
 (6) *Calcutta v. The Collector of Calcutta (1911) 42 Cal. 971*  
 (7) *Calcutta v. The Collector of Calcutta (1911) 42 Cal. 971*  
 (8) *Calcutta v. The Collector of Calcutta (1911) 42 Cal. 971*  
 (9) *Calcutta v. The Collector of Calcutta (1911) 42 Cal. 971*  
 (10) *Calcutta v. The Collector of Calcutta (1911) 42 Cal. 971*

## Government of India Act

**Ss** court, whether with or without the chief justice, are to  
**103-110** constitute the several division courts

Original Jurisdiction—See notes to a. 115 above Appeal.

Rules—An order made by a judge in excess of the jurisdiction delegated to him by rules framed by the High Court under this section is a nullity ( )

**109** [28 & 29 Vict c 15 ss 3, 4, 6]—(1) The Governor General in Council may, by order, transfer any territory or place from the jurisdiction of one to the jurisdiction of any other of the high courts, and authorise any High Court to exercise all or any portion of its jurisdiction in any part of British India not included within the limits of which the high court was established, and also to exercise any such jurisdiction in respect of Christian subjects of His Majesty resident in any part of India outside British India

(2) The Governor General in Council shall transmit to the Secretary of State an authentic copy of every order made under this section

(3) His Majesty may signify, through the Secretary of State in Council, his disallowance of any such order, and such disallowance shall make void and annul the order as from the day on which the Governor General notifies that he has received intimation of the disallowance, but no act done by any High Court before such notification shall be deemed invalid by reason only of such disallowance

**110** [13 Geo III c 63, ss 15 17 21 Geo III c 70 s 1 37 Geo III c 142 s 11 39 & 40 Geo III c 79 s 3 4 Geo IV c 41 s 7]—(1) The Governor General, each Governor and each of the members of their respective executive councils shall not—

(a) be subject to the original jurisdiction of any High Court by reason of anything counselled or done by any of them in his public capacity or nor

Government of India

(b) be liable to be arrested or imprisoned in any suit or proceeding in any high court acting in the exercise of its original jurisdiction, nor

(c) be subject to the original criminal jurisdiction of any high court in respect of any offence not being treason or felony

(2) The exemption under this section from liability to arrest and imprisonment shall extend also to the chief justices and other judges of the several high courts

**111** [21 Geo III c 70 ss 2 3 4]—The order in writing of the Governor General in Council for any act shall, in any proceeding, civil or criminal, in any high court acting in the exercise of its original jurisdiction, be a full justification of the act, except so far as the order extends to any European British subject, but nothing in this section shall exempt the governor-general, or any member of his executive council, or any person acting under their orders, from any proceedings in respect of any such act before any competent court in England

Written order by governor general  
not general justification for  
act in any court in India

### *Law to be administered*

**112** [21 Geo III c 70, s 17 17 Geo III c 142 s 13]—The high courts at Calcutta, Madras and Bombay in the exercise of their original jurisdiction in suits against inhabitants of Calcutta, Madras or Bombay, as the case may be, shall in matters of inheritance and succession to lands rents and goods, and in matters of contract and dealing between party and party, when both parties are subject to the same personal law or custom having the force of law, decide according to that personal law or custom and when the parties are subject to different personal laws or customs having the force of law decide according to the law or custom to which the defendant is subject

Law to be administered in  
cases of inheritance and  
sucession

### *Additional High Courts*

**113** His Majesty may if he sees fit by letters patent establish a high court of judicature in any territory in British India whether

Power to establish additional  
high courts.

## Government of India Act

**Ss**  
**113, 114** or not included within the limits of the local jurisdiction of another high court and confer on any high court so established any such jurisdiction, powers and authorities as are vested in or may be conferred on any high court existing at the commencement of this Act, and where a high court is so established in any area included within the limits of the local jurisdiction of another high court, His Majesty may, by letters patent, alter those limits and make such incidental, consequential and supplemental provisions as may appear to be necessary by reason of the alteration

*Advocate General*

**114** [ 53 Geo III, c 255, s 111 21 & Vic, c 106 s 29 ]—  
Appointment and powers of Advocate General (1) His Majesty may, by warrant under His Royal Sign Manual, appoint an Advocate General for each of the presidencies of Bengal, Madras and Bombay

(2) The Advocate General for each of those presidencies may take on behalf of His Majesty such proceedings as may be taken by His Majesty's Attorney General in England

**131** Nothing in this Act shall affect the power of the Governor General in Legislative Council to  
savings repeal or alter any of the provisions mentioned in the Fifth Schedule to this Act, or the validity of any previous exercise of this power

---

# DESPATCH FROM SECRETARY OF STATE

SIR CHARLES WOODS DESPATCH ACCOMPANYING FIRST  
LETTERS PATENT OR CHARTER

Judicial No 44

INDIA OFFICE  
London 14th May 1862

To

HIS EXCELLENCY THE RIGHT HONOURABLE  
THE GOVERNOR GENERAL OF INDIA IN COUNCIL.

My Lord

I HEREBY transmit to you the Letters Patent or Charter (a) under the Royal Sign Manual for the High Court of Judicature to be established in Bengal in accordance with the provisions of the Act 24 and 25 Victoria Chapter 104 for establishing High Court of Judicature in India and request that you will take immediate measure for instituting the Court the first Judges of which including those appointed under the 3rd section of the Act are designated in the second clause of the Charter Those appointed by the Crown will be severally informed by me of their appointments to the Court

2 This Charter will accomplish the great object which has so long been contemplated of substituting for the Supreme and Sudder Courts abolished by the Act of High Court of Judicature possessing the combined powers and authorities of the abolished Courts and exercising jurisdiction both over the Provinces under the Sudder Court and over the Presidency Town which forms the local jurisdiction of the Supreme Court

3 Before I review the provisions in detail it is necessary that I should direct your attention to the general scope and main provisions of the Act in question

4 It abolishes in the first place (as soon as the Charter shall issue) the Supreme Court and the Court of Sudder Dewany Adawlut It vests in the High Court (by the last provision of section 9) the powers and authorities of those Courts respectively except so far as the Crown may by such Charter otherwise direct And by (the first part of the same section) it invests the High Court with such Civil Criminal Admiralty Vice Admiralty Testamentary Intestate and Matrimonial Jurisdiction and all such powers and authority in relation to the administration of justice in the Presidency as the same Charter may confer With respect therefore to the fusion of the Supreme and Sudder Courts it appears obvious that the Act itself speaks and that to assume and effect the same purpose by affirmative declaration in the Charter would be superfluous It has been consequently deemed unnecessary that the Charter should exhibit on the face of it an explicit statement of the powers and jurisdiction to be possessed by the new Court in consequence of the fusion as would have been the proper course if these powers and jurisdiction had been entirely new Recourse has been had in some places in lieu of such explicit statement to reference to statutory provisions and in others to the Charter of the Supreme Court when the object of clearness appeared to require it But wherever the Charter does not otherwise specify the High Court will use powers and administer the jurisprudence appertaining to those Courts respectively to whose authority it now succeeds

(a) The Letters Patent, dated the 14th May 1862, forwarded with this despatch were afterwards revoked by further Letters Patent dated the 14th December 1863 for which see post.

## Despatch from Secretary of State

5 But the Charter is intended positively to declare all such Civil Criminal and other jurisdictions above specified as the Crown thinks proper by this Charter to be on it supplementary or additional to its main purpose namely the fusion of the said Courts

6 Moreover the words giving authority to confer on the Court such jurisdiction and such powers and authorities for the administration of justice as the Crown may direct appear very large and such as in point of fact invest the Crown with extensive powers so far as the administration of justice within the meaning of the sections may require It has been however thought best to use this power very sparingly and simply as ancillary to the real purpose of the Act namely the establishment of new Courts

7 Another reason for the form which the present Letters Patent assume is to be found in the provisions of section 17 of the Act of last Sessions By that section power is given to the Crown to recall the Letters Patent establishing the Court at any time within three years after its establishment and to grant other Letters Patent in their stead This provision was inserted in the Act mainly with the view of enabling Her Majesty's Government to avail themselves of the advice and assistance of the Judges of the Court in framing the more perfect Charter by which the jurisdiction and authority of the Court is to be permanently fixed On this point I request you will put yourselves in communication with the Judges of the Court and at any time previous to the expiration of three years from the date of establishment of the Court furnish me with any suggestions they make or any amendments they may propose in the Letters Patent now transmitted and I shall be glad if in proposing alterations the Judges will put their recommendations as nearly as possible in the form in which they wish them to appear in the new Letters Patent

8 I proceed to notice in order such of the provisions of the Charter as appear to me to call for special remark

9 By clause 6 power is given to the Chief Justice to appoint the officers of the Court and to fix their salaries subject however in his cases to the approval and confirmation of the Government in Council This provision does not refer to the setting of fees where fees are allowed which under section 15 of the Act is required to be done by the Court

10 The Supreme Court exercises an authority entirely independent of the Government in regard to its ministerial officers The Government however have considered itself at liberty to receive representations from any of the officers of the Subordinate Courts who felt themselves aggrieved by the orders of the Judicial Authorities and to express its opinion on the propriety or otherwise of the proceedings of the Courts in such cases It will be expedient for you to take the question into consideration and after communication with the Court to adopt some rule in regard to it which of course must be uniformly applicable to all the officers of the Court constituted as the High Court will be it will merit all the confidence you can repose in it but as a question of policy the extension of the liberty of application to the Government to those who have not hitherto enjoyed it appears to me preferable to taking it away from those who have heretofore been permitted to avail themselves of it as a mode of obtaining redress against proceedings alleged by the applicants to be unjust and oppressive

## Despatch from Secretary of State

- 11 In regard to the admission of Advocates Vakeels and Attorneys the recommendations of the Law Commissioners have been followed

Clause 7 10

Under the existing practice the Advocate pleads and the Attorney acts for the suitors of the Supreme Court and the Vakeel both pleads and acts for the suitors of the Sudder Court of which Court the Advocate and Attorney of the Supreme Court are *ex officio* Vakeels. The terms are employed in the Charter simply to express the functions of these several classes of practitioners. The Advocate and Attorney will respectively plead and act in the High Court and the Vakeel will both plead and act in the High Court as he did in the Sudder Court. Any person may apply to be admitted either as an Advocate or Vakeel or Attorney under the rules which the Court is authorised by the Charter to make and there is nothing in the Charter to prevent the admission of Advocates and Attorneys to be also Vakeels of the High Court should the Judges consider such a course to be expedient.

12 The provisions in the Act section 2 clause 4 which declares that Pleaders of the Sudder Court who shall have been admitted as Pleaders of the High Court shall be eligible under certain condition to the Bench of the Court implies that a discretionary power may be exercised as to the admission of the present Pleaders of the Sudder Court to the Bar of the High Court. This enactment will account to you for the omission from the Charter of any provision appointing all the present practitioners of the Supreme and Sudder Courts to the High Court. I conclude however that unless in any special case there are strong reasons to the contrary the Court will admit the whole of the practitioners in the abolished Courts at the date of their abolition to be the first Advocates Vakeels and Attorneys of the High Court.

- 13 With reference to the concluding sentence of clause 10 it is to be observed

Clause 10

that the Letters Patent contain no provision reserving to the Attorneys of the present Supreme Court the right of pleading after the issue of this Charter in the Insolvent Court as newly regulated by clause 17. No such provision however is necessary as the Insolvent Court is a separate tribunal not affected by the Act authorising the Letters Patent and will continue a separate Court though for the future presided over by a Judge of the High Court. The Attorneys therefore will as heretofore practise in accordance with the rules of the Insolvent Court itself.

14 By the important provisions contained in the clauses of the Charter 11 to 34 inclusive effect is given to the 9th section of the Act respecting the jurisdictions and powers to be exercised by the High Court.

- 15 The original civil jurisdiction now exercised by the Supreme Court within

Civil Jurisdiction  
Clause 11

the limits of the Presidency Town will henceforth be exercised under the Charter by the High Court including its term (Clause 36 of the Charter) a Judge or Divisional Judge

of the High Court appointed or constituted under the provisions of the 13th section of the Act.

16 As it is very desirable that every suit should be instituted in the Court district in which the property forming the subject of dispute is situated or in which the cause of action has its origin or in which the defendant resides or carries on business the jurisdiction hitherto exercised by the Supreme Court (on the ground of inhabitancy or otherwise) over persons and property beyond the local authority of the High Court has not been vested in the High Court.



## Despatch from Secretary of State

provision of clause 11 provides that the exercise of the ordinary original civil jurisdiction of the Court shall be confined to the local limits of the Presidency Town, with power however to the Court under clause 13 to call for and try any suit instituted in a district subject to its superintendence when for reasons to be recorded it shall think proper to do so

17 The terms of clause 12 defining the original jurisdiction of the High Court as to suits are nearly similar to those employed in section 5 of the Code of Civil Procedure (Act VIII of 1859) and are intended to include every description of case over which the Mofussil Courts have jurisdiction By the 8th section of the 21st George III C 10 the Supreme Court is precluded from exercising any jurisdiction in any matter concerning the revenue Further a decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council pronounced in April 1874 ruled against the exercise of the Ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Supreme Court in matters matrimonial between others than Christians and even expressed some hesitation as to whether that Court should administer a remedy in such cases on the Civil side It is one object of the present Charter to do away with all such restrictions and limitations as far as this can be done without trenching on the proper province of legislation It has therefore been sought to invest the High Court in the exercise of its original civil jurisdiction with as ample powers in receiving and determining cases of every description and in applying a remedy to every wrong as are exercised by the Courts not established by Royal Charter and thus to place the Courts of first instance in the Presidency Towns and in the interior of the country in this respect as nearly as may be on the same footing

18 I shall be glad to be furnished with your opinion after consultation with the Judges of the Courts as to the concluding portion of clause 12 excluding the jurisdiction of the Court in regard to cases falling within the jurisdiction of the Small Cause Court of Calcutta in which the debt or damage or value of the property sued for does not exceed 100 Rupees Hitherto I believe there has been no tendency to bring into the Supreme Court cases cognizable by the Small Cause Court but should it appear that under the new system the time of the High Court is unnecessarily taken up with trying cases which might be instituted in the Small Cause Court it may become a question for consideration whether the sum excluding the jurisdiction of the High Court might not be raised to say 300 or 500 Rupees

19 It has been suggested that the Small Cause Court should be placed on the same footing as a Zillah Court in its subjection to the High Court as a Court of appeal and general superintendence But I do not consider that it was the purpose of the 8th of Parliament of last Session that the Crown in framing a Charter under it for the High Court should interfere with the present position and jurisdiction of other established Courts This subject if desirable is properly to be attained by legislative enactment I am of opinion that the Small Cause Court ought to be placed in the same relation to the High Court as any other Court subject to its appellate jurisdiction and general control the measure can be carried into effect by an Act of the Governor General in Council

20 As already observed the effect of clause 12 will be to confine the ordinary original civil jurisdiction of the High Court within narrow limits than the civil jurisdiction exercised by the Supreme Court By Clause 13 however the High Court is empowered

## Despatch from Secretary of State

to call for and to try as a Court of first instance any suit which the law requires to be instituted before some other tribunal. By the exercise of the power thus conferred on it the High Court will be enabled to obviate all reasonable ground of complaint when it shall deem that any hardship or injustice is likely to result from the compulsory institution in a Zillah Court of a suit which but for the change in the system might have been instituted in the Supreme Court.

21 The introduction of the words whether within or without the Bengal Division of the Presidency of Fort William in this and in several other clauses may appear to require explanation. The Court about to be established is called in section 2 of the Act 24 and 25 Victoria C 101 a Court for the Bengal Division of the Presidency of Fort William. That title is of course preserved in the Charter. By sec 8 the Supreme and Sudder Courts are abolished and by section 9 all their jurisdiction power and authority except when otherwise provided are vested in the High Court. But the Supreme Court has various original jurisdiction extending over the whole of the Presidency of Fort William and also over some of the Non Regulation Provinces under the Government of India and the Sudder Court has various appellate jurisdictions extending over the Bengal Division of the Presidency and also over the Province of Assam and others which are not properly parts of the Presidency. The result is that the High Court for the Bengal Division succeeding to the powers of both the Supreme and the Sudder Courts has in several respects jurisdictions in territories not within the Bengal Division. As this is the result of the Act it might not have been necessary to notice it in the Charter. But for the sake of clearness and in order to show distinctly that the Charter is meant to apply to these extra local jurisdiction as well as to the strictly local jurisdiction within the Bengal Division it has been deemed advisable to introduce these words.

22 Clauses 14 and 15 give effect to the recommendation of the law Commissioners that the High Court shall have all the appellate jurisdiction which is now exercised by the Sudder Dewany Adawlut and a new appellate jurisdiction and civil cases from the Courts of original jurisdiction constituted by one or more of its own Judges except that in the case of a decision which has been passed by a majority of the full number of the judges of the Court the appeal shall lie to Her Majesty in Council.

23 It will appear from a subsequent clause of the Letters Patent that the proceedings in the High Court in civil cases are to be regulated by the Code of Civil Procedure enacted by the Legislature of India of which Act VIII of 1861 forms a part. By section 23 of the last mentioned Indian Act provision has been made for a difference of opinion on the hearing of an appeal. A difficulty however may occur when two Judges constituting a Division Court for the trial of cases in the exercise of original jurisdiction differ as to the judgment to be given. For such a case the Code of Civil Procedure which is adapted to Courts of first instance presided over by single Judges only contain no provision. To call in a third Judge and to re try the case with a view to a judgment from which there may be an appeal to the High Court under clause 14 would be productive of unnecessary delay and expense to the parties and I am of opinion that the Court should make provision for such a contingency by a rule made under the 13th section of the Act of Parliament providing either that the judgment shall be in accordance with the opinion of the senior of the Judges constituting the Division Court or that the final judgment shall be entered *pro forma* according to such opinion such judgment being a judgment for the purpose of an appeal against the same but not for any other purpose.

## Despatch from Secretary of State

24 The substantive civil law to be administered by the High Court in the  
 Clauses 18 19 and 20 Jurisdiction of the Supreme and Sudder Court respectively  
 will until otherwise provided continue as at present. As  
 as I have said it was no part of the purpose of the Act of Parliament to effect a  
 Charter to effect And the clauses on which I am now commenting are purely  
 superfluous But they have been introduced to obviate any apprehension which  
 might have been entertained that in fusing the two Courts together it was intended  
 to fuse also the law which they have respectively hitherto administered and thus to make  
 a substantial innovation not only in the tribunals for administration of the law  
 of the law itself I trust however that measures may be taken, ere long for effecting  
 improvements in this respect by enacting for the British possessions in India a new  
 substantive law by which all classes shall be governed and all transactions shall be  
 regulated except in cases to which our Judicatures are required to apply the personal law  
 of any classes of our Indian subjects

25 Under clauses 21 22 and 38 no change will be effected by the Charter  
 Clauses 10 and 33 the administration of criminal justice in the Presidency  
 Town or in respect of persons subject to its criminal jurisdiction residing in the interior of the country It appears however to His  
 Majesty's Government that some modification of the existing practice both in the  
 capital and in the provinces is necessary and on these points I shall address you  
 a separate despatch

26 The Sudder Court exercises no original jurisdiction but by clause 20  
 Clause 23 original criminal jurisdiction throughout the territories subject  
 to its authority has been given to the High Court, the  
 principal object being to enable the Judges to hold trials for offences committed in  
 the Presidency Town at which from their importance or for other specific cause it may  
 be expedient that a Judge or Judges of the High Court should preside

27 The remaining clauses of the Letters Patent on the subject of the criminal  
 Clauses 24 25 jurisdiction of the High Court do not call for any particular  
 notice They contain no special provisions respecting the  
 transfer to that Court of the criminal jurisdiction exercised by the Supreme Court  
 in inhabitants of such parts of India as are not comprised within the local limits  
 of the Letters Patent that having been fully provided for by section 10 of the Act  
 under the authority of which the High Court is established

28 As in the case of the Small Cause Court you will consult the Judges in regard  
 to the relation in which the High Court is to stand to the Magistrates of Calcutta

29 Clause 30 respecting the exercise of the jurisdiction by the High Court  
 Clause 30 where than at its ordinary place of sitting is a very  
 important provision and one which I have no doubt will be  
 judiciously carried into effect will materially tend to the greater efficiency of all  
 the judicatures subject to the superintendence and authority of the High Court  
 Circumstances may frequently arise when the deputation of a Judge or Judges  
 of the High Court would be a measure of the highest expediency For by means  
 the clause under consideration will enable the Government to provide for the  
 one or more Judges from the High Court who would avail themselves of the  
 opportunity thus afforded them of making a searching inquiry into the manner in which  
 the local Courts were performing their duties

## Despatch from Secretary

30 With reference to this clause it has been considered whether the precedence of section 14 of the Act of Parliament should not be followed and the authority to make the necessary arrangement for exercise of the Court's jurisdiction out of the usual place of sitting vested in the Chief Justice. On the whole it was thought that acts partaking so much of an administrative character might be more perfectly performed by the Governor General in Council. But it is scarcely for me to add that Her Majesty's Government entertain full confidence that the Chief Justice will be the authority habitually consulted in the matter.

31 The Supreme Court exercises at present Admiralty Jurisdiction under its Charter. The Chief Justice has Vice Admiralty Jurisdiction under the commission of the 19th July 1822 and all or any of the Judges of the Supreme Court may be appointed Commissioners under the provisions of 39 and 40 George III C 9 section 25 for the trial and adjudication of prize causes and other maritime questions arising in India. By the present Charter the whole of the jurisdictions and power will be vested in the High Court and as in the Act above cited by the expression "other maritime questions" in general mention is made of all the jurisdictions conferred as above mentioned in the clauses of the Charter providing both for the civil and criminal maritime jurisdiction of the High Court.

Clauses 31 and 32

32 The clauses respecting testamentary and intestate jurisdiction do not call for any remark.

33 Her Majesty's Government are desirous of placing the Christian subjects of the Crown within the Presidency in the same position under the High Court as to matters matrimonial in general as they now are under the Supreme Court and this they believe to be effected by clause 35 of the Charter. But they consider it expedient that the High Court should possess in addition the power of decreeing divorce which the Supreme Court does not possess in other words that the High Court should have the same jurisdiction as the Court for Divorce and Matrimonial Causes in England established in virtue of 20 and 21 Vic C 85 and in regard to which further provisions were made by 22 and 31 Vic C 61 and 23 and 24 Vic C 144. The Act of Parliament for establishing the High Court however does not purport to give to the Crown the power of importing into the Charter all the provisions of the Divorce Court Act and some of them the Crown clearly could not so import such for instance as those which prescribe the period of remarriage or those which exempt from punishment clergymen refusing to re-marry adulterers. All these are in truth matters for Indian legislation and I request that you will immediately take the subject into your consideration and introduce into your Council a Bill for conferring upon the High Court the jurisdiction and powers of the Divorce Court in England one of the provisions of which should be to give an appeal to the Privy Council in those cases in which the Divorce Court Act gives an appeal to the House of Lords.

34 The object of the proviso at the end of clause 35 is to obviate any doubt that may possibly arise as to whether by vesting the High Court with the powers of the Court for Divorce and Matrimonial Causes in England it was intended to take away from the Courts within the divisions of the Presidency not established by Royal Charter any jurisdiction which they might have in matters Matrimonial as for instance in a suit for alimony between Armenians or Native Christians. With any such jurisdiction it is not intended to interfere.

## Despatch from Secretary of State

35 Clause 36 refers to the powers of single Judges and Division Courts appointed or constituted under the provisions of the 13th section of the Act. By section 14 of the Act the power of determining from time to time what Judge in each case shall sit alone and what Judges shall constitute Division Courts is placed in the hands of the Chief Justice. It will be observed that the law does not require that a Judge selected from the Panel shall necessarily form a part of every Division Court and it will be for the Chief Justice to consider whether in cases exclusively between natives it will not be desirable to follow as far as possible the course which has already been resolved upon in regard to the cases under appeal to the Sudder Court at the time of its abolition and to constitute the Division Court of Judges trained in the country whose knowledge of the Native language will obviate the expense and delay of translating the proceedings.

36 Clause 37 is a very important one and there is little doubt will prove a very salutary provision. It has therefore been inserted, although the change introduced is somewhat greater and more substantial than is generally aimed at in this Charter. It extends to the High Court the Code of Civil Procedure enacted by the Legislature of India for the Court not established by Royal Charter and thus accomplishes the object so far contemplated of substituting one simple Code of Procedure for the various systems (corresponding to its common law equity and admiralty jurisdiction) which have been in operation in the Supreme Court since the date of its establishment.

37 In regard to the rules respecting appeals to the Privy Council the object has been to avoid unnecessary innovation where so much of change with its necessary inconvenience is unavoidable. The existing rules which regulate these appeals are therefore left in force with one or two additions only which experience in the Court of the Judicial Committee has found advisable. For instance clause 40 is introduced, as it had been commonly introduced of late years in the appeal rules of other dependencies of Great Britain in order to remove all doubts as to the power of the High Courts to allow an appeal to the Council from interlocutory judgments.

38 It will however be obvious to you that the rules as now framed will be liable to the reproach of confusion and perhaps of uncertainty. They will be compounded of those contained in the Charter and those already in force which will necessitate reference to several documents. You will agree with me that a simple and intelligible Code of Rules to regulate appeals to the Privy Council from the new High Courts or rather from the High Courts in general which may be constituted under the Act of Parliament will be of great advantage to the suitors and the public. I should wish therefore that one of the first objects of the Judges as soon as the amount of labour thrown on them by their new position may allow it might be to prepare suggestions for such a Code of Rules which might then be reduced into a complete shape by the authority of the Privy Council at Home.

39 In forwarding the Letters Patent to the Judges of the High Court you are requested to furnish them with a copy of this despatch. I trust that the Letters Patent taken in connection with the Act for establishing the Court will be found to contain everything requisite for enabling the Court to proceed at once to the discharge of its important duties. It is possible that omissions may be discovered by the local authorities in India which may impede the proper action of the Courts and should the Judges represent to you that such is the case you will take immediate steps for supplying what is wanting by such legislative measures as you may consider most expedient for remedying the defects brought under your consideration.

## Despatch from Secretary of

40 I cannot conclude this despatch without expressing the deep interest felt by Her Majesty's Government in the success of this important measure. The Crown by its Letters Patent has sanctioned the establishment of a tribunal as the Chief Court of Justice in India which in the trained learning of the Judges selected from the Bar and in the knowledge of the language feelings and habits of the Natives of that country possessed by the other members of the Court combines the most material elements of success. And Her Majesty's Government look with confidence to the zealous exertions and cordial co-operation of the Judges to place the administration of Justice in India under the controlling authority of the Court in such a state of efficiency as will render it in every respect adequate to its ends and satisfactory to the people and to the Government.

I have the honour to be

My Lord

Your Lordship's most obedient humble Servant

(Signed) C WOOD

---

## APPENDIX II

### Letters Patent for the High Court of Calcutta

(December 28, 1865)

[A B—The Letters Patent for the High Courts of Madras and Bombay are in the  
mutatis in almost the same terms]

VICTORIA, by the Grace of God, of the United Kingdom  
of Great Britain and Ireland, Queen  
Defender of the Faith To all to whom  
these presents shall come, greeting Where  
as by an Act of Parliament passed in the twenty fourth and  
twenty fifth years of Our reign, entitled "An Act for establish-  
ing High Courts of Judicature in India" it was, amongst other  
things, enacted that it shall be lawful for Her Majesty by  
Letters Patent under the Great Seal of the United Kingdom to  
erect and establish a High Court of Judicature at Fort William  
in Bengal, for the Bengal Division of the Presidency of Fort  
William aforesaid, and that such High Court should consist  
of a Chief Justice and as many judges, not exceeding fifteen  
as Her Majesty might, from time to time, think fit to appoint,  
who shall be selected from among persons qualified as in the  
said Act is declared Provided always that the persons who  
at the time of the establishment of such High Court were  
Judges of the Supreme Court of Judicature and permanent  
Judges of the Court of Sudder Dewany Adawlut or Sudder  
Adawlut of the same Presidency, should be and become  
Judges of such High Court without further appointment for  
that purpose, and the Chief Justice of such Supreme Court  
should become the Chief Justice of such High Court, and  
that upon the establishment of such High Court as afore-  
said, the Supreme Court and the Court of Sudder Dewany  
Adawlut and Sudder Nizamut Adawlut at Calcutta in the  
said Presidency, should be abolished

And that the High Court of Judicature so to be established  
should have and exercise all such Civil, Criminal, Admiralty

Let Pat [Cal, Bom, and

and Vice Admiralty, Testamentary, Intestate and Matrimonial Jurisdiction, original and appellate and, all such powers and authority for, and in relation to, the administration of justice in the said Presidency as Her Majesty might by such Letters Patent as aforesaid, grant and direct subject how ever to such directions and limitations as to the exercise of original, civil and criminal jurisdictions beyond the limits of the Presidency Town as might be prescribed thereby and save as by such Letters Patent might be otherwise directed subject and without prejudice to the legislative powers in relation to the matters aforesaid of the Governor General of India in Council, the High Court so to be established should have and exercise all jurisdiction, and every power and authority whatsoever in any manner vested in any of the Courts in the same Presidency abolished under the said Act at the time of the abolition of such last mentioned Courts (a)

1 Now know ye that We, upon full consideration of the premises, and of Our special grace, certain knowledge and mere motion, have thought fit to revoke and do by these presents (from and after the date of the publication thereof as hereinafter provided and subject to the provisions thereof) revoke Our said Letters Patent of the fourteenth of May, one thousand eight hundred and sixty two, except so far as the Letters Patent of the fourteenth year of His Majesty King George the Third dated the twenty-sixth March, one thousand seven hundred and seventy four, establishing a Supreme Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal were revoked or determined thereby

2 And We do by these presents grant, direct and ordain that notwithstanding the revocation of the said Letters Patent of the fourteenth of May, one thousand eight hundred and sixty-two, the High Court of Judicature, called the High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal, shall be and continue, as from the time of the original erection and establishment thereof, the High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal, for the Bengal Division of the Presidency of Fort William aforesaid, and that the said Court shall be and continue a

Revocation of Letters Patent of 186  
High Court at Fort William to be continued



Let Pat [Cal, Bom, and Mad]

Cls 2-5 Court of record, and that all proceedings commenced in the said High Court prior to the date of the publication of these Letters Patent shall be continued and depend in the said High Court as if they had commenced in the said High Court after the date of such publication, and that all rules and orders in force in the said High Court, immediately before the date of the publication of these Letters Patent, shall continue in force, except so far as the same are altered hereby, until the same are altered by competent authority

3 And We do hereby appoint and ordain that the person and persons who shall immediately before the date of the publication of those Letters Patent, be the Chief Justice or Judges, or acting Chief Justice or Judges, if any, of the said High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal, shall continue to be the Chief Justice and Judges or acting Chief Justice or Judges, of the said High Court, until further or other provisions shall be made by Us or Our heirs and successors in that behalf, in accordance with the said recited Act for establishing High Courts of Judicature in India

4 And We do hereby appoint and ordain that every clerk and ministerial officer of the said High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal, appointed by virtue of the said Letters Patent of the fourteenth of May, one thousand eight hundred and sixty two, shall continue to hold and enjoy his office and employment with the salary thereunto annexed until he be removed from such office and employment, and he shall be subject to the like power of removal, regulations, and provisions as if he were appointed by virtue of these Letters Patent

5 And We do hereby ordain that the Chief Justice and every Judge who shall be from time to time appointed to the said High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal, previously to entering upon the execution of the duties of his office shall make and subscribe the following declaration before such authority or person as the Governor General in Council may commission to receive it —

Let Pat [Cal, Bom, and M

Clis 5-

"I, A B, appointed Chief Justice [or a Judge] of the High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal, do solemnly declare that I will faithfully perform the duties of my office to the best of my ability, knowledge and judgment "



6 And We do hereby grant, ordain and appoint that the said High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal shall have and use, as occasion may require, a seal bearing a device and impression of Our Royal Arms, within an evergue or label surrounding the same with this inscription, "The Seal of the High Court at Fort William in Bengal "

And We do further grant, ordain, and appoint that the said Seal shall be delivered to and kept in the custody of the Chief Justice, and in case of vacancy of the office of Chief Justice or during any absence of the Chief Justice, the same shall be delivered over and kept in the custody of the person appointed to act as Chief Justice under the provisions of section 7 of the recited Act and We do further grant, ordain and appoint that whensoever it shall happen that the office of Chief Justice or of the Judge to whom the custody of the said Seal be committed shall be vacant, the said High Court shall be and is hereby authorized and empowered to demand seize, and take the said Seal from any person or persons whomsoever, by what ways and means soever the same may have come to him, or their possession

Writes to to issue in  
name of the Crown and  
under the " 1

7 And We do hereby further grant, ordain, and appoint that all writs, summons, precepts, rules, orders and other mandatory process to be used, issued or awarded by the said High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal, shall run and be in the name and style of Us or of Our heirs and successors, and shall be sealed with the Seal of the said High Court

Appointment of Officers

8 And We do hereby authorize and empower the Chief Justice of the said High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal, from time to time, as occasion may require, and subject to any rules and restrictions which may be prescribed by the Governor General in Council, to

Let Pat [Cal, Bom, and Mad]

Cls 8-10 appoint so many and such clerks and other ministerial officers, as shall be found necessary for the administration of Justice and the due execution of all the powers and authorities granted and committed to the said High Court by these Our Letters Patent (b) And it is our further will and pleasure, and We do hereby for Us, Our heirs and successors, give, grant, direct and appoint that all and every the officers and clerks to be appointed as aforesaid shall have and receive respectively such reasonable salaries as the Chief Justice shall from time to time appoint for each office and place respectively, and as the Governor General in Council shall approve of Provided always and it is Our will and pleasure, that all and every the officers and clerks to be appointed as aforesaid shall be resident within the limits of the jurisdiction of the said Court so long they shall hold their respective offices, but this proviso shall not interfere with or prejudice the right of any officer or clerk to avail himself of leave of absence under any rules prescribed by the Governor General in Council, and to absent himself from the said limits during the term of such leave, in accordance with the said rules

*Admission of Advocates, Vakeels and Attorneys*

9 And We do hereby authorize and empower the said High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal to approve, admit and enrol such and so many Advocates, Vakeels and Attorneys as to the said High Court shall seem meet, such Advocates, Vakeels and Attorneys shall be and are hereby authorized to appear for the suitors of the said High Court, and to plead or to act, or to plead and act, for the said suitors according as the said High Court may by its rules and directions determine, and subject to such rules and directions

10 And We do hereby ordain that the said High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal shall have power to make rules for the qualifications and admission of proper persons to be Advocates, Vakeels and

Powers of High Court in admitting Advocates Vakeels and Attorneys

In making rules for the qualifications &c of Advocates Vakeels and Attorneys

(b) The words "And we do hereby ordain that every such appointment shall be submitted to the approval of the Governor-General in Council and shall be either confirmed or disallowed by the Governor-General in Council" which occurred in this clause were omitted by the Amending Letters Patent dated 11th March 1919



## Let Pat [Cal, Bom, and Mad]

CIs  
10-12

counsel accepts brief to appear at the trial of a case and is paid the consultation fee and the fee for attending the trial he should return both the fees if after holding consultation he leaves for another place and is unable to attend the trial of the case. If the consultation must be deemed to be held with a view to his attending the trial (j)

Appeal—See notes to clause 39 below

*Civil Jurisdiction of the High Court*

Local limits of the ordinary original jurisdiction of the High Court

11. And We hereby ordain that the said High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal shall have and exercise ordinary original civil jurisdiction within such local limits as may, from time to time, be declared and prescribed by any law made by competent legislative authority for India and until some local limits shall be so declared and prescribed within the limit declared and prescribed by the proclamation fixing the limits of Calcutta issued by the Governor-General in Council, on the 10th day of September, in the year of Our Lord, one thousand seven hundred and ninety four and the ordinary original civil jurisdiction of the said High Court shall not extend beyond the limits for the time being declared and prescribed as the local limits of such jurisdiction (k)

Local limits—Power is given by s 109 of the Government of India Act to the Governor General in Council to alter the local limits of the jurisdiction of High Courts

Issue of warrant.—The High Court has no power in the exercise of its ordinary original civil jurisdiction to issue a warrant against the person of a judgment debtor and appoint a special bailiff to execute it against the judgment-debtor wherever he might be found in the Presidency (l). Such an order however may be made for the arrest of a defendant who has been guilty of a contempt of Court (m). The reason is that an order for attachment for contempt is not an order made in exercise of the High Court's civil jurisdiction (n).

12. And We do further ordain that the said High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal in the exercise of its ordinary original civil jurisdiction shall be empowered to receive try, and determine suits of every description, if, in the case of

Original jurisdiction as to suits

(j) *An Ad te an re* (191) 41 Cal 741 4  
I C 63 (practice for seniors to name their juniors and for juniors to name their seniors condemned)

(k) In the Madras and Bombay Letters Patent the words are by any law made by the Governor in Council. In the Bengal Letters Patent for the words within the limits declared and prescribed &c are substituted

ted within the limits of the local jurisdiction of the said High Court of Judicature at the date of the publication of the reports

(l) *Rajah of Imanul v. Seetharam* (1877) 11 Cal 10  
(m) *Hars Allahdas v. Chumchand* (1877) 11 Cal 17  
(n) *Vasistahoo v. Vasuldamas* (1883) 11 Cal 1

Let Pat [Cal, Bom, and Ma

CI 12

suits for land or other immovable property, such land or property shall be situated, or, in all other cases, if the cause of action shall have arisen either wholly, or, in case the leave of the Court shall have been first obtained, in part, within the local limits of the ordinary original jurisdiction of the said High Court or if the defendant at the time of the commencement of the suit shall dwell or carry on business, or personally work for gain, within such limits, except that the said High Court shall not have such original jurisdiction in cases falling within the jurisdiction of the Small Cause Court at Calcutta in which the debt or damage, or value of the property sued for does not exceed one hundred rupees

Scope of the clause—Barring certain suits specified at the end of this clause the High Courts of Calcutta Madras and Bombay are empowered to try the following suits in the exercise of their ordinary original civil jurisdiction namely—

#### I Suits for land or other immovable property—

- (a) if the land or property is situated wholly within the local limits of the ordinary original civil jurisdiction of the said High Courts or
- (b) where the land or property is situated in part only within the said limits if the leave of the Court shall have been first obtained (c) See notes below Suit for land of which a part is within jurisdiction

#### II Suits other than those for land—

- (a) if the cause of action has arisen wholly within the said limits or
- (b) where the cause of action has arisen in part only within the said limits if the leave of the Court shall have been first obtained or
- (c) if the defendant at the time of the commencement of the suit dwells or carries on business or personally works for gain within such limits

Suits for land or other immovable property.—The High Court of Calcutta has held that a suit for land within the meaning of this clause is a suit substantially for land that is for the purpose of acquiring title to or possession of land (p) or for declaring an interest in land (q) I agrees in Calcutta to sell to B land situated outside the original jurisdiction of the Calcutta High Court If A fails to perform his contract and B sues A for specific performance the suit is one for land and it will not be entertained by the Court the land being situated outside its jurisdiction. But if B fails to perform his contract and I sues B for specific performance the suit is not one for land, and hence the suit will lie in the Calcutta Court (r) Similarly a suit by a mortgagee for specific performance of an agreement to execute a mortgage of land is a suit for land and it will not be entertained by the Calcutta Court if the land is situated beyond the original jurisdiction of the Court (s) And it has been laid down by the same High Court that

- (a) *I I ram v Pambandra* (19) 2 Lum 195
- (p) *D A J L Ion Jaz & Word* (18) 61 Cal 19 63 *Pat Indian I way Co v General Milt* (18) 61 Cal 9 *If a Fall Vamz* (1901) 34 1 315
- (q) *A M Chaler v Aury M A Roy* (19) 19 Cal 361 365

- (r) *Land Mrtg p F & S vud e* (19) 19 Cal 35 *Jeand V A L u. pnd* (19) 49 Cal 60 *O I C. V. (—)* A C 413
- (s) *Greenath J y v Cury Doe* (18) 51 Cal 8 *I at land Co. ad (19) 1) 1 (a. —* 661 C 44 (—) A C 32

## Let Pat [Cal, Bom, and Mad]

CI 12

suits for redemption or foreclosure or for sale of mortgage property are all suits for land, and they will not be entertained by that Court if the land is situated beyond its or its jurisdiction (f) also that a suit by a lessee for a declaration that a lease was a sub-lease and for rents and profits is a suit for land, and it will not be entertained if the land is situated beyond its jurisdiction (u) A suit for a share in the sale proceeds of land without jurisdiction is not a suit for land (v) Page J in the case last cited said that the term suits for land or other immovable property means suits in which having regard to the issues raised in the pleadings the decree or order will affect directly the proprietary or possessory title to land or other immovable property The learned Judge observed that this construction conformed to the rule that questions relating to title or ownership of land should be determined not only by the *lex situs* but also in the *forum situs* In short the Calcutta High Court would appear to hold that suits of the kind mentioned in cls (a) to (e) of s 16 of the Code are all suits for land (w) The same view was taken until recently by the Madras High Court (x) In *Vellappa Chettiar v Govinda Dass* (y) a Full Bench of the Madras High Court held that a suit by a purchaser of land situate outside Madras for specific performance of a contract to sell made in Madras against the vendor who resides in Madras is not a suit for land and is cognisable by the High Court of Madras In the view taken by Courts Trotter C J a suit in which the plaintiff asks for a decree which if passed, would compel the defendant to do or abstain from doing something which the Court orders him to do would not be a suit for land but a suit in which a plaintiff asks for a decree which if passed would bring about *proprio vigore* an immediate change in the ownership of property would be a suit for land (z) Thus a suit for maintenance in which the plaintiff prays that the amount may be charged on specific land is a suit for land for if a charge is created by the decree it can be enforced by a sale of the land (a)

The High Court of Bombay gives a very restricted meaning to the expression suit for land Sir Charles Sargent in *Holkar v Dadabhai* (b) held that the Court had jurisdiction to try a suit for specific performance of an agreement to execute a mortgage made in Bombay of land situate outside the original jurisdiction. The ratio decidendi was that the expression suit for land was intended to exclude from the Court's jurisdiction only such suits relating to land as if brought in England, the Courts would refuse to entertain on the ground that the land was situate abroad. This case was followed, though sometimes with evident reluctance for many years Farren C J in an unreported case (c) passed a foreclosure decree on a mortgage of land outside jurisdiction, and this was followed by Strachey J in *Sorabji v Ruttonji* (d) In *Hunraj v Bhachordas* (e) a purchaser a suit for specific performance of an agreement to sell land situate beyond the local limits of jurisdiction was entertained although the prayer was that the defendant be ordered upon making out a marketable title to execute a conveyance thereof to the plaintiff In *Venkatras v Ahimji* (f) a suit for sale was decreed on a mortgage of land outside jurisdiction and Scott C J said that such a suit was not a suit for land as it was not a suit to obtain land or to obtain a declaration of title to land or to obtain damages for interference with land. This case was followed by

(f) *Kant Chunder v Kis ory Mohun Roy* (189 ) 19 Cal 361 at p 365

(u) *Ed Ah m v P o as Chu der* (1900) 36 Cal 59 11 C 47

(v) *Goculji v Cl ganial* (19 7) 54 Cal 655 104 L E 7 1 ( 7 ) A C 789

(w) *Sud md A Coal L v Empira Coal Co* (1915) 4 Cal 912 951 95 31 L C 581

(x) *Vai m v Ari Anas wmy* (1904) 27 Mad 157 161

(y) (19 9) 52 Mad 809

(z) (19 9) 5 11 d 809 815

(a) *Sundara Bai v Tirumal* (1910) 33 Mad 11 31 C 930

(b) (1890) 14 Bom 353

(c) *Keerajji v Ahimji* suit No. 91 of 11

(d) (1898) Bom 701

(e) (1905) 7 Bom L. R. 319

(f) (19 4) 5 Bom L. R. 335 80 L. C. 41-

Let Pat [Cal, Bom, and

much hesitation by Shah J and Jasraj v Akubai (g) which was also a suit for sale by a mortgagee. On the other hand Jenkins C J in *Vaghoji v Camaj* (h) correctly summarised the principles on which the Courts in England exercise jurisdiction in suits relating to land abroad and refused to make a declaration of title to land outside jurisdiction. This was followed in *Pranlal v Goculdas* (i) where Pratt J held that the Court had no jurisdiction to make a declaration as to which of two mortgages of land outside jurisdiction had priority. In *Yesudabai v Janardhan* (j) Fawcett J held that a suit by a wife praying that her maintenance be secured by a charge on her husband's immovable property in Bombay was a suit for land. The same learned Judge in *Rajah Kotakal v Malabar Timber Co* (k) said that if the land is outside jurisdiction a suit to declare a charge on it is not a suit for land but resided from this opinion in his judgment in *Hatimkhas v Framroz* (l).

Now as explained by Jenkins C J in *Vaghoji v Camaj* (m) the Courts in England do not entertain suits for land outside jurisdiction unless (1) the defendant is in England and (2) there is some privity between the parties on the ground of contract trust or fraud. The defendant in *Holkar's case* did not reside or carry on business in Bombay and this fact appears to have been overlooked in the judgment. The case was adversely criticized on this ground in previous editions of this commentary and that criticism was entirely accepted by a Full Bench of the Bombay High Court in *India Spinning and Weaving Co v Climax Syndicate* (n). In that case the plaintiff mortgagees had filed a suit against the defendant mortgagor who resided out of jurisdiction asking for the sale of the mortgaged properties which were also outside jurisdiction. The mortgage had been executed in Bombay and though curiously enough the judgment does not refer to this fact that was the circumstance which brought the case within *Holkar v Dadabhai*. Nevertheless the Court overruling *Holkar v Dadabhai* said the suit was not competent. The Court entirely agreed with the Calcutta decisions and quoted with approval the dictum of Jenkins C J in *Sudamdih Coal Co v Empire Coal Co* (o) that regard must be had to the substance of the suit in deciding whether it was a suit for land.

But the Bombay High Court has again changed its mind in *Hatimkhas v Framroz* (p) a Full Bench has held that a suit by a mortgagee to enforce his mortgage by sale of the land mortgaged is not a suit for land and that if the mortgagor lives within jurisdiction the High Court can entertain the suit even though the land is wholly outside the limits of its original civil jurisdiction. The judgment does not proceed on the equitable jurisdiction wrongly claimed in *Holkar's case* but rests on two main grounds (1) that a suit for sale on a mortgage is a suit in personam to recover a debt and (2) that suits for land are suits the primary object of which is to obtain a declaration of title to or possession of land. This view is inconsistent with the definition of mortgage in sec 53 of the Transfer of Property Act 1882. The same High Court has held (q) following *Hatimkhas's case* and dissenting from *Pranlal v Goculdas* (r) that the High Court has jurisdiction in a suit brought by an equitable mortgagee against the mortgagor for lands situate outside Bombay to impound a legal mortgage residing out of Bombay and alleging a prior legal mortgage in his favour provided the legal mortgage is executed in Bombay.

(g) (1941) 6 Bom L.R. 559 80 I.C. 1007  
(241 A B 419

(h) (1905) 4 Bom 49

(i) (1911) 7 Bom L.R. 270 53 I.C. 9 (25)

A B 333

(j) (1933) 5 Bom L.R. 111 51 I.C. 76

(k) (1914) 4 Bom L.R. 141

(l) (1914) 4 Bom L.R. 63 50 I.C. 1049 (14) A B

41

(m) (1915) 51 Bom L.R. 104 I.C. 8 (16) A B

41 B

(n) (1905) 2 I.M. 19

(o) (1905) 50 L.R. 1 91 I.C. 81 (16) A B

1 B B

(p) (1915) 4 Cal 91 31 I.C. 31

(q) (1915) 51 I.M. 310 104 I.C. 4 (16) A B

- 51 B

(r) *Shamindra v E. Zamland* (1909) 21

Bom L.R. 100

(s) (1912) 2 Bom L.R. 10 53 I.C. 9 (16) A B

4 B 333



## Let Pat [Cal, Bom, and Mad]

## Cl 12

Suits for the partition of land and suits for a declaration of title to land are suits for land and will not be entertained if the land is outside jurisdiction (a) A suit for damages for trespass to land is a suit for land (b) Suits for the recovery of title deeds are according to the Calcutta High Court not suits for land (u) but the Bombay High Court has held that they are if a question of title to land is involved (v) This seems incorrect for as said in *India Spinning and Weaving Co v Climax Syndicate* (w) it is difficult to see how a suit to recover title deeds can be beyond the jurisdiction of the Court if the defendant is within the jurisdiction

The Bombay High Court has held that an administration suit is not a suit for land although there are immovable properties alleged to belong to the estate of the deceased beyond jurisdiction and the High Court therefore can entertain such a suit and determine the question whether they belonged to the deceased at the time of his death. If the suit is otherwise within jurisdiction no leave under cl. 12 is necessary merely because the immovable properties or some of them are situated beyond jurisdiction (x) The High Court of Calcutta has held that a suit for administration, and as incidental to that suit for a declaration that certain leases granted by the executors of the estate cannot stand as against the plaintiff (the beneficiary) is not a suit for land (y). In a Privy Council case where a suit was brought by three out of four executors against the fourth executor for his removal from the office of trustee and executor and for accounts of the assets of the deceased and for administration of his estate it was held that the suit was not one for land, and that the High Court of Madras had jurisdiction to entertain the suit though the property left by the deceased was outside jurisdiction as a part of the cause of action had arisen within the jurisdiction, and the defendant was dwelling in Madras at the time of the institution of the suit (z). In a Calcutta case it was held that the High Court may entertain a suit by an executor for a declaration and injunction (though not for possession) in respect of the estate of the testator consisting of several immovable properties provided one at least of the properties is situated within its original jurisdiction and leave of the Court is obtained it is not necessary that the cause of action should arise within the local limits or be specifically with reference to that property which is situated within those limits (a)

Every suit which has any reference to land is not a suit for land (b) In *La J Mortgage Bank v Sudurudeen Ahmed Trevelyan, J* said I decline to hold that wherever land has anything to do with a suit it is therefore a suit for land (c) Thus a suit by a trustee against his co trustees to enforce his right under a deed of trust jointly with the defendants as shabait and manager of lands dedicated to an idol in which neither the plaintiff nor the defendants have any beneficial interest is not a suit for land and may be entertained by the High Court though the lands may be situated outside jurisdiction (d) So a suit for an account and dissolution of partnership is not a suit for land

- (a) *D'Almeida v London Bank v W dia* (18 6) 1 Cal 249 *E. of Indan Highway Co v Hejal C. I Co* (18 6) 1 Cal 95 *Har Lal v Nizam* (1900) 9 Cal 315 *Sum v Jashnasumji* (1904) 27 M d 17 181 *Ja am v Almarum* (1880) 4 Bom 48 9 Bom 49 *supra*

- (b) *Lalnia Collery Co v Bipan* (1912) 39 Cal 732 17 I C 540 *Fayhori v Camaj* (1905) 9 Bom 21 *Sudind & Coal Co v Emp Co Coal Co* (1911) 3 Cal 91 31 I C 3 *B. with South Africa Co v Companhia de Mocambique* (1903) A C 60

- (c) *Jaggernath v Brif* (18 9) 4 Cal 3  
(e) *Zulekhai v Fbrahim* (1913) 37 Bom 491 17 I C 193  
(w) (19 6) 50 Lom 1 21 I C 847 ( 6) A B I

- (x) *M. Homel Hy v Abd I Hu* (1911) 41 Bom 5 21 I C 40 (1) A B 33 *Abd I Hu v Abd I Hu* (1912) 46 Lom 7 8 I C 161 (1911) A B 413

- (y) *Natani v Nanda Lal* (1913) 30 Cal 373 333  
(z) *Srinivasa v Vantala* (1906) 23 Mad 179 affirmed in 34 Mad 241 A B 179 followed in *Arushnados v Chaudhary* (19 5) 49 Mad L J 311 91 I C 14 (25) A B 1081

- (a) *Ganoda Sundary v Nalini* (19 3) 38 Cal 4 11 I C 514  
(b) *Suppal mba v Puddumony* (19 3) 13 B L R 314 3 0  
(c) (190) 10 Cal 338 387  
(d) *Suppal mba v Puddumony* (1900) 13 B L R 316

Let Pat [Cal, Bom, and

for land because one asset of the partnership happens to be a tea garden situate in the mufassal (e)

All other cases —suits for partition of movable and immovable property the latter being situated wholly outside jurisdiction—The words all other cases in this clause do not include cases of suits for immovable *plus* movable property. They refer to cases in which immovable property is not involved. Hence if A sues B for partition of movable and immovable property and the immovable property is situated wholly outside jurisdiction the suit must be dismissed as to such property even if the leave of the Court has been obtained. This is because the immovable property being situated wholly outside jurisdiction the Court has no power to grant leave to sue as regards such property (f). In such a case the plaint may be amended with the leave of the Court by omitting paragraphs which relate to immovable property and the suit may be proceeded with so far as it relates to movable property (g).

Suit for land of which part is within jurisdiction—Where there are several immovable properties then if even one of them is situated within jurisdiction the Court can entertain a suit for a partition of all the properties including those situated outside jurisdiction provided the leave of the Court has been first obtained. Such a case comes within the following words of cl 12 namely the said High Court shall be empowered to determine suits of every description if in the case of suits for land, such land shall be situated either wholly or in case the leave of the Court shall have been first obtained in part within the local limits (h). But in *Malimbhas v Framro* (i) some of the Judges were of opinion that the condition as to leave of the Court did not apply to suits for land where some part of the land was situate outside jurisdiction. If some of the properties are situated within and some outside jurisdiction but no leave is obtained the Court can proceed only with the suit so far as it relates to the immovable properties situated within jurisdiction (j). Similarly if some of the properties included in a deed of mortgage are within and some outside the jurisdiction the Court has jurisdiction on leave to sue being obtained to entertain a suit on the mortgage in respect of all the properties including those situated outside jurisdiction (k) but not if the properties outside jurisdiction are the subject of a *separate* mortgage (l). The same rules apply where some of the properties are situated in British India and some outside British India (m). See notes above scope of the clause.

Leave of Court—The leave under this clause is a condition precedent to jurisdiction so that unless the condition is fulfilled by obtaining the necessary leave to sue the Court will have no jurisdiction to entertain the suit (n). Such leave affords the very foundation of the jurisdiction hence it must be obtained before the institution of the suit it cannot be granted after the suit has been instituted. The leave granted is confined to the cause or causes of action set forth in the plaint at the time when the leave was granted hence the plaint cannot be amended so as to alter the cause of action (o). But

- (e) *o Kellie v F. & C. (18)* 3 Cal 445 464  
 (f) *Ja m v. Alim ram (14)* 4 Bom 48  
*Ha a L li v. Vithoba (190)* 3 Cal  
 315 *S. Agara v. I. m. L. a (1830)* 19  
 31 1 445  
 (g) *Abt I. Karim v. F. Ibrahim (190)* 5 M d  
 16  
 (A) *B. hood v. V. ei d s (1914)* 16 1 m L. R.  
 63 69 31 C 91 s e con appeal  
 to 1 C (1916) 43 1 4 56 (1916) 40  
 14 m C 3 1 C 403 77 1 C 934  
 (1) A B 3 4  
 (i) (19) 51 11 m 516 104 1 C 8 (1917) A B  
 8 1 11  
 (j) *I. Iram v. Pancha naga (1894)* 2. Bom

- D 9 3 1 ncha naga v. Sakh Chakr  
 (185) 14 Cal 853  
 (k) *Ha. Jee Lal v. H. a. Da. (1914)* 41 1 A  
 110 41 Cal 9 32 C 63 *M. I. p. e*  
*cond C v. V. Agara Ld (1911)* 3 Cal.  
 8 1 13 1 C. 4 ) *S. m. L. a naga* *Naga*  
*P. I. (1911)* 37 Cal 93 911 1 C 114  
 (l) *A. K. A. K. v. V. m. naga (190)* 24  
 C. W. 633 56 1 C. 3  
 (m) *G. m. L. a v. B. s. Lal (19)* 46 Bom 19  
 77 1 C 931 (191) A B 3 3 *P. m*  
*ch. p. v. Anan. Acharya (1 21)* 15 Bom  
 3 9 (a case under s 17 of the Code)  
 (n) *D. N. m. v. Cal (1 6)* 3 M H C. 3 4  
 (o) *I. m. p. naga v. Pancha naga (1 21)* 15 Bom 93

## Let Pat (Cal, Bom, and Mad)

**CI 12** if the cause of action is not altered there is no objection to an amendment (p) If a suit is brought in a Chartered High Court with leave of the Court but there is nothing on the face of the plaint to show that any part of the cause of action arose within its jurisdiction, the plaintiff may be allowed to prove by evidence that part of the cause of action arose within the jurisdiction and if it is necessary to amend the plaint by adding a statement that part of the cause of action arose within the jurisdiction the amendment may be allowed for such an amendment does not alter or add to the original cause of action (q). Where a defendant who does not reside within the jurisdiction and against whom the cause of action has arisen in part only within the jurisdiction is added after the institution of the suit leave under this clause must be obtained at the time of the application for adding him as a party though leave was obtained when the suit was originally filed (r). The force of an order granting leave to institute a suit is exhausted when the suit is instituted in pursuance of the order. Hence if the suit is withdrawn with liberty to bring a fresh suit upon the same cause of action and a fresh suit is brought there is nothing to prevent the Court from granting fresh leave to institute the fresh suit (s).

The leave under this section must be distinctly applied for and obtained. It cannot be implied from the fact that the plaintiff was granted leave to sue as a pauper (t) or from the fact that a defendant is added who does not reside within the jurisdiction (u). Nor can it be presumed from the fact that the Court orders a third party notice to be served on a party resident outside its jurisdiction. The defendant taking out such notice must apply for leave under Clause 12 and the leave must be endorsed on the notice as it is on a plaint (v). The granting of leave under this clause is discretionary (w).

**Cause of action**—See notes to s. 20 of the Code. Cause of action, Cause of action in suit on contracts and Cause of action in other suits above.

**If the cause of action shall have arisen in part.**—It has been said in two Bombay cases that the words if the cause of action shall have arisen in part refer to a material part of the cause of action (x). There is nothing in the language of this clause to warrant such a construction though the Court may in the exercise of its discretion refuse to grant leave to sue if a material part of the cause of action did not arise within its jurisdiction. The High Court of Madras has held that in dealing with applications for leave to sue under this clause the Court is not precluded from taking the question of convenience into consideration (y).

For other cases see notes to s. 20 of the Code. Cause of action in suits on contracts, and Cause of action in other suits above.

**Defendant**—The word defendant in this clause means all the defendants where there are two or more defendants to a suit. It is not sufficient that one of the defendants dwells or carries on business within the jurisdiction (z).

**Jurisdiction over non resident foreigners**—See notes to s. 20 of the Code. Suits against non resident foreigners above.

The question whether the fact of carrying on business through an agent within the local limits of jurisdiction would give the Court jurisdiction over a non resident foreigner

- (p) *Poolibai v Fampriab* (1893) 17 Bom 46  
 (q) *Pank v Baido Das* (1899) 25 C. 1 715  
 (r) *Fampriab v Poolibai* (1894) 20 Bom 767  
     *Fampriab v (a) shakti* (19 3)  
     *Lom J R 7 85 I C 461* (21) A B 109  
 (s) *Saba pidi v Lakshmi* (1901) 21 Mad 293  
 (t) *Jas v Atm ram* (1883) 4 Bom 482  
 (u) (1896) 20 Bom 767 s p a  
 (v) *Krishna Elahi v Sher Ahmad* (19 0) 45 Bom  
     159 I C 23 reversing *Held & Co v*

- Sher Mahomed* (1919) 21 Bom L. K. An  
 59 I C 13  
 (w) *Wick v Laxmi* (1907) 29 P. 6  
     L. R. 131 100 I C 946 (23) A B 603  
 (x) *Ke v v Laxmi* (1911) 913 Bom 21  
     1 691 s v *Doulatram* (1851) 11 Bom  
     257 267  
 (y) *Seethagiri v Ashwary* (1907) 37 M 143  
 (z) *Hadi v Ismail v Hadji Mahomed* (19  
     13 B L. R. 91

Let Pat [Cal, Bom, and M

was raised before the Privy Council but was not decided (a) The Madras High Court has held that it does (b)

**Dwell**—See notes to s. 20 of the Code of Letters Patent. **Dwell within the meaning of clause 12**

**Carries on business** —See notes to s. 20 of the Code above under the same head.

Personally works for gain—See notes to s. 20 of the Code

Suits against companies—See notes to s 20      Suits against corporation

**Suits of every description**—This expression has been held to confer upon the Court matrimonial jurisdiction over Jews (c)

**Ordinary jurisdiction**—The ordinary jurisdiction of the High Court embraces all such as is exercised in the ordinary course of law and without any special occasion or special order being necessary therefor (d)

**Appeal**—The leave under this clause is granted on an ex parte application. If an order is made granting leave the defendant may apply to have the order set aside or he may wait until the hearing or the legality of the order may be called in question as a separate issue for trial at the hearing of the suit (e). If the defendant does not wait until the hearing and applies to have the order granting the leave set aside and if the application is rejected he may appeal from the order rejecting the application (f). Similarly if the plaintiff applies for leave and leave is refused the plaintiff may appeal from the order (g). The appeal would be one under cl. 13 of the Letters Patent.

The order granting or refusing leave by one Judge cannot be superseded by another Judge *except on appeal from the order (h)*

**Waiver**—There are two classes of cases to be considered under this head, namely:—

- (1) where the plaintiff in his plaint alleges that *part* of the cause of action arose outside the local limits of the ordinary original civil jurisdiction and fails to obtain leave and the case comes on for trial
- (2) where the plaintiff in his plaint alleges that the *whole* cause of action arose within the local limits of the ordinary original civil jurisdiction but it turns out at the trial that part of the cause of action arose within and part outside the local limits of the ordinary original civil jurisdiction.

In case (1) the defendant may by appearing and pleading waive the objection to the jurisdiction. Thus it was held by the High Court of Calcutta (5) following *Moore v Gamgee* (7) in a case where the plaintiff alleged in his plaint that part of the cause of action had arisen within the local limits of the ordinary original civil jurisdiction but no leave was obtained by the plaintiff under clause 1, and the defendant without raising any objection to the jurisdiction filed his written statement and applied subsequently for a commission to examine witnesses that the defendant had waived his objection to the jurisdiction. The decisions proceeded on the ground that the absence of leave under

(a) 4 m L 4 M rugosa (19013) 6 M 1

(b) J 0211 A 119 3145 M 1 L J

4 1 0 1 6 75 (4) 6 34 154

( )  $I_{\text{max}} = 1.5 \text{ A}$  (196) 50 1 m  
300 04 I ( 50 ( 6) A R 169

(d) A circularly T-free (191) 161 & 16

( ) *Let sowj v L km d (16 9) 33 I m 404*

14

(f) <sup>14</sup> Lagh j v kamaj (190) "2 1 m 19

40

|     |   |   |   |   |    |        |        |   |   |   |   |   |     |   |   |   |       |     |     |    |    |
|-----|---|---|---|---|----|--------|--------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|---|---|---|-------|-----|-----|----|----|
| (a) | 4 | m | l | s | 11 | rugosa | (1903) | 6 | M | 1 | H | 1 | per | 1 | m | 1 | Madge | Mal | med | (1 | 1) |
|-----|---|---|---|---|----|--------|--------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|---|---|---|-------|-----|-----|----|----|

(b) *J. mull.* 1/1 (A) (19/3) 45 M 1 L 3 (g) *De* 1/1 (A) (15/3) 3 M 1 L 3

(9) 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 82 83 84 85 86 87 88 89 90 91 92 93 94 95 96 97 98 99 100 101 102 103 104 105 106 107 108 109 110 111 112 113 114 115 116 117 118 119 120 121 122 123 124 125 126 127 128 129 130 131 132 133 134 135 136 137 138 139 140 141 142 143 144 145 146 147 148 149 150 151 152 153 154 155 156 157 158 159 160 161 162 163 164 165 166 167 168 169 170 171 172 173 174 175 176 177 178 179 180 181 182 183 184 185 186 187 188 189 190 191 192 193 194 195 196 197 198 199 200 201 202 203 204 205 206 207 208 209 210 211 212 213 214 215 216 217 218 219 220 221 222 223 224 225 226 227 228 229 230 231 232 233 234 235 236 237 238 239 240 241 242 243 244 245 246 247 248 249 250 251 252 253 254 255 256 257 258 259 260 261 262 263 264 265 266 267 268 269 270 271 272 273 274 275 276 277 278 279 280 281 282 283 284 285 286 287 288 289 290 291 292 293 294 295 296 297 298 299 300 301 302 303 304 305 306 307 308 309 310 311 312 313 314 315 316 317 318 319 320 321 322 323 324 325 326 327 328 329 330 331 332 333 334 335 336 337 338 339 340 341 342 343 344 345 346 347 348 349 350 351 352 353 354 355 356 357 358 359 360 361 362 363 364 365 366 367 368 369 370 371 372 373 374 375 376 377 378 379 380 381 382 383 384 385 386 387 388 389 390 391 392 393 394 395 396 397 398 399 400 401 402 403 404 405 406 407 408 409 410 411 412 413 414 415 416 417 418 419 420 421 422 423 424 425 426 427 428 429 430 431 432 433 434 435 436 437 438 439 440 441 442 443 444 445 446 447 448 449 450 451 452 453 454 455 456 457 458 459 460 461 462 463 464 465 466 467 468 469 470 471 472 473 474 475 476 477 478 479 480 481 482 483 484 485 486 487 488 489 490 491 492 493 494 495 496 497 498 499 500 501 502 503 504 505 506 507 508 509 510 511 512 513 514 515 516 517 518 519 520 521 522 523 524 525 526 527 528 529 530 531 532 533 534 535 536 537 538 539 540 541 542 543 544 545 546 547 548 549 550 551 552 553 554 555 556 557 558 559 560 561 562 563 564 565 566 567 568 569 570 571 572 573 574 575 576 577 578 579 580 581 582 583 584 585 586 587 588 589 590 591 592 593 594 595 596 597 598 599 600 601 602 603 604 605 606 607 608 609 610 611 612 613 614 615 616 617 618 619 620 621 622 623 624 625 626 627 628 629 630 631 632 633 634 635 636 637 638 639 640 641 642 643 644 645 646 647 648 649 650 651 652 653 654 655 656 657 658 659 660 661 662 663 664 665 666 667 668 669 670 671 672 673 674 675 676 677 678 679 680 681 682 683 684 685 686 687 688 689 690 691 692 693 694 695 696 697 698 699 700 701 702 703 704 705 706 707 708 709 710 711 712 713 714 715 716 717 718 719 720 721 722 723 724 725 726 727 728 729 730 731 732 733 734 735 736 737 738 739 740 741 742 743 744 745 746 747 748 749 750 751 752 753 754 755 756 757 758 759 760 761 762 763 764 765 766 767 768 769 770 771 772 773 774 775 776 777 778 779 780 781 782 783 784 785 786 787 788 789 790 791 792 793 794 795 796 797 798 799 800 801 802 803 804 805 806 807 808 809 810 811 812 813 814 815 816 817 818 819 820 821 822 823 824 825 826 827 828 829 830 831 832 833 834 835 836 837 838 839 840 841 842 843 844 845 846 847 848 849 850 851 852 853 854 855 856 857 858 859 860 861 862 863 864 865 866 867 868 869 870 871 872 873 874 875 876 877 878 879 880 881 882 883 884 885 886 887 888 889 890 891 892 893 894 895 896 897 898 899 900 901 902 903 904 905 906 907 908 909 910 911 912 913 914 915 916 917 918 919 920 921 922 923 924 925 926 927 928 929 930 931 932 933 934 935 936 937 938 939 940 941 942 943 944 945 946 947 948 949 950 951 952 953 954 955 956 957 958 959 960 961 962 963 964 965 966 967 968 969 970 971 972 973 974 975 976 977 978 979 980 981 982 983 984 985 986 987 988 989 990 991 992 993 994 995 996 997 998 999 1000 1001 1002 1003 1004 1005 1006 1007 1008 1009 1010 1011 1012 1013 1014 1015 1016 1017 1018 1019 1020 1021 1022 1023 1024 1025 1026 1027 1028 1029 1030 1031 1032 1033 1034 1035 1036 1037 1038 1039 1040 1041 1042 1043

(c)  $\frac{1}{2}mv^2 = \frac{1}{2}m(\frac{h}{m\lambda})^2 = \frac{h^2}{2m\lambda^2}$  (19.8) So  $\lambda = \frac{h}{\sqrt{2mE}}$   
So  $\lambda = \frac{6.626 \times 10^{-34}}{\sqrt{2 \times 9.1 \times 10^{-31} \times 100}} = 1.227 \times 10^{-10} \text{ m}$

(d) A circularly T-free (191) 161 & 16

( )  $\Delta \rho$  5000 v L km d (10 9) 33 I m 404

(c)  $41 \pm 4$  (10) B. D. 41. Latency: 1. of

(f) *Id.* v. *Id.* (1981) 99 L.M. 49

40



Let Pat [Cal, Bom, and M

Cl<sub>5</sub> 13

The power of transfer contained in sec. 15 of the Charter Act has nothing to do with the power of removal conferred by the present clause and the Letters Patent make superintendence not appellate jurisdiction the condition of the exercise of the power of removal conferred by this clause. It has accordingly been held that the Court of the Political Resident at Aden being a Court *subject to the superintendence* of the High Court of Bombay within the meaning of the present clause the High Court of Bombay has power to remove a suit from that Court to itself for trial and determination on though the Aden Court is not subject to the *appellate* jurisdiction of the High Court (q).

Let. Pat [Cal, Bom, and Mad]

**Cls 14, 15** Joinder of several causes of action—The word several means separate. Under this clause it is necessary that one cause of action at least should arise within the original jurisdiction of the High Court ( ) Where a suit is founded upon two causes of action one of which is alleged to have arisen partly within the jurisdiction of the Bombay High Court and the other wholly outside the jurisdiction the High Court has power after granting leave to sue in respect of the former cause of action and release 12 to allow the plaintiff to join the latter in the same suit There is nothing in the present clause to show that the power of the Court to make such an order under this clause is limited to cases where one of the causes of action has arisen wholly within the jurisdiction (a) The jurisdiction of the High Court to pass an order under this clause in regard to joinder of cause of action is not taken away by the plea of want of jurisdiction which the defendant may raise in respect of a cause of action so joined (b)

Such causes of action not being for land—This expression means exclude any cause of action which is for land (c)

**15** And We do further ordain that an appeal shall lie to the said High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal from the judgment (not being a judgment passed in the exercise of appellate jurisdiction in respect of a decree or order made in the exercise of appellate jurisdiction by a Court subject to the superintendence of the said High Court, and not being an order made in the exercise of revisional jurisdiction, and not being a sentence or order passed or made in the exercise of the power of superintendence under the provisions of section 107 of the Government of India Act, or in the exercise of criminal jurisdiction) of one Judge of the said High Court or one Judge of any Division Court, pursuant to section 108 of the Government of India Act, and that notwithstanding anything hereinbefore provided an appeal shall lie to the said High Court from a judgment of one Judge of the said High Court or one Judge of any Division Court, pursuant to section 108 of the Government of India Act, made [on or after the first day of February, 1929] in the exercise of appellate jurisdiction in respect of a decree or order made in the exercise of appellate jurisdiction by a Court subject to the superintendence of the said High Court, where the Judge who passed the judgment declares that the case is a fit one for appeal, but that the right of appeal from other judgments of Judges of the said High Court or of such Division Court shall

(1) See *Tulsi v. Govt. of India* (1929) 3 B.M. 111  
(2) *Dor v. T. Ariana Mills Ltd.* (1910) 34 Lora 64 B.L.C. 619

(3) (1929) 3 B.M. 51  
(4) 117 L.C. 111  
(5) 117 L.C. 111

Let Pat [Cal, Bom, and

be to Us, Our Heirs or Successors in Our or Their Privy Council, Cl  
as hereinafter provided

**Amendment**—The above clause except the words enclosed in rectangular brackets is clause 10 as amended by the Letters Patent of 1928 which came into force on the date of publication in Calcutta on the 11th January 1928 in Bombay on the 27th January 1928 and in Madras on the 13th January 1928. Clause 10 of the Allahabad Letters Patent clause 13 of the Rangoon Letters Patent clause 10 of the Lahore Letters Patent and clause 10 of the Patna Letters Patent have been similarly amended and they came into force respectively on the 28th January 1928 2nd February 1928 8th February 1928 and 30th January 1928. The previous Letters Patent were as follows—

And We do further ordain that an appeal shall lie to the said High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal from the judgment (not being an order made in the exercise of revisional jurisdiction and not being a sentence or order passed or made in the exercise of the power of superintendence under the provisions of section 107 of the Government of India Act 1915 or in the exercise of criminal jurisdiction) of one Judge of the said High Court or one Judge of any Division Court pursuant to section 13 of the said recited Act and that an appeal shall also lie to the said High Court from the judgment (not being a sentence or order as aforesaid) of two or more Judges of the said High Court or of such Division Court whenever such Judges are equally divided in opinion and do not amount in number to a majority of the whole of the Judges of the said High Court at the time being but that the right of appeal from other judgments of the Judges of the said High Court or of such Division Court shall be to Us Our heirs or successors in Our or Their Privy Council as hereinafter provided

The effect of the amendments made in 1928 is—

- (1) the exclusion of a right of appeal from a judgment passed by a single Judge sitting in second appeal unless the Judge who passed the judgment grants a certificate that the case is a fit one for appeal. There is no question of grant of certificate that the case is a fit one for appeal in the case of two Judges composing a Division Bench differing in opinion (d)
- (2) the exclusion of a right of appeal when the Judges of a Division Bench are equally divided in opinion. This case is provided for by the amendment of clause 36

There is as before an unqualified right of appeal from the judgment of a single Judge on the original side

As to amendment no (1) it was held by the High Court of Calcutta that it had no retrospective effect and that it could not apply to suits filed before the amended Letters Patent came into force (e). The clause was therefore again amended by adding the words in rectangular brackets namely on or after the first day of February 1929. The result is that there is no right of appeal from the judgment of a single Judge sitting in second appeal in cases where the judgment is pronounced after the 1st February 1929 whatever may be the date when the suit was filed unless a certificate is granted declaring that the case is a fit one for appeal (f)

(d) *Pratt v. Chakravarty* (1929) 56 Cal. 61  
(e) *Pratt v. Chakravarty* (1929) 56 Cal. 61  
(f) *Pratt v. Chakravarty* (1929) 56 Cal. 61



Let Pat. [Cal., Bom., and Mad.]

Cl 15

bearing of "judgment" as used in this clause —

1. *Calcutta High Court*—The bearing case on the subject is that of *The J. & F. I. Co. for Calcutta v. The Oriental Gas Co.* (2) decided by the High Court of Calcutta as far back as 1872. In that case C. J. said: "We think judgment means a decision in which affords the rule of the question between the parties a right or liability. It may be either final or preliminary or interlocutory. The difference between them being that a final judgment determines the whole case and a preliminary or interlocutory judgment determines only a part of it. Some matters to be determined. This definition is now of some antiquity and has been held to be correct if it has not already become almost classical (1). The principle was laid down in *The Justice of the Peace for Calcutta v. The Oriental Gas Co.* was this: so as to be liable under this clause from an order directing the issue of a mandamus to the Justice of the Peace for Calcutta to compel them to refer to arbitration a question relating to the gas. The above decision was followed by a decision of the same Court in *Haji Imam v. Haji Mahomed* (3) where it was held that an appeal lies under this clause from an order refusing to set aside an order granting leave to sue to the plaintiff under the Letters Patent. Referring to the said order C. J. said: "It is not a formal order or an order merely regulating the procedure in the suit but one that has the effect of giving a jurisdiction to the Court which it otherwise would not have. It may fairly be said to determine some right between them as the right to sue in a civil Court and to compel the defendants who are not within its jurisdiction to sue and defend the suit or if they do not to make them liable to have a decree passed against them in their absence. In a later case *Carth v. C. J.* said: "I think that the word judgment means a judgment or decree which decides the case one way or the other in its entirety and that it does not mean a decision or order of an interlocutory character which merely decides some isolated point not affecting the result of the entire suit. (4) In a recent case *Pankin v. C. J.* said: "The mere circumstance that an order puts in peril the finality of a decision given in the regular course does not of itself make that order a judgment (5).

The definition of judgment in the case of *Justices of the Peace for Calcutta* was adopted by a majority of the same High Court in a later case where it was held that an appeal lies under this clause from an order made by a single Justice of the Court under Order 4, rule 10 refusing to transmit for execution an Order of His Majesty's Council (6). The decision was affirmed on appeal to the Privy Council (7). Referring to the judgment of the majority their Lordships said: "These learned Justices and their Lordships think rightly that whether the transmission of an order under Order 4, rule 10 would or would not be a merely ministerial proceeding for the Justices (8) the case order was appealed from) had in fact exercised a judicial function and hence to a decision of great importance which if it remained would conclude any rights of Habsunleri for an execution in this suit. They held therefore that it was a judgment within the meaning of clause 15. In a later case (9) C. J. said that the definition of judgment given by Couch C. J. had never been so widely as absolutely exhaustive and that in every case where the Court was called

(1) (1872) 12 L. R. 211.

(2) (1872) 12 L. R. 211.

(3) (1872) 12 L. R. 211.

(4) (1872) 12 L. R. 211.

(5) (1872) 12 L. R. 211.

(6) (1872) 12 L. R. 211.

(7) (1872) 12 L. R. 211.

(8) (1872) 12 L. R. 211.

(9) (1872) 12 L. R. 211.

(10) (1872) 12 L. R. 211.

(11) (1872) 12 L. R. 211.

(12) (1872) 12 L. R. 211.

(13) (1872) 12 L. R. 211.

(14) (1872) 12 L. R. 211.

Let Pat [Cal, Bom, and Mad]

upon to decide whether the decision under appeal was or was not a judgment ' Cl  
regard must be had to the nature of the order (o)

2 *Bombay High Court*—The definition of judgment as given in the two Calcutta cases cited above has been adopted by the High Court of Bombay. In *Miya Mahomed v Zorabi* (p) Scott C J referring to the above Calcutta cases said For a considerable number of years in this Court those two decisions (q) have to my knowledge been regarded as the leading decisions to be followed on the question whether an order in any particular case is a judgment within the meaning of clause 15 of the Letters Patent. The leading Bombay case is *Sonbai v Ahmedbhai* decided in the year 1872 (r).

3 *Madras High Court*—Turning now to the Madras decisions the earlier leading case on the subject was *De Souza v Coles* (s) decided in the year 1868. The modern leading case is that of *Tuljaram v Alagappa* (t) decided by a Full Bench of that Court in 1910. In the former case Bittlestone J said The word judgment cannot be limited to the final judgment in the suit but must be held to have the more general meaning of any decision or determination affecting the rights or the interest of any suitor or applicant. When the language giving the appeal is so general in its terms as that contained in the 15th clause of the Charter it is we think impossible to prescribe any limits to the right of appeal founded upon the nature of the order or decree appealed from. This definition has now been rejected as too wide and instead thereof we have another definition of the term judgment laid down in *Tuljaram's* case. In that case White C J said as follows—

The test seems to me to be not what is the form of the adjudication but what is its effect in the suit or proceeding in which it is made. If its effect whatever its form may be and whatever be the nature of the application on which it is made is to put an end to the suit or proceeding so far as the Court before which the suit or proceeding is pending is concerned or if its effect if it is not complied with is to put an end to the suit or proceedings I think the adjudication is a judgment within the meaning of the clause. An adjudication on an application which is nothing more than a step towards obtaining a final adjudication in the suit is not in my opinion a judgment within the meaning of the Letters Patent. I think too an order on an independent proceeding which is ancillary to the suit (not in title as a step towards judgment but with a view to render the judgment effective if obtained)—e.g. an order on an application for an interim injunction or for the appointment of a receiver is a judgment within the meaning of the clause.

It will be seen that the definition of judgment as stated by White C J is wider than that in *Justice of the Peace for Calcutta* and narrower than the one in *De Souza v Coles*. Referring to the former case White C J said that he was not prepared to say as was said in that case that judgment within the meaning of this clause must be a decision which affects the merits by determining some right or liability. The learned Chief Justice said I think the decision may be a judgment for the purposes of the clause though

- (p) 11 B 115 (1871) 44 (1) 11 B 115  
al 1 115 11 (1871) 44 (1) 11 B 115  
J 1 115 11 (1871) 44 (1) 11 B 115  
(1871) 45 (1) 115 11 (1871) 44 (1) 11 B 115  
M 115 11 (1871) 44 (1) 11 B 115  
11 11 (1871) 44 (1) 11 B 115  
11 11 (1871) 44 (1) 11 B 115  
(r) (1872) 11 B 115 11 (1872) 11 B 115  
11 11 (1872) 11 B 115 11 (1872) 11 B 115  
11 11 (1872) 11 B 115 11 (1872) 11 B 115  
(s) (1868) 11 B 115 11 (1868) 11 B 115  
11 11 (1868) 11 B 115 11 (1868) 11 B 115  
11 11 (1868) 11 B 115 11 (1868) 11 B 115  
(t) (1910) 11 B 115 11 (1910) 11 B 115  
11 11 (1910) 11 B 115 11 (1910) 11 B 115  
11 11 (1910) 11 B 115 11 (1910) 11 B 115  
(u) (1872) 11 B 115 11 (1872) 11 B 115  
11 11 (1872) 11 B 115 11 (1872) 11 B 115  
11 11 (1872) 11 B 115 11 (1872) 11 B 115

## Let Pat [Cal, Bom, and Mad]

**CI 15** it does not affect the merits of the suit or proceeding and does not determine any question of right raised in the suit or proceeding. The result is that some orders which have been held not to be appealable by the Calcutta High Court have been held to be appealable by the Madras High Court e.g. an order under cl 13 of the Letters Patent transferring a suit from a subordinate Court to the High Court (u). Such an order of transfer is appealable in Madras as it puts an end to the suit as it stood in the Court from which it was transferred while an order refusing a transfer is not appealable as the proceedings are allowed to go on (v). Referring to the definition of judgment in *De Souza v Coles* the learned Chief Justice said that it was too wide.

**1 Allahabad High Court—L P cl (10)**—In Allahabad it has been generally held that no order which is appealable under s 104 and O 43 r 1 is appealable under the present clause (w). And further no appellate order from which a second appeal is excluded under section 104 can be appealed from under this clause (x). Conversely an order from which an appeal is allowed under s 104 and O 43 r 1 to the High Court from a subordinate Court is an order from which an appeal will lie under this clause (y). The only definition hitherto given by that Court of the word judgment is that it must be such a judgment on the part of all the learned and honourable Judges who may constitute a Bench as disposes of the suit or the appeal before it (z). See notes to s 104 Letters Patent appeal.

**2 Lahore High Court—L P cl (10)**—The High Court of Lahore has adopted the definition of judgment as given by White C.J. in *Tuljaram's case* referred to above under the head Madras High Court (a). In a recent case it was held that the expression judgment in this clause is not synonymous with the word decree as defined in sec 2 of the Code (b).

**3 Rangoon High Court—L P cl (13)**—In a recent Full Bench case (c) the High Court of Rangoon held that the word judgment in cl 13 of the Letters Patent is intended to cover an order as well as a decree but the effect of the judgment must be such as to put an end to the suit or proceeding so far as the Court before which the suit or proceeding is pending is concerned or if its effect is that it is not complied with is to put an end to the suit or proceeding. If it has this effect the adjudication is a judgment otherwise not. The decision of an issue which has the effect of allowing a suit to proceed does not affect the merits or result of the whole suit in that it does not decide the case one way or another and is therefore not a judgment. The decision of a Judge upon a preliminary issue is not binding on his successor and the Judge himself can change his mind on more mature consideration.

**Interlocutory Order**—All the High Courts are now agreed that no appeal lies under this clause from an order merely regulating procedure in a suit or from an order

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>(u) <i>Kh. Izzat v Sonat am</i> (19 0) 47 Cal 1101<br/>67 I C 863 [n t appeal bl] <i>Ar sh a v</i><br/><i>Tha ka Jalia</i> (19 1) 47 W I 136 "3 I C<br/>10 s (-1) 3 M 90 [apf] <i>Abale</i></p> <p>(v) <i>Narsa Iddis v H j T r M hom d</i> (19 3)<br/>61 Mad 3 0 107 I C 806 (-3) A M 219</p> <p>(w) <i>I o F b v Mhd H at</i> (1899) 11 All<br/>3 Mammad v <i>Sh an ulah</i> (189 ) 14<br/>All 2 8 <i>Manab</i> 41 v <i>Yah I Cha d</i><br/>(1 93) 15 All 359 <i>Ban dhar v G lab</i><br/><i>Awe</i> (1901) 16 All 413 448</p> <p>(x) <i>P r Lail v Maf n Lal</i> (191 ) 29 All 191<br/>23 I C 466</p> <p>(y) <i>Nadip tti v In a</i> (1923) 45 All 66<br/>17 O I C 20 (-3) A A 44</p> | <p>(z) <i>Gha Lam v Vura</i> (19 6) 1 All 31<br/>see also <i>H i v Hlow rd</i> (1 1) 1 J<br/>439 41 an i d d al <i>Awe J</i><br/>(19 3) 45 All 26 v J C 80 (-3) 1<br/>41 see also <i>Shawar v</i> <i>Jur de t</i><br/>48 All 684 66 I C 478 (-1) 1 A 6</p> <p>(a) <i>Fulda v ngh v</i> <i>M i</i> (-1) A 1<br/>188 191 196 67 I C 2 2 (-1) A 1<br/>see also <i>1 Lal Ch ad</i> <i>Awe J</i><br/>(1900) 1 Lal 348 55 I C 6 3</p> <p>(b) <i>Sh tha Maf v I v Nara</i> (1909) 11 I<br/>150 111 I C 2 4 (-1) A L 4 4</p> <p>(c) <i>P K P T E Ch J</i> <i>hara</i> <i>1 d 12</i><br/>(1925) 8 Patz. 63, 111 I C 4 1<br/>A R 41</p> |
|---|---|





## Let Pat [Cal, Bom, and

CI

- O 6 r 17 [amendment of pleadings]—see notes Appeal above
- O 9 r 9 [restoring of suit]—see notes Appeal above
- O 9 r 13 [ex parte decree]—see notes Appeal above
- O 11 r 18 [inspection]—see notes Appeal above
- O 14 r 3 [issues]—see notes Appeal above
- O 20 r 10 [accounts]—see notes Letters Patent Appeal above
- O 21 r 68 [claims to property under attachment]—see notes Appeal above
- O 27 r 9 [abatement]—see notes Letters Patent Appeal above
- O 27 r 10 [abatement]—see notes Letters Patent Appeal above
- O 23 r 1 [withdrawal from suit]—see notes Letters Patent Appeal above
- O 25 r 1 [security for costs of suit]—see notes Appeal above
- O 26 r 4 [evidence on commission]—see notes Appeal above
- O 33 r 10 [leave to sue as a pauper]—see notes Letters Patent Appeal above
- O 37 r 3 [leave to defend in a summary suit]—see notes Appeal above
- O 39 r 1 [injunction]—see notes Appeal above
- O 41 r 10 [stay of execution pending appeal]—see notes Appeal above
- O 41 r 10 [striking out appeal for failure to deposit security for costs]—see notes Appeal from order dismissing petition etc above
- O 41 r 13 [remand]—see notes Letters Patent Appeal above
- O 41 r 10 [order directing trial of issue]—see notes Appeal above
- O 44 r 1 [leave to appeal in forma pauperis]—see notes Appeal above
- O 4 r 3 [leave to appeal to Privy Council]—see notes Appeal above
- O 45 r 7 [security for costs of appeal to Privy Council]—see notes Appeal above
- O 45 r 13 [stay of execution pending appeal to Privy Council]—see notes Appeal above
- O 45 r 15 [execution of order of Privy Council]—see notes Letters Patent Appeal above
- O 4 r 7 [review]—see notes Appeal above

Orders in proceedings other than suits and appeals—A judgment within the meaning of this clause need not be an adjudication in a *suit* or *appeal* as technically understood. An adjudication which terminates what may be called an *original* petition like an application for the custody of a minor may be a judgment so as to be appealable under this clause. The following is a list of such adjudications—

- 1 *Habeas corpus*—An appeal lies under this clause from an order deciding the claim of relatives to the custody of a minor on a writ of *Habeas corpus* (1).

## Let Pat [Cal, Bom, and Mad]

CI 15

- 2 *Leave to sue under cl 12 of the charter*—An appeal lies from an order made to set aside an order granting leave to sue under cl 12 of the Letters Patent and also from an order refusing to grant leave to sue. See notes to cl 1 above. Appeal.
- 3 *Administrator General's Act 3 of 1913*—An appeal lies from an order made to the Administrator General commission at a certain rate (u).
- 4 *Probate and Administration Act 1881 s 90 [now Indian Succession Act 1925 s 307]*—An appeal lies from an order purporting to be made under s 90 of the Probate and Administration Act at the instance of a beneficiary in a case in which there is no restriction imposed by the will on the power of the executor to sell immovable property forming part of the estate of the deceased. Such an order is really one made without jurisdiction (r). An appeal also lies from an order granting probate (w).
- 5 *Limitation Act s 5*—It has been held by the High Court of Calcutta that an appeal lies from an order refusing to excuse the delay in filing an appeal or application (x). The High Court of Bombay has held that an appeal does lie from such an order (y).
- 6 *Mandamus*—It has been held by the High Court of Calcutta in the *Madras case of The Justices of the Peace for Calcutta v The Oriental Gas Co* ( ) that no appeal lies from an order which directs a mandamus to sue to a public body to compel them to refer a question of compensation to arbitration, the reason given being that such an order does not determine any question whatever between the parties but only initiates proceedings by which the liability of the public body to make compensation is to be ascertained and determined. This decision was dissented from by White CJ in the *Madras case of Tuljaram v Ilagappa* (a).
- 7 *Contempt*—An appeal lies from an order of committal for contempt (b) as well as from an order refusing an application to commit for contempt of Court (c).
- 8 *Vice Admiralty jurisdiction*—An appeal lies from the decision of a single Judge of a Chartered High Court exercising Admiralty or Vice Admiralty jurisdiction (d).
- 9 *Arbitration Act 9 of 1893*—An appeal lies under this clause from an order refusing to enlarge time for the submission of an award remitted to the umpire (e) or to set aside an award made and filed under the Arbitration Act (f). There is a conflict of opinion whether an order refusing to set aside proceedings under sec 17 of the Arbitration Act is a judgment (h) or not (i) in some cases that it is (g) while in some that it is not (h). An order returning an award under the Arbitration Act for notice of filing to be given to the parties is not a judgment (i).

|  |   |
|--|---|
| (u) <i>Somnath Lari v Adms (Tulsi General</i><br>(18 03) 131 d 148                   | (c) <i>Mohnd Lal v J. and Co. (18 12)</i><br>Cal 236  |
| (r) <i>I. Lal Singh in the good of (1 28) 3</i><br>Cal 51                            | (d) <i>Chauhan v the matter (18 12)</i><br>Cal 66   |
| (w) <i>U. M. Ch. d. v. B. d. (189) 1 All</i><br>45                                   | (e) <i>M. d. v. B. d. (1901) 31 M. L.</i><br>103 109 J. C. (1901) 31 M. L.                  |
| (x) <i>C. b. da Lal v Sh. b. Das (1906) 33 Cal 13 3</i>                              | (f) <i>C. b. da Lal v Sh. b. Das (1901) 31 M. L.</i><br>461 467 d. v. B. d. (1901) 31 M. L. |
| (y) <i>I. M. d. v. J. M. d. (1918) 4 Bom 260</i><br>441 C. 913 d. v. B. d. (19 1) 46 | (g) <i>J. M. d. v. B. d. (1901) 31 M. L.</i><br>461 467 d. v. B. d. (1901) 31 M. L.         |
| (191) 3 M. L. 1 1 v. B. J. C. 210  | (h) <i>J. M. d. v. B. d. (1901) 31 M. L.</i><br>461 467 d. v. B. d. (1901) 31 M. L.         |
| (b) <i>V. r. d. v. B. d. (1 3) 1 Bom 5</i>   | (i) <i>J. M. d. v. B. d. (1901) 31 M. L.</i><br>461 467 d. v. B. d. (1901) 31 M. L.         |





Let Pat [Cal, Bom, and Mad]

**Cl<sub>s</sub> 15-17**

The appeal given to the Full Court under this clause is not confined to the point on which the Judges of the Division Court differ: the whole appeal is open before the Court for decision (x).

**Land acquisition appeal**—The decision of the High Court in a land acquisition appeal is not a judgment within the meaning of this clause so as to enable a party to file a further appeal to the High Court under this clause (y). See notes to cl. 39. The decision must amount to a judgment, decree or order.

Sentence or order in the exercise of criminal jurisdiction—In criminal proceedings, a sanction granted under s. 193 (1) of the Criminal Procedure Code is one made in the exercise of criminal jurisdiction and is not a judgment within the meaning of the clause ( ) . See the undermentioned case (a)

Review—It is competent to the High Court to review judgments in appeals preferred under cl. 15 above (b)

16 And We do further ordain that the said High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal shall be a Court of Appeal from the Civil Courts of the Bengal Division of the Presidency of Fort William, and from all other Courts subject to its superintendence, and shall exercise appellate jurisdiction in such cases as are subject to appeal to the said High Court by virtue of any laws or regulations now in force

17 And We do further ordain that the said High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal shall have the like power and authority with respect to the persons and estates of infants, idiots, and lunatics, within the Bengal Division of the Presidency of Fort William, as that which is now vested in the said Supreme Court at Calcutta

Within the Bengal Division of the Presidency of Fort William - 24  
the argument of counsel in *Basant v. Narayansah (c)*

**Jurisdiction of Supreme Courts as to Infants and Lunatics**—See cl. of the Charter of the Calcutta Supreme Court cl. 32 of the Charter of the Madras Supreme Court and cl. 42 of the Charter of the Bombay Supreme Court

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>(z) <i>Jam Di v Pann Das</i> (1876) 1 AH 181 1ely<br/> <i>Bhim ry d v B choo</i> (19 4) 48 Moan<br/>         581 87 I C 199 (5) A B 118 1 pend s<br/> <i>Nath v Hindu Ais</i> (1915) Cal J 45<br/>         3 I C 468 <i>Gop sia v Hem Chandro</i><br/>         (19 0) 31 Cal J 447 87 I C 2<br/> <i>Lunjab 4440 r 1 Fre Co v Omdro</i><br/>         (19 6) 7 Lab 179 93 I C 344 (6) A L<br/>         65</p> | <p>69 I C 48 (23) A L 23<br/>         (z) <i>M niwami v Pajarnam</i> (1922) 45 Md.<br/>         9-8 71 I C 16 (11) AM 493<br/>         (a) <i>Desh ch v r</i> (1916) 39 Mad 379 4 I C<br/>         5 7 A <i>Pranami Aiyar v</i> (1916) 39 Mad<br/>         581 291 109 Appd v Appd (1916)<br/>         39 Mad 47 29 I C 66<br/>         (b) <i>Faukta Subbarayudu v C P v Subbarayudu</i><br/>         (1917) 40 Mad 653 32 I C 172<br/>         (c) (1916 41 I A 314 33 N J 307 24 I C 106</p> |
|--|---|

Let Pat [Cal, Bom, and

18 And We do further ordain that the Court for relief of Insolvent Debtors at Calcutta shall be held before one of the Judges of the said High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal, and the said High Court, and any such Judge thereof, shall have and exercise, within the Bengal Division of the Presidency of Fort William, such powers and authorities with respect to original and appellate jurisdiction, and otherwise, as are constituted by the laws relating to insolvent debtors in India

*Provision with respect to the insolvent Court*  
 Laws relating to insolvent debtors in India—The law relating to insolvent debtors in the presidency towns is now contained in the Presidency towns Insolvency Act 1919. Note that cl 12 does not control the provisions of this clause so as to limit the insolvency jurisdiction of the Court (d)

*Law to be administered by the High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal*

19 And We do further ordain that, with respect to the law or equity to be applied to each case coming before the said High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal, in the exercise of its ordinary original civil jurisdiction, such law or equity shall be the law or equity which would have been applied by the said High Court to such case if these Letters Patent had not issued

*By the High Court in the exercise of ordinary original civil jurisdiction*  
 Law or equity to be applied to each case—See the unmentioned case (e). See also Pollock and Mulla's Indian Contract Act 4th ed. pp 20. The present clause is to be read with cl 44 below

Law or equity administered by the Supreme Courts—See cl 13 17 and 18 of the Charter of the Supreme Court of Calcutta cls 21 and 31 of the Charter of the Supreme Court of Madras and cls 28 29 and 41 of the Charter of the Supreme Court of Bombay

Query whether the English law should be applied in cases arising within the original jurisdiction of the High Courts though contrary to the rule of justice equity and good conscience (f)

(d) *1841 Asher v Th* Official Assignee of  
*Madr* (1918) 40 M L R 10 36 L C 34  
*1841 Asher v Th* (1918) 40 M L R 10 36 L C 34  
*51 M J 516 11 L C 149 (1918) A N 3*  
 (e) *Madr* 1841 *der v Th* (1918) 40 M L R 10 36 L C 34

14 Dec L. P. 6 at p 83  
 (f) *Graham v Chas* (1918) 40 M L R 10 36 L C 34  
*Chas v Asher* (1918) 40 M L R 10 36 L C 34  
 344 3 353 353 353 353 353 353

Let Pat [Cal, Bom, and Mad]

Is 20-22

20 And We do further ordain that, with respect to the law or equity and rule of good conscience to be applied to each case coming before the said High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal in the exercise of its extraordinary original civil jurisdiction such law or equity and rule of good conscience shall (until otherwise provided) be the law or equity and rule of good conscience which would have been applied to such case by any local Court having jurisdiction therein

In the exercise of extraordinary original civil jurisdiction

The law which would have been applied by any local Courts.—See note to cl 13 above Powers of High Courts in dealing with suits transferred under this clause

21 And We do further ordain that, with respect to the law or equity and rule of good conscience to be applied by the said High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal to each case, coming before it in the exercise of its appellate jurisdiction, such law or equity and rule of good conscience shall be the law or equity and rule of good conscience which the Court in which the proceedings in such case were originally instituted ought to have applied to such case

By High Court in the exercise of appellate jurisdiction

### *Criminal Jurisdiction*

22 And We do further ordain that the said High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal shall have ordinary original criminal jurisdiction within the local limits of its ordinary original civil jurisdiction, and also in respect of all such persons both within the limits of the Bengal Division of the Presidency of Fort William, and beyond such limits and not within the limits of the criminal jurisdiction of any other High Court or Court established by competent legislative authority in India as the said High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal shall have criminal jurisdiction over at the date of the publication of these Presents (g)

Ordinary original jurisdiction of the High Court

(g) And also in respect of all such persons beyond its limits or over whom the said High Court of Judicature at Bombay

shall have criminal jurisdiction at the time of publication of these presents—Madras and Bombay Letters Patent

Let Pat [Cal, Bom, a

23 And We do further ordain that the said High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal in the exercise of its ordinary original criminal jurisdiction, shall be empowered to try all persons brought before it in due course of law

24 And We do further ordain that the said High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal shall have extraordinary original criminal jurisdiction over all persons residing in places within the jurisdiction of any Court now subject to the superintendence of the said High Court, and shall have authority to try at its discretion any such persons brought before it on charges preferred by the Advocate General, or by any Magistrate or other officer specially empowered by the Government in that behalf

25 And We do further ordain that there shall be no appeal to the said High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal from any sentence or order passed or made in any criminal trial before the Courts of original Criminal Jurisdiction, which may be constituted by one or more Judges of the said High Court But it shall be at the discretion of any such Court to reserve any point or points of law for the opinion of the said High Court

26 And We do further ordain that on such point or points of law being so reserved as aforesaid, or on its being certified by the said Advocate General, that in his judgment there is an error in the decision of a point or points of law decided by the Court of original Criminal Jurisdiction, or that a point or points of law which has or have been decided by the said Court should be further considered, the said High Court shall have full power and authority to review the case or such part of it as may be necessary, and finally determine such point or points of law, and thereupon to alter the sentence passed by the Court of original jurisdiction and to pass such judgment and sentence as to the said High Court shall seem right

Let Pat [Cal, Bom, and Mad]

Is 20-22

20 And We do further ordain that, with respect to the law or equity and rule of good conscience to be applied to each case coming before the said High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal in the exercise of its extraordinary original civil jurisdiction such law or equity and rule of good conscience shall (until otherwise provided) be the law or equity and rule of good conscience which would have been applied to such case by any local Court having jurisdiction therein

In the exercise of extra-ordinary original civil jurisdiction

The law which would have been applied by any local Courts — See s. 13 to cl 13 above Powers of High Courts in dealing with suits transferred under clause

21 And We do further ordain that, with respect to the law or equity and rule of good conscience to be applied by the said High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal to each case, coming before it in the exercise of its appellate jurisdiction, such law or equity and rule of good conscience shall be the law or equity and rule of good conscience which the Court in which the proceedings in such case were originally instituted ought to have applied to such case

In High Court in the exercise of appellate jurisdiction

### *Criminal Jurisdiction*

22 And We do further ordain that the said High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal shall have ordinary original criminal jurisdiction within the local limits of its ordinary original civil jurisdiction, and also in respect of all such persons both within the limits of the Bengal Division of the Presidency of Fort William, and beyond such limits and not within the limits of the criminal jurisdiction of any other High Court or Court established by competent legislative authority in India as the said High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal, shall have criminal jurisdiction over at the date of the publication of these Presents (g)

Ordinary original jurisdiction of the High Court

(g) And also in respect of all such persons beyond such limits as a rule may be made by the High Court of Judicature at Bombay

shall have criminal jurisdiction at the date of publication of these Presents — 21 of 1862 and Bombay Letters Patent

Let Pat [Cal, Bom, and

23 And We do further ordain that the said High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal in the exercise of its ordinary original criminal jurisdiction, shall be empowered to try all persons brought before it in due course of law

24 And We do further ordain that the said High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal shall have extraordinary original criminal jurisdiction over all persons residing in places within the jurisdiction of any Court now subject to the superintendence of the said High Court and shall have authority to try at its discretion any such persons brought before it on charges preferred by the Advocate General, or by any Magistrate or other officer specially empowered by the Government in that behalf

25 And We do further ordain that there shall be no appeal to the said High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal from any sentence or order passed or made in any criminal trial before the Courts of original Criminal Jurisdiction, which may be constituted by one or more Judges of the said High Court But it shall be at the discretion of any such Court to reserve any point or points of law for the opinion of the said High Court

26 And We do further ordain that on such point or points of law being so reserved as afore said, or on its being certified by the said Advocate General, that in his judgment there is an error in the decision of a point or points of law decided by the Court of original Criminal Jurisdiction or that a point or points of law which has or have been decided by the said Court should be further considered, the said High Court shall have full power and authority to review the case or such part of it as may be necessary and finally determine such point or points of law, and thereupon to alter the sentence passed by the Court of original jurisdiction and to pass such judgment and sentence as to the said High Court shall seem right

Let Pat [Cal, Bom, and Mad]

Cls 26-29

Review on certificate of Advocate General—See the undermentioned cases. If there is no error of law the High Court cannot deal further with the case and it considers the question of alteration of sentence (i). But if there is an error of law the High Court has to decide the case finally on review (j).

27 And We do further ordain that the said High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal shall be a Court of Appeal from the Criminal Courts of the Bengal Division of the Presidency of Fort William, and from all other Courts subject to its superintendence, and shall exercise appellate jurisdiction in such cases as are subject to appeal to the said High Court by virtue of any law now in force.

Appeals from Criminal Courts in the Provinces

Subject to its superintendence—Note that the words used in s 13 of the Charter Act [now s 107 of the Government of India Act 1915] are subject to its appellate jurisdiction while those in the present sections are subject to its superintendence. (i) Compare cl 13 above.

28 And We do further ordain that the said High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal shall be a Court of reference and revision from the Criminal Courts subject to its appellate jurisdiction, and shall have power to hear and determine all such cases referred to it by the Sessions Judges or by any other Officer now authorized to refer cases to the said High Court, and to revise all such cases tried by any Officer or Court possessing criminal jurisdiction, as are now subject to reference to, or revision, by the said High Court.

Now subject to reference to or revision by the said High Court.—The High Court cannot under this clause revise an order of a Secretary to Government issued under a warrant under the Goondas Act (Bengal Act 1 of 1903) as such Secretary was not an officer possessing criminal jurisdiction in 1862 when the Letters Patent were issued (h).

29 And We do further ordain that the said High Court shall have power to direct the transfer of any criminal case or appeal from any Court to any other Court of equal or superior jurisdiction and also direct the

High Court may direct the transfer of a case from one Court to another

(A) *Empress v. F. & C. Chaudhary* (1913) 41 Cal 4

341 C 945

(C) *K. J. Empress v. F. & C. Chaudhary* (1923) 4 C W N 1081 1 C 33 (-4)

(A) *Empress v. F. & C. Chaudhary* (1907) 4 Cal 61

41 C 945

(B) *Chaudhary v. K. J. Empress* (1913) 41 Cal 945

(D) *Empress v. F. & C. Chaudhary* (1907) 4 Cal 61

Let Pat (Cal, Bom, a

preliminary investigation or trial of any criminal case by any Officer or Court otherwise competent to investigate or try it, though such belongs, in ordinary course, to the jurisdiction of some other Officer or Court

**30** And We do further ordain that all persons brought for trial before the said High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal, either in the exercise of its original jurisdiction or in the exercise of its jurisdiction as a Court of appeal, reference or revision charged with any offence for which provision is made by Act No XLV of 1860, called the "Indian Penal Code," or by any Act amending or excluding the said Act which may have been passed prior to the publication of these presents shall be liable to punishment under the said Act or Acts, and not otherwise

Offer here to be published under Indian Penal Code

*Exercise of Jurisdiction elsewhere than at the ordinary place of sitting of the High Court*

**31** And We do further ordain that whenever it shall appear to the Governor General in Council convenient that the jurisdiction and power by these Our Letters Patent or by the recited Act vested in the said High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal should be exercised in any place within the jurisdiction of any Court now subject to the superintendence of the said High Court, other than the usual place of sitting of the said High Court, or at several such places by way of circuit, the proceedings in cases before the said High Court at such place or places shall be regulated by any law relating thereto which has been or may be made by competent legislative authority for India

Judge may be authorized to sit at any place or places within the jurisdiction of the said High Court

*Admiralty and Vice Admiralty Jurisdiction*

**32** And We do further ordain that the said High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal, shall have and exercise all such civil and maritime jurisdiction as may now be exercised by the said High Court as a Court of Admiralty or of Vice Admiralty,

cc 11



Let Pat [Cal, Bom, and Mad]

Cls 32-34 and also such jurisdiction for the trial and adjudication of prize causes, and other maritime questions arising in India as may now be exercised by the said High Court

**Admiralty jurisdiction of Supreme Courts**—See cl 26 of the Charter of the Calcutta Supreme Court cl 41 of the Charter of the Madras Supreme Court and cl 33 of the Charter of the Bombay Supreme Court

**Necessaries supplied to a ship**—It was settled to be the law in England prior to the passing of 3 and 4 Vict c 65 the Court of Admiralty had no jurisdiction in the case of necessaries supplied to a ship though perhaps it occasionally purport to exercise the jurisdiction where not prohibited (m) The same view has obtained in India (n) but there is a difference of opinion as to whether the extended powers vested in 3 and 4 Vict c 65 and 24 Vict c 10 became vested in the Indian High Court by virtue of the several Letters Patent (o) Assuming that the High Court in its Admiralty jurisdiction had no jurisdiction over claims for maritime necessaries under any previous enactment such jurisdiction would now rest on the Colonial Courts of Admiralty Act 1891 which vests in it the power described in sec 5 of the Admiralty Act 1861 [24 Vict c 10]. The effect of the two Acts is to invest the Indian High Courts with jurisdiction over claims for necessaries supplied to a ship elsewhere than in the port to which the ship Court belongs unless it is shown to the satisfaction of the Court that at the time of the institution of the suit the owner is domiciled in British India or Burma (p)

33 And We do further ordain that the said High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal shall have and exercise criminal jurisdiction as may now be exercised by the said High Court as a Court of Admiralty or of Vice Admiralty, or otherwise in connection with maritime matters or matters of prize

Criminal

### *Testamentary and Intestate Jurisdiction*

34 And We do further ordain that the said High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal shall have the like power and authority as that which may now be lawfully exercised by the said High Courts, except within the limits of the jurisdiction for that purpose of any other High Court established by Her Majesty's Letters Patent, in relation to the granting and probates of last wills and testaments, and letters of administration of the goods chattels, credits, and all other effects

(m) *The Two Friends* (1841) 11 A C 116 *The Heir* (1841) 11 A C 116

(n) *Alfred v. La Gorce* (1841) 11 A C 116  
121 *The Alford* (1841) 11 A C 116

(o) *The Fort* (1841) 11 A C 116  
121 *The Alford* (1841) 11 A C 116  
121 *The Alford* (1841) 11 A C 116

Let Pat [Cal, Bom and Mad]

whatsoever of persons, dying intestate, whether within or without the said Bengal Division (g), subject to the order of the Governor General in Council, as to the period when the said High Court shall cease to exercise testamentary and intestate jurisdiction in any place or places beyond the limits of the provinces or places for which it was established. Provided always that nothing in these Letters Patent contained shall interfere with the provisions of any law which has been made by competent legislative authority for India, by which power is given to any other Court to grant such probates and letters of administration

Ecclesiastical jurisdiction of Supreme Courts—See cl 22 of the Charter of the Supreme Court of Calcutta cl 37 of the Charter of the Supreme Court of Madras and cl 47 of the Charter of the Supreme Court of Bombay

**35** And We do further ordain that the said High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal, shall have jurisdiction, within the Bengal Division of the Presidency of Fort William, in matters matrimonial between Our subjects, professing the Christian religion. Provided always that nothing therein contained shall be held to interfere with the exercise of any jurisdiction in matters matrimonial by any Court not established by Royal Charter within the said Presidency lawfully possessed thereof

Our subjects professing the Christian religion —The High Court has no jurisdiction under this clause to grant a decree for restitution unless both parties are Christians. It has therefore no jurisdiction under this clause to grant such a decree when the petitioner is a Christian but the respondent is a Parsi. Nor is any such jurisdiction conferred upon it in suits for *restitutio of conjugal rights* by the Indian Divorce Act 1869 (r). See Indian Divorce Act s 4

Respondent not within the Presidency—The High Court has no jurisdiction to grant a decree for restitution against a respondent who was absent from the Presidency at the time the suit was instituted and remains absent. But *re deo* at date of suit of both spouses *whenever the decree is sufficient to give jurisdiction in suits of this nature (s)*

(g) And we do further ordain that the said High Court of Judicature at Fort William shall have the like power and authority as that which may be now lawfully exercised by the said High Court in relation to the granting of probates of last wills and testaments and letters of administration of the goods

of persons dying intestate whether within or without the Presidency of Bengal. —*See the said Letters Patent*  
(1) *Succession to the Estate of Deceased Persons Act 1925*  
(2) *See the said Letters Patent*  
(3) *See the said Letters Patent*



Let Pat [Cal, Bom, and

Appeal When an application is made to the High Court under s 100 clause (6) of the Criminal Procedure Code to revoke a sanction granted by lower Court or to give a sanction refused by it and the Judges composing the bench hearing the application are equally divided in opinion the case is governed by the present clause and not by s 42 or s 439 of that Code (x)

A Full Bench of the Madras High Court (y) has recently held that in the case of an equal division of opinion between the Judges of the High Court in an appeal preferred to it under the Code of Civil Procedure the procedure to be adopted by the High Court is governed by cl 36 of the Code of Civil Procedure and not by sec 94 of the Code of Civil Procedure See notes to sec 89 above Letters Patent Appeal

Civil Procedure

37 And We do further ordain that it shall be lawful for the said High Court of Judicature at Fort

Regulation of proceedings  
—civil cases

William in Bengal, from time to time, to make rules and orders for the purpose of

regulating all proceedings in civil cases which may be brought before the said High Court, including proceedings in its Admiralty, Vice Admiralty, Testamentary, Intestate and Matrimonial Jurisdiction, respectively Provided always that the said High Court shall be guided in making such rules and orders as far as possible by the provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure being an Act passed by the Governor General in Council, and being Act No VIII of 1859, and the provisions of any law which has been made, amending or altering the same, by competent legislative authority for India

38 And We do further ordain that the proceedings in all criminal cases which shall be brought

Regulation of proceedings  
—criminal cases

before the said High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal in the exercise of

its ordinary original criminal jurisdiction and also in all other criminal cases over which the said High Court had jurisdiction immediately before the publication of these presents, shall be regulated by the procedure and practice which was in use in the said High Court immediately before such publication subject to any law which has been or may be made in relation thereto by competent legislative authority for India

(x) *Empu Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(11) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(12) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(13) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(14) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(15) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(16) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(17) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(18) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(19) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(20) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(21) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(22) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(23) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(24) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(25) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(26) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(27) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(28) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(29) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(30) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(31) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(32) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(33) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(34) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(35) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(36) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(37) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(38) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(39) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(40) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(41) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(42) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(43) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(44) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(45) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(46) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(47) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(48) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(49) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(50) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(51) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(52) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(53) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(54) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(55) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(56) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(57) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(58) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(59) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(60) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(61) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(62) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(63) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(64) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(65) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(66) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(67) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(68) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(69) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(70) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(71) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(72) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(73) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(74) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(75) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(76) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(77) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(78) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(79) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(80) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(81) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(82) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(83) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(84) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(85) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(86) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(87) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(88) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(89) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(90) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(91) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(92) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(93) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(94) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(95) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(96) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(97) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(98) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(99) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363  
(100) *Isp* (1911) 34 Mad 730 141 C 363

Let Pat [Cal, Bom, and Mad]

Cls 38 39 and that the proceedings in all other criminal cases shall be regulated by the Code of Criminal Procedure, prescribed by an Act passed by the Governor General in Council and by the Act No XXV of 1861, or by such further or other laws in relation to criminal procedure as may have been or may be made by such authority as aforesaid

### *Appeals to Privy Council*

39 And We do further ordain that any person or persons may appeal to Us, Our heirs and successors in Our or Their Privy Council in any matter not being of criminal jurisdiction from a final judgment, decree or order of the said High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal made on appeal and from any final judgment, decree, or order made in the exercise of original jurisdiction by Judges of the said High Court or of any Division Court, from which an appeal shall not lie to the said High Court under the provisions contained in the 10th clause of these presents. Provided, in either case, that the sum or matter at issue is of the amount or value of not less than Rupees 10,000, or that such judgment, decree, or order shall involve, directly or indirectly, some claim, demand or question to or respecting property amounting to or of the value of not less than Rupees 10,000, or from any other final judgment, decree or order made either on appeal or otherwise aforesaid, when the said High Court shall declare that the case is a fit one for appeal to Us, Our heirs or successors in Our or Their Privy Council. Subject always to such rules and orders as are now in force, or may, from time to time, be made respecting appeals to Ourselves in Council from the Courts of the said Presidency, except so far as the said existing rules and orders respectively are hereby varied, and subject also to such further rules and orders as We may, with the advice of Our Privy Council, hereafter make in that behalf

Decisions appealable to the Privy Council—No appeal lies to His Majesty in Council under this clause unless—

- (i) the decision from which an appeal is sought to be preferred is a final judgment decree or order
- (ii) the decision is a final one and
- (iii) the decision is passed on appeal or in the exercise of original jurisdiction

The decision must amount to a judgment decree or order — A decree of a High Court in a testamentary matter is appealable to His Majesty in Council if the case is one which if it were an ordinary civil case would fulfill the conditions of sections 109 and 110 of the Civil Procedure Code ( ) But no appeal lies to the Privy Council from an award made by a High Court on appeal from a District Court under s 54 of the Land Acquisition Act 1894 Such an award is not a judgment decree or order within the meaning of this clause (a) Similarly no appeal lies from a decision of the High Court upon a case referred by the Chief Revenue Authority under s 10 of the Income Tax Act 1918 The judgment given on such a reference is merely advisory ( )

The judgment decree or order must be final — See notes to s 109 of the Code under the head Final s 238 above

The final judgment decree or order must be one made on appeal or in the exercise of original jurisdiction — Cl 10 of the Charter empowers the High Court to deal with professional misconduct by suspension or removal An order made under that clause is not in the exercise either of the original or appellate jurisdiction of the High Court and is not therefore appealable to His Majesty in Council ( ) But an order made in the exercise of the power of superintendence under s 10 of the High Courts Act (d) [now s 10<sup>a</sup> of the Government of India Act 1915] or in the exercise of revisional jurisdiction under section 115 of the Code (e) is appealable to the Privy Council It may here be stated that cl 15 of the Letters Patent was amended by the Amended Letters Patent of 11th March 1919 by adding into the clause certain words which make it clear that no appeal lies to the High Court under that clause from an order made in the exercise of revisional jurisdiction or from an order made in the exercise of the power of superintendence under s 107 of the Government of India Act 1915 But if the order in revision is made by a single Judge section 111 of the Code bars an appeal to the Privy Council (f)

“Made on appeal” — An order made by the High Court rejecting an application to amend a decree passed by that Court on appeal is not an order made on appeal within the meaning of this clause (g) nor is an order made by the High Court rejecting an application to review a judgment passed on appeal (h) Such an order is not an order made on appeal against the judgment sought to be reviewed it is an order in the appeal in which the judgment sought to be reviewed was given ( )

(1) *Pa. and v. Picham* (1906) 49 M d 94

(2) *Special Officer v. Lait v. Doo* (1913) 37

*Lom. 106* (1913) 1 C W N 4101 C 63

*I. a. goe J. A. (1913) 41 C. L. d. 133*

*I. a. goe (1913) 41 C. L. d. 133*

*I. a. goe (1913) 41 C. L. d. 133*

*I. a. goe (1913) 41 C. L. d. 133*

*I. a. goe (1913) 41 C. L. d. 133*

*I. a. goe (1913) 41 C. L. d. 133*

*I. a. goe (1913) 41 C. L. d. 133*

*I. a. goe (1913) 41 C. L. d. 133*

*I. a. goe (1913) 41 C. L. d. 133*

*I. a. goe (1913) 41 C. L. d. 133*

*I. a. goe (1913) 41 C. L. d. 133*

*I. a. goe (1913) 41 C. L. d. 133*

*H. a. goe (1913) 41 C. L. d. 133*

*H. a. goe (1913) 41 C. L. d. 133*

*H. a. goe (1913) 41 C. L. d. 133*

*H. a. goe (1913) 41 C. L. d. 133*

*H. a. goe (1913) 41 C. L. d. 133*

*H. a. goe (1913) 41 C. L. d. 133*

*H. a. goe (1913) 41 C. L. d. 133*

*H. a. goe (1913) 41 C. L. d. 133*

*H. a. goe (1913) 41 C. L. d. 133*

*H. a. goe (1913) 41 C. L. d. 133*

*H. a. goe (1913) 41 C. L. d. 133*

*H. a. goe (1913) 41 C. L. d. 133*

*H. a. goe (1913) 41 C. L. d. 133*

*H. a. goe (1913) 41 C. L. d. 133*

*H. a. goe (1913) 41 C. L. d. 133*

Let Pat [Cal, Born, and Mad]

**Cls 40, 41**

40 And We do further ordain that it shall be lawful for the said High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal, at its discretion on the motion, or if the said High Court be not sitting, then for any Judge of the said High Court upon the petition of any party who considers himself aggrieved by any interlocutory judgment, decree, order or sentence of the High Court, in any such proceeding as aforesaid, being of criminal jurisdiction, to grant permission to any party to appeal against the same to Us, Our heirs and successors, in Our or Their Privy Council, subject to the rules, regulations, and limitations, as are herein expressed respecting appeals from final judgments, decrees, orders and sentences.

Appeal from interlocutory judgment—No appeal lies to the Privy Council from an interlocutory judgment or order of a Judge of a High Court until such judgment or order has been subjected to an appeal to the High Court under cl 13 except in the cases in which by reason of the number of Judges who have made such order an appeal under cl 13 is given directly to the Privy Council (j) The High Court will not sit in the exercise of its discretion under this clause grant leave to appeal to the Privy Council upon a mere question of practice such as an order for inspection of documents (k) or an order refusing the appointment of a receiver in a suit (l) But an order made by the High Court of Bombay under cl 13 of the Letters Patent transferring to a court of first instance from the Court of the Resident at Aden raises a question of jurisdiction and an appeal from practice and leave may be granted from such an order to appeal to the Privy Council (m) But for this clause no appeal would lie from an interlocutory judgment or order (n)

Let Pat [Cal, Bom, and Mad]

said High Court shall declare that the case is a fit one for such Cls 41  
 appeal and under such conditions as the said High Court may  
 establish or require subject always to such rules and orders  
 as We may with the advice of Our Privy Council, hereafter  
 make in that behalf

Appeals in Criminal cases — See the undermentioned case (o)

42 And We do further ordain that in all cases of appeal  
 made from any judgment, order, sentence  
 or decree of the said High Court of Judi-  
 cature at Fort William in Bengal, to Us  
 Our heirs or successors in Our or Their

Rule as to trans-  
 of copy of the  
 other document

Privy Council a true and correct copy of all evidence, proceed-  
 ings, judgments, decrees, and orders had or made in such cases  
 appealed, so far as the same have relation to the matters of  
 appeal, such copies to be certified under the seal of the said  
 High Court, and that the said High Court shall also certify  
 and transmit to Us, Our heirs and successors in Our or Their  
 Privy Council, a copy of the reasons given by the Judges of  
 such Court or by any such Judges for or against the judgment  
 or determination appealed against

And We do further ordain that the said High Court shall,  
 in all cases of appeal to Us, Our heirs or successors, conform to  
 and execute or cause to be executed, such judgment and orders  
 as We Our heirs or successors in Our or Their Privy Council,  
 shall think fit to make in the premises in such manner as any  
 original judgment, decree or decretal orders, or other order  
 or rule of the said High Court should or might have been  
 executed

*Calls for Records, &c, by the Government*

43 And it is Our further will and pleasure that the said  
 High Court of Judicature at Fort William  
 in Bengal shall comply with such requisitions  
 as may be made by the Government for  
 records, returns, and statements in such  
 form and manner as such Government may deem proper

High Court to comply  
 with requisitions for  
 records, returns, and statements



Let Pat [Cal, Bom, and Mad]

Cl 44

44 And We do further ordain and declare that all the provisions of these Our Letters Patent be subject to the legislative powers of the Governor General in Legislative Council and also of the Governor General in Council under section seventy one of the Government of India Act, 1915, and also of the Governor General in cases of emergency under section seventy two of that Act and may be in all respects amended and altered thereby

<sup>Powers of the Indian Legislature preserved</sup>  
Alterations in this clause.—This clause was substituted for the original clause 44 by the Amending Letters Patent of 11th March 1910. The material alteration consists in substituting the words powers of the Governor General in Legislative Council and also of the Governor General in Council for the words powers of the Governor General in Council.

Legislative powers of the Governor General in Council.—The powers of the Governor General in Council to make laws are derived from the Indian Councils Act of 1861 (24 and 25 Vict. c. 67). By sec. 2 of that Act the Governor General in Council is given power to make laws in the manner provided including power to repeal or amend existing laws and including the making of laws for all Courts of justice and for all persons whatever British or Native foreigners or others. But a proviso to that section enacts that there is to be no power to repeal or in any way affect a law passed in the same session of Parliament with the Indian Councils Act. The High Courts Act of 1861 (24 and 25 Vict. c. 104) is such an Act and the Governor General in Council therefore has no power to alter its provisions unless such power is expressly given by the Act. Thus the Governor General in Council has no power to alter the provisions of that Act as to the qualifications of the Judges of the High Courts or the provisions of sec. 1 of thereof giving the High Courts superintendence over the Courts which are subject to its appellate jurisdiction (p). But the Governor General in Council has power to remove any place or territory from the jurisdiction of a High Court, the reason being that such power is distinctly recognized by sec. 9 of the said Act and is also consistent with the Letters Patent (cl. 44) as required by the said sec. 9 (p).

Further there is a proviso to sec. 22 of the Indian Councils Act which enacts that there is to be no power to repeal or in any way affect any provision of the Government of India Act of 1858. Sec. 6 of the latter Act provides that all persons shall have the same suits remedies and proceedings against the Secretary of State in Council as they could have done against the East India Company before the commencement of the India Act 1858. A British subject could sue the Secretary of State for his claim to any right over land. The Governor General in Council has no power under the Indian Councils Act to pass an Act taking away the right of a

Let Pat [Cal, Bom, and

subject to sue the *Secretary of State* in a Civil Court to determine his claim to any right Cls  
over land (r) See now the Government of India Act 1915 s 106 (2)

An order made in revision by a single Judge is final since the amendment of cl 15  
and would therefore be appealable to Privy Council under cl 39 but as Letters Patent  
are subject to Imperial Legislation that appeal is taken away by Section 111 of the  
Code (s)

45 And it is Our further will and pleasure that these  
Letters Patent shall be published by the  
Governor General in Council, and shall  
come into operation from and after the  
date of such publication, and that from

Provisions of former Let  
ters Patent inconnitent with  
these Letters Patent to be  
void

and after the date on which effect shall have been given to  
them, so much of the aforesaid Letters Patent granted by  
His Majesty, King George The Third, as was not revoked or  
determined by the said Letters Patent of the fourteenth of  
May, one thousand eight hundred and sixty two, and is incons-  
istent with these Letters Patent, shall cease, determine and  
be utterly void, to all intents and purposes whatsoever

In Witness thereof We have caused these Our Letters to  
be made Patent Witness Ourselves at Westminster, the twenty-  
eighth day of December, in the twenty ninth year of Our  
reign

(Sd) C ROMILLY

# Letters Patent for the High Court of Allahabad

(March 17, 1866)

Cls 1, 2

[The two first paragraphs of the Preamble are similar to those of the Letters Patent of 1864.]

And whereas it is further declared by the said recited Act that it shall be lawful for Us by Letters Patent to erect and establish a High Court of Judicature in any or any portion of the territories within Her Majesty's dominions in India not included within the limits of the local jurisdiction of another High Court to consist of a Chief Justice and such number of other Judges with such qualifications as were by the said Act required in persons to be appointed to the High Courts established at the said Presidencies as We from time to time might think fit and appoint and that subject to the directions of the Letters Patent all the provisions of the said recited Act relative to the Courts and to the Chief Justice and other Judges of such Courts and to the Governor General or Governor of the Presidency in which such High Courts were established shall as far as circumstances may permit be applicable to any new High Court which may be established in the said territories and to the Chief Justice and other Judges thereof and to the persons administering the Government of the said territories

And whereas We did upon full consideration of the premises think fit to erect and establish and by Our Letters Patent under the Great Seal of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland bearing date at Westminster the fourteenth day of May in the twenty fifth year of Our reign in the year of Our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty two did accordingly for Us Our heirs and successors erect and establish at Fort William in Bengal for the Bengal Division of the Presidency of Fort William a High Court of Judicature which should be called the High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal and did thereby constitute the said Court to be a Court of Record

1 Now know ye that We upon full consideration of the premises and of Our special grace certain knowledge and mere motion have thought fit to erect and establish and by the present Letters Patent do accordingly for Us Our heirs and successors erect and establish for the North Western Provinces of the Fort William aforesaid a High Court of Judicature which shall be called the High Court of Judicature for the North Western Province and We do hereby constitute the said Court to be a Court of Record

2 And We do hereby appoint and ordain that the High Court of Judicature for the North Western Provinces shall until further or other provisions shall be made by Us or Our heirs and successors in that behalf in accordance with the said recited Act consist of a Chief Justice and five Judges the first Chief Justice being Walter Mordaunt Esquire and the five Judges being Alexander Ross Esquire William Edward Fraser Esquire William Roberts Esquire Francis Boyle Pearson Esquire and Charles Arthur Turner Esquire being respectively qualified as in the said Act is declared

[Powers of Crown to appoint a sixth puisne Judge — A question has arisen as to the validity of the appointment of a sixth puisne judge it was held that

Let Pat

under clauses 1 and 2 it was quite competent to the Crown to appoint a sixth puisne Judge (f) See High Courts Act 1861 s. 16 ] Cls

3 And We do ordain that the Chief Justice and every Judge of the said High Court of Judicature for the North Western Provinces  
 Declaration to be made by Judges previously to entering upon the execution of the duties of his office shall make and subscribe the following declaration before such authority or person as the Governor General in Council may commission to receive it —

I, *I B* appointed Chief Justice [or a Judge] of the High Court of Judicature for the North Western Province do solemnly declare that I will faithfully perform the duties of my office to the best of my ability knowledge and judgment

4 8 [These clauses are similar to clauses 6 to 10 of the Calcutta Letters Patent of 1865]

#### *Civil Jurisdiction of the High Court*

9 And We do further ordain that the said High Court of Judicature for the North Western Provinces shall have power to remove and to try  
 Extraordinary original civil jurisdiction and determine as a Court of extraordinary original jurisdiction any suit being or falling within the jurisdiction of any Court subject to its superintendence when the said High Court shall think proper to do so either on the agreement of the parties to that effect or for purpose of justice the reasons for so doing being recorded on the proceedings of the said High Court

**Original Jurisdiction**—[Note that the High Court of Allahabad does not possess ordinary original civil jurisdiction]

10 11 —Clause 10 is the same as the amended clause 12 of the Calcutta Letters Patent See note to clause 15 of Calcutta Clause 11 is the same as clause 16 of the Calcutta Letters Patent 1865

12 And We do further ordain that the said High Court of Judicature for the North Western Province shall have the like power and authority  
 Jurisdiction in infants and lunatics with respect to the persons and estates of infants idiots and lunatics within the North Western Province as that which is exercised in the Bengal Division of the Presidency of Fort William by the High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal but subject to the provisions of any laws or regulations now in force

**Hindu Joint Family**—The jurisdiction of the Court of Chancery which devolved to the Supreme Court of Calcutta is conferred by this clause on the High Court of Allahabad but the Court is reluctant to exercise it in the case of a Hindu Joint family (v)

13 14 [The clauses are similar to clauses 20 and 21 of the Calcutta Letters Patent of 1865]

#### *Criminal Jurisdiction*

15 And We do further ordain that the said High Court of Judicature for the North Western Province shall have ordinary original  
 Ordinary original jurisdiction of the High Court criminal jurisdiction in respect of all such persons within the said Provinces as the High Court of Judicature at Fort

## Let Pat [All]

**Cls 15-23** William in Bengal shall have criminal jurisdiction over at the date of the publication of these presents and the criminal jurisdiction of the said last mentioned High Court over such persons shall cease at such date. Provided nevertheless that criminal proceedings which shall at such date have been commenced in the said last mentioned High Court shall continue as if these presents had not been issued.

16 And We do further ordain that the said High Court of Judicature for the North Western Provinces in the exercise of its ordinary original criminal jurisdiction shall be empowered to try all persons brought before it in due course of law.

17 And We do further ordain that the said High Court of Judicature for the North Western Provinces shall have extraordinary original criminal jurisdiction over all persons residing in places within the jurisdiction of any Court now subject to the superintendence of the Sudder Nizamut Adawlut and shall have authority to try at its discretion any such persons brought before it on charges preferred by any Magistrate or other officer specially empowered by the Government in that behalf.

18 [This clause is similar to clause 25 of the Calcutta Letters Patent of 1860]

19 And We do further ordain that on such point or points of law being so reserved as aforesaid the said High Court shall have full power and authority to review the case or such part of it as may be necessary and finally determine such point or points of law and thereupon to alter the sentence passed by the Court of original jurisdiction and to pass such judgment and sentence as to the said High Court shall seem right.

20 And We do further ordain that the said High Court of Judicature for the North Western Provinces shall be a Court of Appeal from the Criminal Courts of the said Provinces and from all other Courts from which there is now an appeal to the Court of Sudder Nizamut Adawlut for the said Provinces and shall exercise appellate jurisdiction in such cases as are subject to appeal to the said Court of Sudder Adawlut by virtue of any law now in force.

21 And We do further ordain that the said High Court shall be a Court of reference and revision from the Criminal Courts subject to its appellate jurisdiction and shall have power to hear and determine all such cases referred to it by the Session Judges or by any other Officers now authorized to refer cases to the Court of Sudder Nizamut Adawlut of the North Western Provinces and to revise all such cases tried by any Officer or Court possessing criminal jurisdiction as are now subject to reference or to revision by the said Court of Sudder Nizamut Adawlut.

22 And We do further ordain that the said High Court shall have power to direct the transfer of any criminal case or appeal from any Court to any other Court of equal or superior jurisdiction, and also to direct the preliminary investigations or trial of any criminal case by any Officer or Court otherwise competent to investigate or try it though such case belongs in ordinary course to the jurisdiction of some other Officer or Court.

23 [This clause is similar to clause 29 of the Calcutta Letters Patent of 1860]

Let Pat  
Cis

*Exercise of Jurisdiction elsewhere than at the ordinary place of sitting of the High Court*

24 And We do further ordain that whenever it shall appear to the Lieutenant Governor of the North Western Provinces subject to the control of the Governor General in Council convenient that the jurisdiction and power by these Our Letters Patent or by the recited act vested in the said High Court should be exercised in any place within the jurisdiction of any Court now subject to the superintendence of any Sudder Dewany Adawlut or the Sudder Nizamut Adawlut of the North Western Provinces other than the usual places of sitting of the said High Court or at several such places by way of circuit the proceedings in cases before the said High Court at such place or places shall be regulated by any law relating thereto which has been or may be made by competent legislative authority for India

*Testamentary and Intestate Jurisdiction*

25 And We do further ordain that the said High Court of Judicature for the North Western Provinces shall have the like power and authority as that which is now lawfully exercised within the said Provinces by the said High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal in relation to the granting of probates of last wills and testaments and letters of administration of the goods chattels credits and all other effects whatsoever of persons dying intestate and that the jurisdiction of the said last mentioned High Court in relation hereto shall cease from the date of the publication of these presents Provided always that any proceedings already commenced in relation to any of the matters aforesaid in the said last mentioned High Court shall continue as if these presents had not been issued Provided also that nothing in these Letters Patent contained shall interfere with the provisions of any law which has been made by competent legislative authority for India by which power is given to any other Court to grant such probates and letters of administration

26 27 [These clauses correspond with clause 35 of the Calcutta Letters Patent of 1860 and clause 36 of the Calcutta Letters Patent 1908]

*Civil Procedure*

28 And We do further ordain that it shall be lawful for the said High Court of Judicature for the North Western Provinces from time to time to make rules and orders for the purpose of adopting as far as possible the provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure being an Act passed by the Governor General in Council and being Act No VIII of 1859 and the provisions of any law which has been or may be made amending or altering the same by competent legislative authority for India to all proceedings in its testamentary intestate and matrimonial jurisdiction respectively

*Criminal Procedure*

29 And We do further ordain that the proceedings in all criminal cases which shall be brought before the said High Court in the exercise of its ordinary original criminal jurisdiction shall be regulated by the procedure and practice which was in use in the High Court of Judicature for Fort William in Bengal immediately before the publication of these presents subject to any law which has been or may be made

Let Pat [All]

Cls 29-30 in relation thereto by competent legislative authority for India and that the proceedings in all other criminal cases shall be regulated by the Code of Criminal Procedure prescribed by an Act passed by the Governor General in Council, and by Act No XXV of 1861 or by such further or other laws in relation to criminal procedure as may have been or may be made by such authority as aforesaid.

*Appeals to Privy Council*

30 And We do further ordain that any person or persons may appeal to Us Our heirs and successors in Our or Their Privy Council in any matter not being of criminal jurisdiction from any final judgment decree or order of the said High Court of Judicature for the North Western Provinces made on appeal and from any final judgment decree or order made in the exercise of original jurisdiction by the Judges of the said High Court or of any District Court from which an appeal shall not lie to the said High Court under the provisions contained in the 10th Clause of these presents Provided in either case that the matter or matter at issue is of amount or value of not less than 10 000 rupees or that such judgment decree or order shall involve directly or indirectly some claim demand or question to or respecting property amounting to or of the value of not less than 10 000 rupees or from any other final judgment decree or order made either on appeal or otherwise as aforesaid when the said High Court shall declare that the case is fit for appeal to Us Our heirs or successors in Our or Their Privy Council subject always to such rules and orders as are now in force or may from time to time be made respecting appeals to Ourselves in Council from the Courts of the said Provinces except so far as the said existing rules and orders respectively are hereby varied and subject also to such further rules and orders as we may with the advice of our Privy Council hereafter make in that behalf

31 32 33 34 35 [These clauses are similar to clauses 40 41 42 43 and 44 of the Calcutta Letters Patent of 1865]

By Warrant under the Queen's Sign Manual

(Sd) C ROMILLY

# Letters Patent for the High Court of Patna

(February 9, 1916)

GEORGE THE FIFTH by the grace of God of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and of the British Dominions beyond the Seas King Defender of the Faith Emperor of India To all to whom these Presents shall come greeting WHEREAS by an Act of Parliament recited of Act 24 and 25 Vict c 104 passed in the Twenty fourth and Twenty fifth Years of the Reign of Her late Majesty Queen Victoria and called the Indian High Courts Act 1861 it was amongst other things enacted by section one that it should be lawful for Her Majesty by Letters Patent under the Great Seal of the United Kingdom to erect and establish a High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal for the Bengal Division of the Presidency of Fort William

and by section two that such High Court should consist of a Chief Justice and as many Judges not exceeding fifteen as Her Majesty might from time to time think fit to appoint who should be selected from among persons qualified as in the said Act was declared

and by section eight that upon the establishment of such High Court as aforesaid the Supreme Court and the Court of Sudder Dewany Adawlut and Sudder Nazamut Adawlut at Calcutta in the said Presidency should be abolished

and by section nine that the High Court of Judicature so to be established should have and exercise all such civil criminal admiralty and vice admiralty testamentary intestate and matrimonial jurisdiction original and appellate and all such powers and authority for and in relation to the administration of justice in the said Presidency as Her Majesty might by such Letters Patent as aforesaid grant and direct subject however to such directions and limitation, as to the exercise of original civil and criminal jurisdiction beyond the limits of the Presidency town as might be prescribed thereby and that save as by such Letters Patent might be otherwise directed and subject and without prejudice to the legislative powers in relation to the matters aforesaid of the Governor General of India in Council the High Court so to be established should have and exercise all jurisdiction and every power and authority whatsoever in any manner vested in any of the Courts in the same Presidency abolished under the said Act at the time of the abolition of such last mentioned Courts

And whereas it was further declared by section sixteen of the said recited Act that it should be lawful for Us by Letters Patent to erect and establish a High Court of a Judicature in and for any portion of territories within Our Dominions in India not included within the limits of the local jurisdiction of another High Court to consist of Chief Justice and such number of other Judges with such qualifications as were by the same Act required in persons to be appointed to the High Courts established at the Presidencies of Fort William in Bengal of Madras and of Bombay as We from time to time might think fit and appoint and that it should be lawful for Us by such Letters Patent to confer on any new High Court which might be so established any such jurisdiction powers and authority as under the same Act was authorized to be conferred on or would become vested in the High Court established in any of the said Presidencies and that subject to the directions of the Letters Patent all the provisions of the said recited Act relative to High Courts and to the Chief Justice and other Judges of such Court and to the Governor General or Governor of the Presidency in which such High Court were established should as far as circumstances might permit be applicable to any new High Court which might be established in the said territories and to the Chief Justice and other



## Let Pat. [Patna]

Judges thereof and to the persons administering the Government of the said territories

And whereas upon full consideration of the premises Her late Majesty Queen Victoria by Letters Patent under the Great Seal of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland bearing date at Westminster the Fourteenth day of May in the Twenty-fifth Year of Her Reign in the Year of Our Lord One thousand eight hundred and sixty two did erect and establish a High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal for the Bengal Division of the Presidency of Fort William aforesaid and did constitute that Court to be a Court of Record.

And whereas Her late Majesty Queen Victoria by Letters Patent under the Great Seal of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland bearing date at Westminster the Twenty eighth day of December in the Twenty ninth Year of Her Reign in the Year of Our Lord One thousand eight hundred and sixty five did revoke the said Letters Patent bearing date the Fourteenth day of May in the Year of Our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty two but notwithstanding that revocation did continue the said High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal and declare that the Court should continue to be a Court of Record

And whereas upon full consideration of the premises Her late Majesty Queen Victoria by Letters Patent under that Great Seal of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland bearing date at Westminster the Seventeenth day of March in the Twentieth year of Her Reign, in the Year of Our Lord One thousand eight hundred and sixty six did erect and establish a High Court of Judicature for the North Western Provinces which said Court is situated at Allahabad in the Province of Agra and is now called the High Court of Judicature at Allahabad and did constitute that Court to be a Court of Record

And whereas by an Act of Parliament passed in the First and Second Years of Our Reign and called the Indian High Courts Act 1811 it was enacted amongst other things by section one that the maximum number of Judges of a High Court of Judicature in India including the Chief Justice should be twenty

and by section two that Our power under section sixteen of the Indian High Courts Act 1861 might be exercised from time to time and that a High Court might be established under the said section sixteen in any portion of the territories within Our Dominion in India whether or not included within the limits of the local jurisdiction of another High Court and that where such a High Court was established in any part of such territories included within the limits of the local jurisdiction of another High Court it should be lawful for Us by Letters Patent to alter the local jurisdiction of that other High Court and to make such incidental consequential and supplemental provisions as might appear to be necessary by reason of the alteration of those limits

And whereas the said Indian High Courts Acts 1861 and 1911 have been repealed and re enacted by an Act of Parliament passed in the Fifth and Sixth Years of Our Reign and called the Government of India Act 1915

And whereas certain territories formerly subject to and included within the limits of the Presidency of Fort William in Bengal were by provision made by the Governor General of India on the Twenty second day of March in the Year of Our Lord One

Recital of establishment of High Courts at Fort William and Allahabad

Recital of Act 1 & 2 Geo 5 c 18

Recital of Act 5 & 6 Geo 5 c 61

It is of creation of Province of Bihar and Orissa

Let Pat [F

thousand nine hundred and twelve constituted a separate Province called the Province of Bihar and Orissa and are now governed by a Lieutenant Governor in Council

1 Now know ye that We upon full consideration of the premises and of Our Special grace certain knowledge and mere motion have thought fit to erect and establish and by these presents We do accordingly for Us Our Heirs and Successors erect and establish for the Province of Bihar and Orissa aforesaid with effect from the date of the publication of these presents in the Bihar and Orissa Gazette a High Court of Judicature which shall be called the High Court of Judicature at Patna and We do hereby constitute the said Court to be a Court of Record

2 And We do hereby appoint and ordain that the High Court of Judicature at Patna shall until further or other provision be made by Us or Our Heirs and Successors in that behalf in accordance with section one hundred and one of the said recited Government of India Act 1915 consist of a Chief Justice and six other Judges the first Chief Justice being Sir Edward Maynard Des Champs Chamier Knight and the six other Judges being Saiyid Shurf ud din Esquire Edmund Pelly Chapman Esquire Basanta Kumar Mullick Esquire Francis Reginald Roe Esquire the Honourable Cecil Atkinson and Jowala Persad Esquire being respectively qualified as in the said Act is declared

3 And We do hereby ordain that the Chief Justice and every other Judge of the High Court of Judicature at Patna previously to entering upon the execution of the duties of his office shall make and subscribe the following declaration before such authority or person as the Lieutenant Governor in Council may commission to receive it —

I *I B* appointed Chief Justice [or a Judge] of the High Court of Judicature at Patna do solemnly declare that I will faithfully perform the duties of my office to the best of my ability knowledge and judgment

4 And We do hereby grant ordain and appoint that the High Court of Judicature at Patna shall have and use as occasion may require a seal bearing a device and impression of Our Royal arms within an evergreen or label surrounding the same with this inscription The Seal of the High Court at Patna And We do further grant ordain and appoint that the said seal shall be delivered to and kept in the custody of the Chief Justice



Seal.

and in case of vacancy of the office of Chief Justice or during any absence of the Chief Justice the same shall be delivered over and kept in the custody of the person appointed to act as Chief Justice under the provisions of section One hundred and five of the Government of India Act 1915 and We do further grant ordain and appoint that whenever the office of Chief Justice or of the Judge to whom the custody of the said seal be committed is vacant the said High Court shall be and is hereby authorized and empowered to demand seize and take the said seal from any person or persons whomsoever by what ways and means soever the same may have come to him her or their possession

5 And We do hereby further grant ordain and appoint that all writs summonses precept rule orders and other mandatory process to be used is used or awarded by the High Court of Judicature at Patna shall run and be in the name and style of Us or of Our Heirs and Successors and shall be sealed with the seal of the said High Court

Writs to be issued in name of the Crown and under seal

## Let Pat [Patna]

Cls 6-9

6 And We do hereby authorize and empower the Chief Justice of the High Court of Judicature at Patna from time to time as occurs Appointment of officers may require and subject to any rules and restrictions which may be prescribed from time to time by the Lieutenant Governor in Council to appoint so many and such clerks and other ministerial officers as may be found necessary for the administration of justice and the due execution of all the powers and authorities granted and committed to the said High Court by the said Our Letters Patent And We do hereby ordain that every such appointment shall be forthwith submitted to the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council and shall be either confirmed or disallowed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council And it is Our better will and pleasure and We do hereby for Us Our heirs and successors give grant direct and appoint that all and every the officers and clerks to be appointed as aforesaid shall have and receive respectively such reasonable salaries as the Chief Justice may from time to time appoint for each office and place respectively and as the Lieutenant Governor in Council subject to the control of the Governor General in Council may approve of Provided always and it is Our will and pleasure that all and every the Officers and clerks to be appointed as aforesaid shall be resident within the limits of the jurisdiction of the said Court so long as they hold their respective offices but this provision shall not interfere with or prejudice the right of any officer or clerk to avail himself of leave of absence under any rule prescribed from time to time by the Governor General in Council and to absent himself from the said limits during the term of such leave in accordance with the said rules

*Admission of Advocates Vakils and Attorneys*

7 And We do hereby authorize and empower the High Court of Judicature at Patna to approve admit and enrol such and so many Advocates Vakils and Attorneys as to the said High Court may seem meet and such Advocates Vakils and Attorneys shall be and are hereby authorized to appear for the said Court of the said High Court and to plead or to act or to plead and act for the said Court according as the said High Court may by its rules and directions determine and subject to such rules and directions

8 And We do hereby ordain that the High Court of Judicature at Patna shall have power to make rules from time to time for the qualification and admission of proper persons to be Advocates Vakils and Attorneys at Law of the said High Court and shall be empowered to remove or to suspend from practice on reasonable cause the said Advocates Vakils or Attorneys at Law and no person whatsoever but such Advocates Vakils or Attorneys shall be allowed to act or to plead for or on behalf of any suitor in the said High Court except that any suitor shall be allowed to appear plead or act on his own behalf or on behalf of a co suitor

*Civil Jurisdiction of the High Court*

9 And We do further ordain that the High Court of Judicature at Patna shall have power to remove and to try and determine a suit of extraordinary original jurisdiction any suit being or falling within the jurisdiction of any Court subject to the superintendence when the said High Court may think proper to do so either on the agreement of the parties to that effect or for purposes of justice the reasons for so doing being recorded on the proceedings of the said High Court

Let Pat [P

Cis

10 And We do further ordain that an appeal shall lie to the said High Court of Judicature at Patna from the judgment (not being a judgment passed in the exercise of appellate jurisdiction in respect of a decree or order made in the exercise of appellate jurisdiction by a Court subject to the superintendence of the said High Court and not being an order made in the exercise of revisional jurisdiction and not being a sentence or order passed or made in the exercise of the power of superintendence under the provisions of section 107 of the Government of India Act or in the exercise of criminal jurisdiction) of one Judge of the said High Court or one Judge of any Division Court pursuant to section 108 of the Government of India Act and that notwithstanding anything hereinbefore provided an appeal shall lie to the said High Court from a judgment of one Judge of the said High Court or one Judge of any Division Court pursuant to section 108 of the Government of India Act made in the exercise of appellate jurisdiction in respect of a decree or order made on or after the first day of February 1929 in the exercise of appellate jurisdiction by a Court subject to the superintendence of the said High Court where the Judge who passed the judgment declare that the case is a fit one for appeal but that the right of appeal from other judgments of Judges of the said High Court or of such Division Court shall be to Us Our Heirs or Successors in Our or Their Privy Council as hereinafter provided

11 And We do further ordain that the High Court of Judicature at Patna shall be a Court of Appeal from the Civil Courts of the Province of Bihar and Orissa and from all other Courts subject to its superintendence and shall exercise appellate jurisdiction in such cases as were immediately before the date of the publication of these presents subject to appeal to the High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal by virtue of any law then in force or as may after that date be declared subject to appeal to the High Court of Judicature at Patna by any law made by competent legislative authority for India

12 And We do further ordain that the High Court of Judicature at Patna shall have the like power and authority with respect to the persons and estates of infants idiots and lunatics within the Province of Bihar and Orissa as that which was vested in the High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal immediately before the publication of these presents

*Law to be administered by the High Court*

13 And We do further ordain that with respect to the law or equity to be applied to each case coming before the High Court of Judicature at Patna in the exercise of its extraordinary original civil jurisdiction such law or equity shall until otherwise provided be the law or equity which would have been applied to such case by any local Court having jurisdiction therein

14 And We do further ordain that with respect to the law or equity and rule of good conscience to be applied by the High Court of Judicature at Patna to each case coming before it in the exercise of its appellate jurisdiction such law or equity and rule of good conscience shall be the law or equity and rule of good conscience which the Court in which the proceeding in such case were originally instituted ought to have applied to such case

Let Pat [Patna]

Cls 15 21

*Criminal Jurisdiction*

15 And We do further ordain that the High Court of Judicature at Patna shall have ordinary original criminal jurisdiction in respect of all such persons within the Province of Bihar and Orissa as the High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal had such criminal jurisdiction over immediately before the publication of these presents

*Ordinary original criminal jurisdiction of the High Court*

16 And We do further ordain that the High Court of Judicature at Patna shall be empowered to try all persons brought before it in due course of law

*Jurisdiction as to persons*

17 And We do further ordain that the High Court of Judicature at Patna shall have extraordinary original criminal jurisdiction over all persons residing in places within the jurisdiction of the Court subject to its superintendence and shall have authority to try at its discretion any such persons brought before it on charges preferred by any magistrate or other officer specially empowered by the Government in that behalf

*Extraordinary original Criminal jurisdiction*

18 And We do further ordain that there shall be no appeal to the High Court of Judicature at Patna from any sentence or order passed or made by the Courts of original criminal jurisdiction which may be constituted by one or more Judges of the said High Court. But it shall be at the discretion of any such Court to reserve any point or points of law for the opinion of the said High Court

*No appeal from High Court exercising original jurisdiction*

*High Court But it shall be at the discretion of any such Court to reserve any point or points of law for the opinion of the said High Court*

19 And We do further ordain that on such point or points of law as may be reserved as aforesaid the High Court of Judicature at Patna shall have full power and authority to review the case or such part of it as may be necessary and finally determine such point or points of law and thereupon to affirm or reverse or modify the sentence passed by the Court of original jurisdiction and to pass such judgment and sentence as to the said High Court may seem right

*High Court to review cases on points of law reserved by one or more Judges of the High Court*

20 And We do further ordain that the High Court of Judicature at Patna shall be a Court of Appeal from the Criminal Court of the Province of Bihar and Orissa and from all other Courts subject to its superintendence and shall exercise appellate jurisdiction in such cases as were immediately before the publication of these presents subject to appeal to the High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal by virtue of any law then in force or as may after that date be declared subject to appeal to the High Court of Judicature at Patna by any law made by competent legislative authority for India

*Appeals from other Criminal Court in the province of Bihar and Orissa*

21 And We do further ordain that the High Court of Judicature at Patna shall be a Court of reference and revision from the Criminal Courts subject to its appellate jurisdiction and shall have power to hear and determine all such cases referred to it by the Session Judges or by any other officers in the Province of Bihar and Orissa who were immediately before the publication of these presents authorized to refer cases to the High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal

*Hearing of referred cases and revision of criminal trials*

Let Pat [Pa

Cls 2

and to revise all such cases tried by any officer or Court possessing criminal jurisdiction in the Province of Bihar and Orissa as were immediately before the publication of these presents subject to reference to or revision by the High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal

22 And We do further ordain that the High Court of Judicature at Patna shall have power to direct the transfer of any criminal case or appeal from any Court to any other Court of equal or superior jurisdiction and also to direct the preliminary investigation or trial of any criminal case by any officer or Court otherwise competent to investigate or try it though such case belongs in ordinary course to the jurisdiction of some other officer or Court

High Court may direct the transfer of a case from one Court to another

#### *Criminal Law*

23 And We do further ordain that all persons brought for trial before the High Court of Judicature at Patna, either in the exercise of its original jurisdiction or in the exercise of its jurisdiction as a Court of appeal reference or revision charged with any offence for which provision is made by Act No XLV of 1860 called the Indian Penal Code or by any Act amending or excluding the said Act which may have been passed prior to the publication of these presents shall be liable to punishment under the said Act or Acts and not otherwise

Offenders to be punished under Indian Penal Code

#### *Admiralty Jurisdiction*

24 And We do further ordain that the High Court of Judicature at Patna shall have and exercise in the Province of Bihar and Orissa all such civil and maritime jurisdiction as was exercisable there immediately before the publication of these presents by the High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal as a Court of Admiralty and also such jurisdiction for the trial and adjudication of prize causes and other maritime questions as was so exercisable by the High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal

Civil

25 And We do further ordain that the High Court of Judicature at Patna shall have and exercise in the Province of Bihar and Orissa all such criminal jurisdiction as was exercisable therein immediately before the publication of these presents by the High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal as a Court of Admiralty or otherwise in connection with maritime matters or matters of prize

Criminal

#### *Testamentary and Intestate Jurisdiction*

26 And We do further ordain that the High Court of Judicature at Patna shall have the like power and authority as that which was immediately before the publication of these presents lawfully exercised within the Province of Bihar and Orissa by the High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal in relation to the granting of probates of last wills and testaments and letters of administration of the goods chattels credits and all other effects whatsoever of persons dying intestate Provided always that nothing in these Letters Patent contained shall interfere with the provisions of any law which has been made by competent legislative authority for India, by which power is given to any other Court to grant such probates and letters of administration.

Testamentary and intestate jurisdiction

Let Pat. [Patna]

Cls 27-30

*Matrimonial Jurisdiction*

27 And We do further ordain that the High Court of Judicature at Patna shall have jurisdiction, within the Province of Bihar and Orissa in matters matrimonial between Our subjects professing the Christian religion Provided always that nothing herein contained shall be held to interfere with the exercise of any jurisdiction in matrimonial by any Court not established by Letters Patent within the said Province which is lawfully possessed of that jurisdiction.

*Powers of single Judges and Division Courts*

28 And We do hereby declare that any function which is hereby directed to be performed by the High Court of Judicature at Patna, in the exercise of its original or appellate jurisdiction, may be performed by any Judge or by any Division Court, then appointed or constituted for such purpose in pursuance of Section One hundred and eight of the Government of India Act 1915 and if such Division Court is composed of two or more Judges and the Judges are divided in opinion as to the decision to be given on any point such point shall be decided according to the opinion of the majority of the Judges if there be a majority but if the Judges be equally divided they shall state the point upon which they differ and the case shall then be heard upon that point by one or more of the other Judges and the point shall be decided according to the opinion of the majority of the Judges who have heard the case including those who first heard it.

**Amendment.**—The words in the last clause after the words “equally divided” were substituted for the words “the opinion of the senior Judge shall prevail” by amended Letters Patent of 1925. See note under clause 30 of the Calcutta Letters Patent.

*Civil Procedure.*

29 And We do further ordain that it shall be lawful for the High Court of Judicature at Patna from time to time to make rules and regulations for regulating the practice of the Court and for the purpose of adopting as far as possible the provisions of the Civil Procedure being an Act No V of 1908 passed by the Governor-General in Council and the provisions of any law which has been or may be made amended or altered the same by competent legislative authority for India to all proceedings in the ordinary original and matrimonial jurisdiction, respectively.

*Criminal Procedure.*

30 And We do further ordain that the proceedings in all criminal cases before the High Court of Judicature at Patna, in the exercise of its ordinary original criminal jurisdiction shall be regulated by the procedure and practice which was in use in the High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal immediately before the publication of these provisions to any law which has been or may be made in relation thereto by competent legislative authority for India and that the proceedings in all other criminal cases shall be regulated by the Code of Criminal Procedure being Act No VIII of 1902 passed by the Governor-General in Council or by such further or other law in relation to criminal procedure as may have been or may be made by such authority as aforesaid.

Let Pat

*Appeals to Privy Council*

C]

31 And We do further ordain that any person or persons may appeal to Us Our heirs and successors in Our or their Privy Council in any matter not being of criminal jurisdiction from any final judgment decree or order of the High Court of Judicature of Patna made on appeal and from any final judgment decree or order made in the exercise of original jurisdiction by Judges of the said High Court or of any Division Court from which an appeal does not lie to the said High Court under the provision contained in the 10th clause of these presents Provided in either case that the sum or matter at issue is of the amount of value of not less than 10 000 rupees or that such judgment decree or order involves directly or indirectly some claim demand or question to or respecting property amounting to or of the value of not less than 10 000 rupees or from any other final judgment decree or order made either on appeal or otherwise as aforesaid when the said High Court declares that the case is a fit one for appeal to Us Our heirs or successors in Our or their Privy Council but subject always to such rules and orders as are now in force or may from time to time be made respecting appeals to Our selves in Council from the Courts of the Province of Bihar and Orissa except so far as the said existing rules and orders respectively are hereby varied and subject also to such further rules and orders as We may with the advice of Our Privy Council hereafter make in that behalf

32 And We do further ordain that it shall be lawful for the High Court of Judicature at Patna at its discretion on the motion or if the said High Court be not sitting then for any Judge of the said High Court upon the petition of any party who considers himself aggrieved by any preliminary or interlocutory judgment decree or order of the said High Court in any such proceeding as aforesaid not being of criminal jurisdiction grant permission to such party to appeal against the same to Us Our heirs and successors in Our or their Privy Council subject to the same rules regulations and orders as are herein expressed respecting appeals from final judgments decrees and orders

33 And We do further ordain that from any judgment order or sentence of the High Court of Judicature at Patna made in any case of original criminal jurisdiction or in any case where any point or points of law have been reserved for the opinion of the said Court in manner provided by the 18th clause of these presents to which the said Court has exercised original jurisdiction it shall be lawful for any person or persons aggrieved by such judgment order or sentence to appeal to Us Our heirs and successors in Council provided the said High Court declares that the case is a fit one for appeal and that the appeal be made under such conditions as the said High Court may establish or require but subject always to such rules and orders as may from time to time be made respecting appeals to Ourselves in the Courts of the Province of Bihar and Orissa

34 And We do further ordain that in all cases of appeal from any judgment decree order or sentence of the High Court of Judicature at Patna to Us Our heirs or successors in Our or their Privy Council such High Court shall cause to be made and preserved a true and correct copy of all evidence proceedings judgments and decrees made in such cases appealed, so far as the same have reference to the points of law reserved for the consideration of the Privy Council



## Let Pat [Patna]

**Cal 34-38** such copies to be certified under the seal of the said High Court And that the said High Court shall also certify and transmit to Us Our heirs and successors in Our or their Privy Council a copy of the reasons given by the Judges of such Court or by any of such Judges for or against the judgment or determination appealed against And we do further ordain that the said High Court shall in all cases of appeal to Us Our heirs or successors conform to and execute or cause to be executed such judgments and orders as We Our heirs or successors in Our or their Privy Council may think fit to make on the premises in such manner as any original judgment decree or decretal orders or other order or rule of the said High Court, should or might have been executed.

*Exercise of jurisdiction elsewhere than at the usual place  
of sitting of the High Court*

**35** And We do further ordain that unless the Governor General in Council otherwise directs one or more Judges of the High Court of Judicature at Patna shall visit the Division of Orissa, by way of circuit whenever the Chief Justice from time to time appoints in order to exercise in respect of cases arising in the Division the jurisdiction and power by these Our Letters Patent or by or under the Government of India Act 1915 vested in the said High Court Provided always that such visits shall be made not less than four times in every year unless the Chief Justice with the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council otherwise directs Provided also that the said High Court shall have power from time to time to make rules with the previous sanction of the Lieutenant Governor in Council for determining what cases or classes of cases arising in the Division of Orissa shall be heard at Patna and not in that Division and that the Chief Justice may in his discretion, order that any particular case arising in the Division of Orissa shall be heard at Patna or in the Division

**36** And We do further ordain that whenever it appears to the Lieutenant Governor in Council subject to the control of the Governor General in Council convenient that the jurisdiction and power by these Our Letters Patent or by or under the Government of India Act 1915 vested in the High Court of Judicature at Patna should be exercised in any place within the jurisdiction of any Court subject to the superintendence of the said High Court other than the usual place of sitting of the said High Court or at several such places by way of circuit one or more Judges of the Court shall visit such place or places accordingly

**37** And We do further ordain that whenever any Judge or Judges of the High Court of Judicature at Patna visit any place under the 36th or the 36th clause of these presents the proceedings in cases before him or them at such place shall be regulated by any law relating thereto which has been or may be made by the competent legislative authority for India

*Delegation of Duties to Officers*

**38** The High Court of Judicature at Patna may from time to time make rules for delegating to any Registrar Prothonotary or Master or other official of the Court any Judicial, quasi-judicial and non-judicial duties

Let Pat [

*Cessation of Jurisdiction of the High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal* Cls

39 And We do further ordain that the jurisdiction of the High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal in any matter in which jurisdiction is by these presents given to the High Court of Judicature at Patna shall cease from the date of the publication of these presents and that all proceedings pending in the former Court on that date in reference to any such matter shall be transferred to the latter Court

*Cessation of jurisdiction of the High Court of Judicature at Fort William over the Province of Bihar and Orissa*

Provided first that the High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal shall continue to exercise jurisdiction—

- (a) in all proceedings pending in that Court on the date of the publication of these presents in which any decree or order other than an order of an interlocutory nature has been passed or made by that Court or in which the validity of any such decree or order is directly in question \* and
- (b) in all proceedings (not being proceedings referred to in paragraph (a) of this clause) pending in that Court on the date of the publication of these presents under the 13th 14th 22nd 23rd 24th 25th 26th 27th 28th 29th 32nd 33rd 34th or 35th clause of the Letters Patent bearing date at Westminster the Twenty eighth day of December in the Year of Our Lord One thousand eight hundred and sixty five relating to that Court and
- (c) in all proceedings instituted in that Court on or after the date of the publication of these presents with reference to any decree or order passed or made by that Court

Provided secondly that if any question arises as to whether any case is covered by the first proviso to this clause the matter shall be referred to the Chief Justice of the High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal and his decision shall be final

*Calls for Records etc by the Government*

40 And it is Our further will and pleasure that the High Court of Judicature at Patna shall comply with such requisitions as may be made by the Lieutenant Governor in Council for records returns and statements in such form and manner as he may deem proper

*High Court to comply with requisition from Government for records etc*

*Powers of Indian Legislatures*

41 And We do further ordain and declare that all the provisions of these Our Letters Patent are subject to the legislative power of the Governor General in Legislative Council and also of the Governor General in Council under section Seventy-one of the Government of India Act 1915 and also of the Governor General in cases of emergency under section Seventy two of that Act and may be in all respects amended and altered thereby

*Powers of Indian Legislatures preserved*

In Witness whereof we have caused these Our Letters to be made Patent Witness Ourselves at Westminster the Ninth day of February in the Year of Our Lord One thousand nine hundred and sixteen and in the sixth year of Our Reign

By warrant under the King's Sign Manual

(Signed) SCHUSTER.

# Letters Patent for the High Court of Lahore

March 21, 1919

Cls 1-3

GEORGE THE FIFTH by the Grace of God of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and of the British Dominions beyond the Seas King Defender of the Faith Emperor of India To all to whom these Presents shall come greeting Whereas by an Act of Parliament passed in the Fifth and Sixth years of Our said Majesty called the Government of India Act 1915 it was amongst other things enacted that it should be lawful for Us by Letters Patent to establish a High Court of Judicature in any territory in British India whether or not included within the limits of the local jurisdiction of another High Court and to confer on any High Court so established such jurisdiction powers and authority as were vested in or might be conferred on any High Court existing at the commencement of that Act

And whereas the Provinces of the Punjab and Delhi are now subject to the Jurisdiction of the Chief Court of the Punjab which was established by an Act of the Governor General of India in Council being Act No XXIII of 1860 and was continued by subsequent enactments and no part of the said provinces is included within the limits of the local jurisdiction of any High Court

1 Now know ye that We upon full consideration of the premises and of Our special grace certain knowledge and mere motion have thought fit to erect and establish and by these presents We do accordingly for Us Our heirs and successors erect and establish for the Province of the Punjab and Delhi aforesaid with effect from the date of the publication of these presents in the *Gazette of India* a High Court of Judicature which shall be called the High Court of Judicature at Lahore and We do hereby constitute the said Court to be a Court of Record


2 And We do hereby appoint and ordain that the High Court of Judicature at Lahore shall until further or other provision be made by Us or Our heirs and successors in the behalf in accordance with section one hundred and one of the said Government of India Act 1915 consist of a Chief Justice and six other Judges the first Chief Justice being Sir Henry Adolphus Pattison Knight and the six other Judges being William Chervis Esquire Henry Scott Smith Esquire Shadi Lal Esquire Rai Bahadur Walter Aubinle Poddigool Esquire Leonard Hudson Leslie Jones Esquire and Alan Bruce Broadway Esquire being respectively qualified as in the said Act is declared

3 And We do hereby ordain that the Chief Justice and every other Judge of the High Court of Judicature at Lahore previously to entering in the execution of the duties of his office shall make and subscribe the following declaration before such authority or person as the Lieutenant Governor of the Punjab may commission to receive it—

I A B appointed Chief Justice (or a Judge) of the High Court of Judicature at Lahore do solemnly declare that I will faithfully perform the duties of my office to the best of my ability knowledge and judgment

Let Pat [La

Cis

4 And We do hereby grant ordain and appoint that the High Court of Judicature at Lahore shall have and use as occasion may require a Seal bearing a device and impression of Our Royal arms within an evergreen or label surrounding the same with this inscription  
The Seal of the High Court at Lahore And We do further grant ordain and appoint that the said seal shall be delivered to and kept in the custody of the Chief Justice and in case of vacancy of the Office of Chief Justice or during any absence of the Chief Justice the same shall be delivered over and kept in the custody of the person appointed to act as Chief Justice under the provisions of section one hundred and five of the Government of India Act 1915 and We do further grant ordain and appoint that whensoever the office of Chief Justice or of the Judge to whom the custody of the said seal be committed is vacant the said High Court shall be and is hereby authorized and empowered to demand seize and take the said seal from any person or persons whomsoever by what ways and means soever the same may have come to his her or their possession

5 And We do hereby further grant ordain and appoint that all writs summonses precepts rules orders and other mandatory process to be used issued or awarded by the High Court of Judicature at Lahore shall run and be in the name and style of Us or of Our heirs and successors and shall be sealed with the seal of the said High Court

6 And We do hereby authorize and empower the Chief Justice of the High Court of Judicature at Lahore from time to time as occasion may require and subject to any rules and restrictions which may be prescribed from time to time by the Lieutenant Governor of the Punjab to appoint so many and such clerks and other ministerial officers as may be found necessary for the administration of justice and the due execution of all the powers and authorities granted and committed to the said High Court by these Our Letters Patent And it is Our further will and pleasure and we do hereby for Us Our heirs and successors give grant direct and appoint that all and every the officers and clerks to be appointed as aforesaid shall have and receive respectively such reasonable salaries as the Chief Justice may from time to time appoint for each office and place respectively and as the Lieutenant Governor of the Punjab subject to the control of the Governor General in Council may approve of Provided always and it is Our will and pleasure that all and every the officers and clerks to be appointed as aforesaid shall be resident within the limits of the jurisdiction of the said Court so long as they hold their respective offices but this provision shall not interfere with or prejudice the right of any officer or clerk to avail himself of leave of absence under any rules prescribed from time to time by the Governor General in Council and to absent himself from the said limits during the term of such leave in accordance with the said rules

#### Admission of Advocates Vakils and Attorneys

7 And We do hereby authorize and empower the High Court of Judicature at Lahore to approve admit and enrol such and so many Advocates Vakils and Attorneys as to the said High Court may seem meet and such Advocates Vakils and Attorneys shall be and are hereby authorized to appear for the suitors of the said High Court and to plead or to act or to plead and act for the said suitors according as the said High Court may by its rules and directions determine and subject to such rule and directions

## Let Pat [Lahore]

Cis 8-11

8 And We do hereby ordain that the High Court of Judicature at Lahore shall have power to make rules from time to time for the qualification and admission of proper persons to be Advocates Vakils and Attorneys at Law of the said High Court and shall be empowered to remove or to suspend from practice on reasonable cause the said Advocates Vakils or Attorneys at Law and no person whatsoever but such Advocates Vakils or Attorneys shall be allowed to act or to plead for or on behalf of any suitor in the said High Court except that any suitor shall be allowed to appear plead or act on his own behalf or on behalf of a co suitor

Powers of High Court in making rules for the qualifications etc of Advocates Vakils and Attorneys

have power to make rules from time to time for the qualification and admission of proper persons to be Advocates Vakils and Attorneys at Law of the said High Court and shall be empowered to remove or to suspend from practice on reasonable cause the said Advocates Vakils or Attorneys at Law and no person whatsoever but such Advocates Vakils or Attorneys shall be allowed to act or to plead for or on behalf of any suitor in the said High Court except that any suitor shall be allowed to appear plead or act on his own behalf or on behalf of a co suitor

*Civil Jurisdiction of the High Court.*

9 And We do further ordain that the High Court of Judicature at Lahore shall have power to remove and to try and determine as a Court of extraordinary original jurisdiction any suit being or falling within the jurisdiction of any Court subject to its superintendence when the said High Court may think proper to do so either on the agreement of the parties to that effect or for purposes of justice the reasons for so doing being recorded on the proceedings of the said High Court

10 And We do further ordain that an appeal shall lie to the said High Court of Judicature at Lahore from the judgment (not being a judgment passed in the exercise of appellate jurisdiction in respect of a decree or order made in the exercise of appellate jurisdiction by a Court subject to the superintendence of the said High Court and not being an order made in the exercise of revisional jurisdiction and not being a sentence or order passed or made in the exercise of the power of superintendence under the provisions of section 107 of the Government of India Act or in the exercise of criminal jurisdiction) of one Judge of the said High Court or one Judge of any Division Court pursuant to section 108 of the Government of India Act and that notwithstanding anything heretofore provided an appeal shall lie to the said High Court from a judgment of one Judge of the said High Court or one Judge of any Division Court pursuant to section 108 of the Government of India Act made on or after the first day of February, 1903 in the exercise of appellate jurisdiction in respect of a decree or order made in the exercise of appellate jurisdiction by a Court subject to the superintendence of the said High Court where the Judge who passed the judgment declares that the case is a fit one for appeal but that the right of appeal from other judgments of Judges of the said High Court or of such Division Court shall be to Us Our Heirs or Successors in Our or Their Privy Council as hereinafter provided.

11 And We do further ordain that the High Court of Judicature at Lahore shall be a Court of Appeal from the Civil Courts of the Provinces of the Punjab and Delhi and from all other Courts subject to its superintendence and shall exercise appellate jurisdiction in such cases as were immediately before the date of the publication of these presents subject to appeal to the Chief Court of the Punjab by virtue of any law then in force or as may after that date be declared subject to appeal to the High Court of Judicature at Lahore by any law made by competent legislative authority for India.

Appeal from other Civil Courts in the Provinces of the Punjab and Delhi

be a Court of Appeal from the Civil Courts of the Provinces of the Punjab and Delhi and from all other Courts subject to its superintendence and shall exercise appellate jurisdiction in such cases as were immediately before the date of the publication of these presents subject to appeal to the Chief Court of the Punjab by virtue of any law then in force or as may after that date be declared subject to appeal to the High Court of Judicature at Lahore by any law made by competent legislative authority for India.

Let Pat [L

Cl

12 And We do further ordain that the High Court of Judicature at Lahore shall have the like power and authority with respect to the persons and estates of infants idiots and lunatics within the Provinces of the Punjab and Delhi as that which was vested in the Chief Court of the Punjab immediately before the publication of these presents

*Law to be administered by the High Court*

13 And We do further ordain that with respect to the law or equity to be applied to each case coming before the High Court of Judicature at Lahore in the exercise of its extraordinary original civil jurisdiction such law or equity shall until otherwise provided be the law or equity which would have been applied to such case by any local Court having jurisdiction thereon.

14 And We do further ordain that with respect to the law or equity and rule of good conscience to be applied by the High Court of Judicature at Lahore to each case coming before it in the exercise of its appellate jurisdiction such law or equity and rule of good conscience shall be the law or equity and rule of good conscience which the Court in which the proceedings in such case were originally instituted ought to have applied to such case

*Criminal Jurisdiction*

15 And We do further ordain that the High Court of Judicature at Lahore shall have ordinary original criminal jurisdiction in respect of all such persons within the Provinces of the Punjab and Delhi as the Chief Court of the Punjab had such criminal jurisdiction over immediately before the publication of these presents.

16 And We do further ordain that the High Court of Judicature at Lahore in the exercise of its ordinary original criminal jurisdiction shall be empowered to try all persons brought before it in due course of law

17 And We do further ordain that the High Court of Judicature at Lahore shall have extraordinary original criminal jurisdiction over all persons residing in places within the jurisdiction of any Court subject to its superintendence and shall have authority to try at its discretion any such persons brought before it on charges preferred by any magistrate or other officer specially empowered by the Government in that behalf

18 And We do further ordain that there shall be no appeal to the High Court of Judicature at Lahore from any sentence or order passed or made by the Courts of original criminal jurisdiction which may be constituted by one or more Judges of the said High Court But it shall be at the discretion of any such Court to reserve any point or points of law for the opinion of the said High Court.

19 And We do further ordain that on such point or points of law being so reserved as aforesaid the High Court of Judicature at Lahore shall have full power and authority to review the case or such part of it as may be necessary and finally determine such point or points of law and thereupon to alter the sentence passed by the Court of original jurisdiction and to pass such judgment and sentence as to the said High Court may seem right.

## Let Pat [Lahore]

Cls 20-24      20 And We do further ordain that the High Court of Judicature at Lahore shall

Appeals from other criminal Courts in the Provinces of the Punjab and Delhi

be a Court of Appeal from the Criminal Courts of the Provinces of the Punjab and Delhi and from all other Courts subject to its superintendence and shall exercise appellate jurisdiction in such cases as were immediately before the

date of the publication of these presents subject to appeal to the Chief Court of the Punjab by virtue of any law then in force or as may after that date be declared subject to appeal to the High Court of Judicature at Lahore by any law made by competent legislative authority for India

21 And We do further ordain that the High Court of Judicature at Lahore shall

Hear and revise of referred cases and revision of criminal trials

be a Court of reference and revision from the Criminal Courts subject to its appellate jurisdiction and shall have power to hear and determine all such cases referred to it by the Sessions Judges or by any other officers in the Provinces of

the Punjab and Delhi who were immediately before the publication of these presents authorized to refer cases to the Chief Court of the Punjab and to revise all such cases tried by any officer or Court possessing criminal jurisdiction in the Provinces of the Punjab and Delhi as were immediately before the publication of these presents subject to reference to or revision by the Chief Court of the Punjab

22 And We do further ordain that the High Court of Judicature at Lahore shall

High Court may direct the transfer of a case from one Court to another

have power to direct the transfer of any criminal case or appeal from any Court to any other Court of equal or superior jurisdiction and also to direct the preliminary investigation or trial of any criminal case by any officer or Court

otherwise competent to investigate or try it though such case belongs in ordinary course to the jurisdiction of some other officer or Court

*Criminal Law*

23 And We do further ordain that all persons brought for trial before the High

Offenders to be punished under Indian Penal Code

Court of Judicature at Lahore either in the exercise of its original jurisdiction or in the exercise of its jurisdiction as a court of appeal reference or revision charged with any offence for which provision is made by Act No XLV of 1860 called the Indian Penal Code or by any Act amending or excluding the said Act which may have been passed prior to the publication of these presents shall be liable to punishment under the said Act or Acts and not otherwise

*Testamentary and Intestate Jurisdiction*

24 And We do further ordain that the High Court of Judicature at Lahore shall

Testamentary and Intestate Jurisdiction

have the like power and authority as that which was immediately before the publication of these presents vested in the Chief Court of the Punjab and Delhi but not exercised within the Provinces of the Punjab and Delhi

Chief Court of the Punjab in relation to the granting of probates of wills and letters of administration of the goods chattel credits and all other whatsoever of persons dying intestate Provided always that nothing in these presents shall interfere with the provisions of any law which has been or shall be enacted by competent legislative authority for India by which power is given to any Court to grant such probates and letters of administration

Let Pat [L

Cis

*Matrimonial Jurisdiction*

25 And We do further ordain that the High Court of Judicature at Lahore shall have jurisdiction within the Provinces of the Punjab and Delhi in matters matrimonial between Our subjects professing the Christian religion. Provided always that nothing herein contained shall be held to interfere with the exercise of any jurisdiction in matters matrimonial by any Court not established by Letters Patent within the said Provinces which is lawfully possessed of that jurisdiction.

*Powers of single Judges and Division Courts*

26 And We do hereby declare that any function which is hereby directed to be performed by the High Court of Judicature at Lahore in the exercise of its original or appellate jurisdiction may be performed by any Judge or by any Division Court thereof appointed or constituted for such purpose in pursuance of section one hundred and eight of the Government of India Act 1915 and if such Division Court is composed of two or more Judges and the Judges are divided in opinion as to the decision to be given on any point such point shall be decided according to the opinion of the majority of the Judges if there be a majority but if the Judges be equally divided they shall state the point upon which they differ and the case shall then be heard upon that point by one or more of the other Judges and the point shall be decided according to the opinion of the majority of the Judges who have heard the case including those who first heard it.

**Amendment**—The words in the last clause after the words equally divided were substituted for the words the opinion of the senior Judge shall prevail by the amended Letters Patent of 1928. See note under clause 36 of the Calcutta Letters Patent.

*Civil Procedure*

27 And We do further ordain that it shall be lawful for the High Court of Judicature at Lahore from time to time to make rules and orders for regulating the practice of the Court and for the purpose of adapting as far as possible the provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure being an Act No 1 of 1908 passed by the Governor General in Council and the provisions of any law which has been or may be made amending or altering the same by competent legislative authority for India to all proceedings in its testamentary intestate and matrimonial jurisdiction respectively.

*Criminal Procedure*

28 And We do further ordain that the proceedings in all criminal cases brought before the High Court of Judicature at Lahore shall be regulated by the Code of Criminal Procedure being an Act No 1 of 1898 passed by the Governor General in Council or by such further or other law in relation to criminal procedure as may have been or may be made by competent legislative authority for India.

*Appeals to Privy Council*

29 And We do further ordain that any person or persons may appeal to Us Our heirs and successors in Our or their Privy Council in any matter not being of criminal jurisdiction from any final judgment decree or order of the High Court of Judicature at Lahore made on appeal and from any final judgment decree or order made in the



## Let Pat [Lahore]

**Cls 29-32** exercise of original jurisdiction by Judges of the said High Court or of any District Court from which an appeal does not lie to the said High Court under the provisions contained in the 10th clause of these presents. Provided in either case that the sum or matter at issue is of the amount or value of not less than 10 000 rupees or that the judgment decree or order involves directly or indirectly some claim demand or question to or respecting property amounting to or of the value of not less than 10 000 rupees or from any other final judgment decree or order made either on appeal or otherwise as aforesaid when the said High Court declares that the case is a fit one for appeal to Us Our heirs or successors in Our or their Privy Council but subject always to such rules and orders as are now in force or may from time to time be made respecting appeals to Ourselves in Council from the Courts of the Provinces of the Punjab and Delhi except so far as the said existing rules and orders respectively are hereby varied and subject also to such further rules and orders as We may with the advice of Our Privy Council hereafter make in that behalf

**30** And we do further ordain that it shall be lawful for the High Court of Judicature at Lahore at its discretion on the motion or if the  
*Appeal from interlocutory judgments* said High Court be not sitting then for any Judge of the said High Court upon the petition of any party who considers himself aggrieved by any preliminary or interlocutory judgment decree or order of the said High Court in any such proceeding as aforesaid not being of criminal jurisdiction to grant permission to such party to appeal against the same to Us Our heirs and successors in Our or their Privy Council subject to the same rules regulations and limitations as are herein expressed respecting appeals from final judgments decrees and orders

**31** And We do further ordain that from any judgment order or sentence of the  
*Appeal in criminal cases* High Court of Judicature at Lahore made in the exercise of original criminal jurisdiction or in any criminal case where a point or points of law have been reserved for the opinion of the said High Court in manner provided by the 18th clause of these presents by any Court which has exercised original jurisdiction it shall be lawful for the person aggrieved by such judgment order or sentence to appeal to Us Our heirs or successors in Council provided the said High Court declares that the case is a fit one for such appeal and that the appeal be made under such conditions as the said High Court may establish or require but subject always to such rules and orders as are now in force or may from time to time be made respecting appeals to Ourselves in Council from the Courts of the Provinces of the Punjab and Delhi

**32.** And We do further ordain that in all cases of appeal made from any judgment decree order or sentence of the High Court of Judicature at Lahore to Us Our heirs or successors in Our or their Privy Council such High Court shall certify and transmit to Us Our heirs and successors in Our or their Privy Council  
*Rule as to transmission of copies of evidence and other documents* a true and correct copy of all evidence proceedings judgments decrees and orders made in such cases appealed so far as the same have relation to the matter of appeal such copies to be certified under the seal of the said High Court And the said High Court shall also certify and transmit to Us Our heirs and successors in Our or their Privy Council a copy of the reasons given by the Judges of such Court or Courts of such Judges for or against the judgment or determination appealed against And We do further ordain that the said High Court shall in all cases of appeal to Us Our heirs and successors conform to and execute or cause to be executed such judgments and orders

Let Pat [La

We Our heirs or successors in Our or their Privy Council may think fit to make in the premises in such manner as any original judgment decree or decretal orders or other order or rule of the said High Court should or might have been executed

*Exercise of Jurisdiction elsewhere than at the usual place of sitting of the High Court*

33 And We do further ordain that whenever it appears to the Lieutenant Governor of the Punjab subject to the control of the Governor General in Council convenient that the jurisdiction and power by these Our Letters Patent or by or under the Government of India Act 1915 vested in the High Court of Judicature at Lahore should be exercised in any place within the jurisdiction of any Court subject to the superintendence of the said High Court other than the usual place of sitting of the said High Court or at several such places by way of circuit one or more Judges of the Court shall visit such place or places accordingly

Special commissions and circuits  
Proceedings of Judges on special commission or circuit

34 And We do further ordain that whenever any Judge or Judges of the High Court of Judicature at Lahore visit any place under the 3rd clause of these presents the proceedings in cases before him or them at such place shall be regulated by any law relating thereto which has been or may be made by competent legislative authority for India

*Delegation of Duties to Officers*

35 The High Court of Judicature at Lahore may from time to time make rules for delegating to any Registrar Prothonotary or Master or other official of the Court any judicial quasi judicial and non judicial duties

*Calls for records etc by the Government*

High Court to comply with req. Liti na from Government for record etc

36 And it is Our further will and pleasure that the High Court of Judicature at Lahore shall comply with such requisitions as may be made by the Governor General in Council or by the Lieutenant Governor of the Punjab for records returns and statements in such form and manner as he may deem proper

*Powers of Indian Legislature*

Powers of Indian Legislature preserved

37 And We do further ordain and declare that all the provisions of these Our Letters Patent are subject to the legislative powers of the Governor General in Legislative Council and also of the Governor General in Council under section seventy one of the Government of India Act 1915 and also of the Governor General in cases of emergency under section seventy two of that Act and may be in all respects amended and altered thereby

In Witness thereof We have caused these Our Letters to be made Patent

Witness Ourself at Westminster the 21st day of March in the Year of Our Lord one thousand nine hundred and nineteen and in the ninth Year of Our reign.

By Warrant under the King's Sign Manual.

(Signed) SCHUSTER.

Let Pat [Rangoon]

Cls 7-11

*Admission of Advocates and Pleaders*

7 And We do hereby authorize and empower the High Court of Judicature at Rangoon to approve admit and enrol such and so many Advocates Pleaders and Attorneys as to the said High Court may seem meet and such Advocates Pleaders and Attorneys shall be and are hereby authorized to appear for the sutors of the said High Court and to plead or to act or to plead and act for the said sutors, according as the said High Court may by its rules and directions determine and subject to such rules and directions

See *In the matter of certain First Grade Advocates (a)*

8 And We do hereby ordain that the High Court of Judicature at Rangoon shall have power to make rules from time to time for the qualification and admission of proper persons to be Advocates Pleaders and Attorneys of the said High Court and shall be empowered to remove or to suspend from practice on reasonable cause the said Advocates Pleaders or Attorneys and no person whatsoever but such Advocates Pleaders or Attorneys shall be allowed to act or to plead for or on behalf of any sutor of the said High Court except that any sutor shall be allowed to appear plead or act on his own behalf or on behalf of a co sutor

*Civil Jurisdiction of the High Court*

9 And We do hereby ordain that the High Court of Judicature at Rangoon shall have and exercise ordinary original civil jurisdiction within such local limits as may from time to time be declared and prescribed by any law made by the local legislature and until some local limits shall be so declared and prescribed within the limits of the ordinary original civil jurisdiction of the Chief Court of Lower Burma immediately before the publication of these presents and the ordinary original civil jurisdiction of the said High Court shall not extend beyond the limits for the time being declared and prescribed as the local limits of such jurisdiction

10 And We do further ordain that the High Court of Judicature at Rangoon in the exercise of its ordinary original civil jurisdiction shall be empowered to receive try and determine suits of every description if in the case of suits for land or other immovable property such land or property shall be situated or in all other cases if the cause of action shall have arisen either wholly or in case the leave of the Court shall have been first obtained in part within the local limits of the ordinary original civil jurisdiction of the said High Court or if the defendant at the time of the commencement of the suit shall dwell or carry on business or personally work for gain within such limits except that the said High Court shall not have such original jurisdiction in cases falling within the jurisdiction of the Rangoon Small Cause Court.

11 And We do further ordain that the High Court of Judicature at Rangoon shall have power to remove and to try and determine as a Court of extraordinary original civil jurisdiction any suit brought or falling within the jurisdiction of any Court subordinate to its superintendence when the said High Court may think proper to do so either on the agreement of the parties to that effect or for purposes of justice the reasons for so doing being recorded on the proceedings of the said High Court.

Let Pat [Ra  
Cis

Application for transfer—Application for transfer should be heard by a Judge sitting on the Original Side of the High Court (b) The original side of the High Court is not competent to transfer a proceeding under the Provincial Insolvency Act from one Court to another (c)

12 And We do further ordain that when the plaintiff has several causes of action against the defendant such causes of action not being for land or other immovable property and the High Court of Judicature at Rangoon shall have original jurisdiction in respect of one such cause of action it shall be lawful for the said High Court to call on the defendant to show cause why the several causes of action should not be joined together in one suit and to make such order for trial of the same as to the said High Court shall seem fit

13 And We do further ordain that an appeal shall lie to the High Court of Judicature at Rangoon from the Judgment (not being a judgment made in the exercise of appellate jurisdiction in respect of a decree or order made in the exercise of appellate jurisdiction by a Court subject to the superintendence of the said High Court and not being an order made in the exercise of revisional jurisdiction and not being a sentence or order passed or made in the exercise of the power of superintendence under the provisions of section 107 of the Government of India Act or in the exercise of criminal jurisdiction) of one Judge of the said High Court or one Judge of any Division Court pursuant to section 108 of the Government of India Act and that notwithstanding anything hereinbefore provided an appeal shall lie to the said High Court from a judgment of one Judge of the said High Court or one Judge of any Division Court pursuant to section 108 of the Government of India Act made in the exercise of appellate jurisdiction in respect of a decree or order made on or after the first day of February 1929 in the exercise of appellate jurisdiction by a Court subject to the superintendence of the said High Court where the Judge who passed the judgment declares that the case is a fit one for appeal that the right of appeal from other judgments of Judges of the said High Court of such Division Court shall be to Us Our Heirs or Successors in Our or Their Privy Council as hereinafter provided

14 And We do further ordain that the High Court of Judicature at Rangoon shall be a Court of Appeal from the Civil Courts of the Province of Burma for which immediately before the publication of these presents the Chief Court of Lower Burma or the Court of the Judicial Commissioner of Upper Burma was a Court of Appeal and from all other Civil Courts whether within or without the Province of Burma for which the said High Court is declared to be a Court of Appeal by any law made by the local legislature or by competent legislative authority for India and shall exercise appellate jurisdiction in such cases as were immediately before the date of the publication of these presents subject to appeal to the Chief Court of Lower Burma or to the Court of the Judicial Commissioner of Upper Burma by virtue of any law then in force or as may after that date be declared subject to appeal to the said High Court by any law made by the local legislature or by competent legislative authority for India

(b) *J. P. Lee General Insurance Co. Ltd. v. Abd. I. Aziz* (1923) 1 Rang. 406 6 I. C. 49  
(1923) A. R. 185

(c) *Oomer Ahmed Brother* In the matter of (1926) 4 Rang. 554 100 I. C. 765 (27)  
A. R. 105

## Let. Pat [Rangoon]

Cls. 14-20

15 And We do further ordain that the High Court of Judicature at Rangoon have the like power and authority with respect to the persons and estates of infants idiots and lunatics within the Province of Lower Burma and the Court of the Judicial Commissioner of Upper Burma immediately before the publication of these presents

16 And We do further ordain that the Court for relief of insolvent debtors at Rangoon shall be held before one of the Judges of the High Court of Judicature at Rangoon and the said High Court and any such Judge thereof shall have and exercise within the Province of Burma such power and authorities with respect to original and appellate jurisdiction and otherwise as are constituted by the laws relating to insolvent debtors in the Province of Burma

17 And We do further ordain that with respect to the law to be applied to each case coming before the High Court of Judicature at Rangoon in the exercise of its ordinary original civil jurisdiction such law shall be the law which would have been applied by the Chief Court of Lower Burma to such case if those Letters Patent had not issued

18 And We do further ordain that with respect to the equity to be applied to each case coming before the High Court of Judicature at Rangoon in the exercise of its ordinary original civil jurisdiction such equity shall be the equity as nearly as may be within the High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal in the exercise of its ordinary original civil jurisdiction is authorized to apply to such case

19 And We do further ordain that with respect to the law or equity and rule of good conscience to be applied to each case coming before the High Court of Judicature at Rangoon in the exercise of its extraordinary original civil jurisdiction such law or equity and rule of good conscience shall until otherwise provided be the law or equity and rule of good conscience which have been applied to such case by any local Court having jurisdiction therein

20 And We do further ordain that with respect to the law or equity and rule of good conscience to be applied by the High Court of Judicature at Rangoon to each case coming before it in the exercise of its appellate jurisdiction such law or equity and rule of good conscience shall be the law or equity and rule of good conscience which the Court in which the proceedings in such case were originally commenced ought to have applied to such case

## CRIMINAL JURISDICTION

21 And We do further ordain that the High Court of Judicature at Rangoon have ordinary original criminal jurisdiction within the limits of its ordinary original civil jurisdiction and in respect of all persons beyond such limits except those in respect of whom the Chief Court of Lower Burma has such criminal jurisdiction immediately before the publication of these presents.

Let Pat [R

22 And We do further ordain that the High Court of Judicature at Rangoon in Cl,  
 Jurisdiction as to persons shall be empowered to try all persons brought before it in  
 the exercise of its ordinary original criminal jurisdiction  
 due course of law

23 And We do further ordain that the High Court of Judicature at Rangoon  
 Extraordinary original  
 criminal jurisdiction shall have extraordinary original criminal jurisdiction over  
 all persons residing in places within the jurisdiction of any  
 Court subject to its superintendence and shall have authority  
 to try at its discretion any such persons brought before it on charges preferred by the  
 Government Advocate or by any magistrate or other officer specially empowered by the  
 Government in that behalf

24 And We do further ordain that there shall be no appeal to the High Court  
 No appeal from High  
 Court exercising original  
 criminal jurisdiction of Judicature at Rangoon from any sentence or order passed  
 or made in any criminal trial before the Courts of original  
 criminal jurisdiction which may be constituted by one or  
 more Judges of the said High Court But it shall be at the discretion of any such Court  
 Court may reserve points  
 of law to reserve any point or points of law for the opinion of the  
 said High Court

25 And We do further ordain that on such point or points of law being so reserved  
 High Court to review on  
 certificate of the Govern  
 ment Advocate as afore said or on its being certified by the Government  
 Advocate that in his judgment there is an error in the decision  
 of a point or points of law decided by the Court of original  
 criminal jurisdiction or that a point or points of law which  
 has or have been decided by the said Court should be further considered the High Court  
 of Judicature at Rangoon shall have full power and authority to review the case or  
 such part of it as may be necessary and finally determine such point or points of law  
 and thereupon to alter the sentence passed by the Court of original jurisdiction and to  
 pass such judgment and sentence as to the said High Court shall seem right

26 And We do further ordain that the High Court of Judicature at Rangoon shall  
 Appeals from Criminal  
 Court be a Court of Appeal from the Criminal Courts for which  
 immediately before the publication of these presents the  
 Chief Court of Lower Burma or the Judicial Commissioner of  
 Upper Burma was a Court of Appeal and from all other Criminal Courts whether within  
 or without the Province of Burma for which the said High Court is declared to be a  
 Court of Appeal by any law made by the local legislature or by competent legislative  
 authority for India and shall exercise appellate jurisdiction in such cases as were  
 immediately before the date of the publication of these presents subject to appeal to  
 the Chief Court of Lower Burma or to the Judicial Commissioner of Upper Burma by  
 virtue of any law then in force or as may after that date be declared subject to appeal  
 to the said High Court by any law made by the local legislature or by competent  
 legislative authority for India

27 And We do further ordain that the High Court of Judicature at Rangoon shall  
 Hearing of referred case  
 and revision of criminal  
 trial be a Court of reference and revision from the Criminal Courts  
 subject to its appellate jurisdiction and shall have power to  
 hear and determine all such cases referred to it by the  
 Sessions Judges or by any other officers who were imme  
 diately before the publication of these presents authorised to refer cases to the Chief

## Let Pat [Rangoon]

**Cls 27-32** Court of Lower Burma or to the Judicial Commissioner of Upper Burma and to review all such cases tried by any officer or Court possessing criminal jurisdiction as were immediately before the publication of these presents subject to reference to or review by the Chief Court of Lower Burma or the Judicial Commissioner of Upper Burma.

28 And We do further ordain that the High Court of Judicature at Rangoon shall have power to direct the transfer of any criminal case or appeal from any Court to any other Court of equal or superior jurisdiction and also to direct the preliminary investigation or trial of any criminal case by any officer or Court otherwise competent to investigate or try it though such case be not in the ordinary course to the jurisdiction of some other officer or Court

*Criminal Law*

29 And We do further ordain that all persons brought for trial before the High Court of Judicature at Rangoon either in exercise of its original jurisdiction or in the exercise of its jurisdiction as a Court of appeal reference or revision charged with any offence for which provision is made by the Indian Penal Code being an Act passed by the Governor General in Council and being Act No. XLV of 1860 or by any Act amending or excluding the said Act which may have been passed prior to the publication of these presents shall be liable to punishment under the said Act or Act and not otherwise

*Admiralty Jurisdiction*

30 And We do further ordain that the High Court of Judicature at Rangoon shall have and exercise all such civil and maritime jurisdiction as might be exercised by the High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal as a Court of Admiralty immediately before the date of the publication of these presents and also such jurisdiction for the trial and adjudication of prize causes and other maritime questions arising in India as might be exercised by the said High Court at the said date

31 And We do further ordain that the High Court of Judicature at Rangoon shall have and exercise all such criminal jurisdiction as might immediately before the publication of these presents be exercised by the High Court of Judicature at Fort William in Bengal as a Court of Admiralty or otherwise in connection with maritime matters or matters of prize

*Testamentary and Intestate Jurisdiction.*

32 And We do further ordain that the High Court of Judicature at Rangoon shall have the like power and authority as that which was immediately before the publication of these presents lawfully exercised within the Province of Burma by the Chief Court of Lower Burma and the Court of the Judicial Commissioner of Upper Burma in relation to the granting of probates of last wills and testaments and letters of administration of the goods chattels credits and all other effects whatsoever of persons deceased intestate Provided always that nothing in these Letters Patent contained shall interfere with the provisions of any law which has been made by competent legislative authority for India by which power is given to any other Court to grant such probates and letters of administration.

Let Pat [Rangoon]

Clis 3

*Matrimonial Jurisdiction*

33 And We do further ordain that the High Court of Judicature at Rangoon shall have jurisdiction within the Province of Burma in matters matrimonial between Our subjects professing the Christian religion. Provided always that nothing herein contained shall be held to interfere with the exercise of any jurisdiction in matters matrimonial by any Court not established by Letters Patent within the said Province which is lawfully possessed of that jurisdiction.

*Powers of Single Judges and Division Courts*

34 And We do hereby declare that any function which is hereby directed to be performed by the High Court of Judicature at Rangoon in the exercise of its original or appellate jurisdiction may be performed by any Judge or by any Division Court thereof appointed or constituted for such purpose in pursuance of section one hundred and eight of the Government of India Act and if such Division Court is composed of two or more Judges and the Judges are divided in union as to the decision to be given on any point such point shall be decided according to the opinion of the majority of the Judges if there be a majority but if the Judges be equally divided they shall state the point upon which they differ and the case shall then be heard upon that point by one or more of the other Judges and the point shall be decided according to the opinion of the majority of the Judges who have heard the case including those who first heard it.

Amendment—The words in the last clause after the words equally divided were substituted for the words the opinion of the senior Judge shall prevail by the amended Letters Patent of 1928 See note under clause 36 of the Calcutta Letters Patent

*Civil Procedure*

35 And We do further ordain that it shall be lawful for the High Court of Judicature at Rangoon from time to time to make rules and orders for the purpose of regulating all proceedings in civil cases which may be brought before the said High Court including proceedings in its Admiralty testamentary intestate and matrimonial jurisdiction respectively. Provided always that the said High Court shall be guided in making such rules and orders as far as possible by the provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure being an Act passed by the Governor General of India in Legislative Council and being Act No 1 of 1908 and the provisions of any law which has been or may be made amending or altering the same by the local legislature or by competent legislative authority for India.

*Criminal Procedure*

36 And We do further ordain that the proceedings in all criminal cases brought before the High Court of Judicature at Rangoon shall be regulated by the Code of Criminal Procedure being an Act No 1 of 1898 passed by the Governor General of India in Legislative Council or by such further or other laws in relation to criminal procedure as have been or may be made by the local legislature or by competent legislative authority for India.



## Let Pat [Rangoon]

Cls 37-40

*Appeals to Privy Council*

37 And We do further ordain that any person or persons may appeal to Us, Our Heirs and Successors in Our or Their Privy Council in a matter not being of criminal jurisdiction from any final judgment decree or order of the High Court of Judicature at Rangoon made on appeal and from any final judgment decree or order made in the exercise of original jurisdiction of Judges of the said High Court or of any District Court from which an appeal shall not lie to the said High Court under the provisions contained in the 13th clause of these presents

Provided in either case that the sum or matter at issue is of the amount or value of not less than 10 000 rupees or that such judgment decree or order involves directly or indirectly some claim demand or question to or respecting property amounting to or of the value of not less than 10 000 rupees or from any other final judgment decree or order made either on appeal or otherwise as aforesaid when the said High Court declares that the case is a fit one for appeal to Us Our Heirs and Successors in Our or Their Privy Council but subject always to such rules and orders as are now in force or may from time to time be made respecting appeals to Ourselves in Council from the Courts of the Province of Burma except so far as the said existing rules and orders respectively are hereby varied and subject also to such further rules and orders as We may with the advice of Our Privy Council hereafter make in that behalf

38 And We do further ordain that it shall be lawful for the High Court of Judicature at Rangoon at its discretion on the motion or if the said High Court be not sitting then for any Judge of the said High Court upon the petition of any party who considers himself aggrieved by any preliminary or interlocutory judgment decree or order of the said High Court in any such proceeding as aforesaid not being of criminal jurisdiction to grant permission to such party to appeal against the same to Us Our Heirs and Successors in Our or Their Privy Council subject to the same rules regulations and limitations as are herein expressed respecting appeals from final judgments decrees and orders

39 And We do further ordain that from any judgment order or sentence of the High Court of Judicature at Rangoon made in the exercise of original criminal jurisdiction or in any criminal case where any point or points of law have been reserved for the opinion of the said High Court in manner provided by the 24th clause of these presents by any Court which has exercised original jurisdiction it shall be lawful for the person aggrieved by such judgment order or sentence to appeal to Us Our Heirs and Successors in Our or Their Privy Council provided the said High Court shall declare that the case is a fit one for such appeal and that the appeal be made under such conditions as the said High Court may establish or require but subject always to such rules and orders as are now in force or may from time to time be made respecting appeals to Ourselves in Council from the Courts of the Province of Burma

40 And We do further ordain that in all cases of appeal made from any judgment decree order or sentence of the High Court of Judicature at Rangoon to Us Our Heirs and Successors in Our or Their Privy Council such High Court shall certify and transmit to Us Our Heirs and Successors in Our or Their Privy Council a true and correct copy of all evidence proceedings judgments decrees and orders had or made in such cases appealed so far as the same be

Power to appeal in civil  
 Appeal from interlocutory judgment  
 Appeal in criminal cases  
 Rules as to transmission of copies of evidence and other documents

Let Pat [Rang

Cis

relation to the matters of appeal such copies to be certified under the seal of the said High Court And that the said High Court shall also certify and transmit to Us Our Heirs and Successors in Our or Their Privy Council a copy of the reasons given by the Judges of such Court or by any of such Judges for or against the judgment or determination appealed against And We do further ordain that the said High Court shall in all cases of appeal to Us Our Heirs and Successors in Our or Their Privy Council conform to and execute or cause to be executed such judgments and orders as We Our Heirs and Successors in Our or Their Privy Council may think fit to make in the premises in such manner as any original judgment decree or decretal order or other order or rule of the said High Court should or might have been executed

*Exercise of Jurisdiction elsewhere than at the usual place of sitting of the High Court*

41 And We do further ordain that unless the Governor of Burma in Council otherwise directs one or more Judges of the High Court of Judicature at Rangoon as the Chief Justice may from time to time direct shall sit at Mandalay in order to exercise in respect of cases arising in such areas in Upper Burma as the Governor of Burma in Council may direct the jurisdiction and power by these Our Letters Patent or by or under the Government of India Act vested in the said High Court provided that the Chief Justice may in his discretion order that any particular case arising in the said areas in Upper Burma shall be heard at Rangoon

42 And We do further ordain that whenever it appears convenient to the Governor of Burma in Council that the jurisdiction and power by these Our Letters Patent or by or under the Government of India Act vested in the High Court of Judicature at Rangoon should be exercised in any place within the jurisdiction of any Court subject to the superintendence of the said High Court other than the usual place of sitting of the said High Court or at several such places by way of circuit one or more Judges of the said High Court shall visit such place or places accordingly

43 And We do further ordain that whenever any Judge or Judges of the High Court of Judicature at Rangoon shall visit or sit at any place under the 41st or the 42nd clause of these presents the proceedings in cases before him or them at such place shall be regulated by any law relating thereto which has been or may be made by the local legislature or by a competent legislative authority for India

*Provisions regarding pending proceedings*

44 And We do further ordain that all suits appeal revisions applications reviews executions and other proceedings whatsoever pending immediately before the publication of these presents in the Chief Court of Lower Burma or before the Judicial Commissioner of Upper Burma or in the Court of the Judicial Commissioner of Upper Burma in the exercise of any jurisdiction vested in them by any law shall be continued and concluded in the High Court of Judicature at Rangoon as if the same had been instituted in the said High Court and the said High Court shall in relation to all such proceedings exercise the jurisdiction given to it by the presents

*Delegation of Duties to Officers*

45 The High Court of Judicature at Rangoon may from time to time make rules for delegating to any Registrar Prothonotary or Master or other official of the Court any judicial quasi-judicial and non-judicial duties

## Let Pat [Rangoon]

Cls 45, 47

*Calls for Records etc by the Government*

46 And it is Our further will and pleasure that the High Court of Justice at Rangoon shall comply with such requisitions as may be made by the Governor General of India in Council or by the Governor of Burma in Council for records returns and statements in such form and manner as he may deem proper

High Court to comply  
with requisition from Gov-  
ernment for records etc

*Powers of Indian Legislatures*

47 And We do further ordain and declare that all the provisions of these Our Letters Patent are subject to the legislative powers of the local legislature and of the Indian legislature and also of the Governor General in Council under section seventy-two of the Government of India Act and also of the Governor General under section seventy-two of that Act and may be in all respects amended and altered thereby

Power of Indian Legis-  
latures preserved

IN WITNESS whereof We have caused these Our Letters to be made Patent

WITNESS Ourselves at Westminster the eleventh day of November in the Year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and twenty two and in the thirteenth Year of Our reign

BY WARRANT under the King's Sign Manual

(Signed) SCHURTEP

## APPENDIX III

---

### *Rules made by the High Court of Calcutta, under s 122*

**O 5 r 5**—*Insert the words* for the ascertainment whether the suit will be contested *after the words* issue only in rule 5 Order I, First Schedule to the Code of Civil Procedure 1908

**O 5 rr 15 17**—*Cancel Rules 15 and 17 Order I and substitute therefor the following*—

15 Where in any suit the defendant is absent from his residence at the time when service is sought to be effected on him thereat and there is no likelihood of his being found thereat within a reasonable time then unless he has an agent empowered to accept service of the summons on his behalf service may be made on any adult male member of the family of the defendant who is residing with him

Provided that where such adult male member has an interest in the suit and such interest is adverse to that of the defendant a summons so served shall be deemed for the purposes of the third column of Article 164 of Schedule I of the Limitation Act 1908 not to have been duly served

*Explanation*—A servant is not a member of the family within the meaning of this rule

17 Where the defendant or his agent or such other persons as afore said refuses to sign the acknowledgment or where the defendant is absent from his residence at the time when service is sought to be effected on him thereat and there is no likelihood of his being found thereat within a reasonable time and there is no agent empowered to accept service of the summons on his behalf nor any other person upon whom service can be made the serving officer shall affix a copy of the summons on the outer door or some other conspicuous part of the house in which the defendant ordinarily resides or carries on business or personally works for gain and shall then return the original to the Court from which it was issued with a report endorsed thereon or annexed thereto stating that he has so affixed the copy the circumstances under which he did so and the name and address of the person (if any) by whom the house was identified and in whose presence the copy was affixed

**O 5 r 19**—*Cancel Rule 19 Order I and substitute therefor the following*—

19 Where a summons is returned under rule 17 the Court shall if the return under that rule has not been verified by the declaration of the serving officer and may if it has been so verified examine the serving officer on oath or cause him to be so examined by another Court touching his proceeding and may make such further inquiry in the matter as it thinks fit and shall either declare that the summons has been duly served or order such service as it thinks fit

**O 5 r 19A**—*Insert the following after Rule 19 Order I*—

19A A declaration made and subscribed by a serving officer shall be received as evidence of the facts as to the service or attempted service of the summons

**O 6 r 14**—*Insert the following after Rule 14 Order II*—

14 (a) Every pleading when filed shall be accompanied by a statement in a prescribed form signed as provided in rule 14 of this Order of the party's address for service Such address may from time to time be changed by lodging in court a

## Rules—Cal.

## App III

duly filled up and stating the new address of the party and accompanied by a verified petition. The address so given shall be called the registered address of the party and shall until duly changed as aforesaid be deemed to be the address of the party for the purpose of service of all processes in the suit or in any appeal from any decree or order therein made and for the purpose of execution and shall hold good subject as aforesaid for a period of two years after the final determination of the cause or matter. Service of any process may be effected upon a party at his registered address in like manner in all respects as though such party resided thereat.

**O 7 r 3**—*After O 7 r 3 add the words—*

and when the area is mentioned such description shall further state the area according to the notation used in the record of settlement or survey with or without at the option of the party the same are in terms of the local measures.

**O 7 r 9**—*Cancel clause (1) Rule 9 Order XII and substitute therefore the following—*

(1) The plaintiff shall endorse on the plaint or annex thereto a list of the documents (if any) which he has produced along with it.

(1) (a) The plaintiff shall present with his plaint—

(i) as many copies on plain paper of the plaint as there are defendants unless the Court by reason of the length of the plaint or the number of the defendants or for any other sufficient reason, permits him to present a like number of concise statements of the nature of the claim made or of the relief claimed in the suit in which case he shall present such statements.

(ii) a petition for service of summons to appear and answer to either with the fees and draft forms of summons.

**O 7 r 11**—*Add the following as clause (e) to Rule 11 Order XII—*

(e) Where any of the provisions of Rule 9 (1) (a) is not complied with and the plaintiff on being required by the Court to comply therewith within a time to be fixed by the Court fails to do so.

**O 16 r 2**—*Cancel clauses (1) and (2) of Rule 2 Order XII and substitute therefore the following—*

(1) The Court shall fix in respect of each summons such a sum of money as appears to the Court to be sufficient to defray the travelling and other expenses of the person summoned in passing to and from the Court in which he is required to attend and for one day's attendance.

(2) In fixing such an amount the Court may in the case of any person summoned to give evidence as an expert allow reasonable remuneration for the time occupied both in giving evidence and in performing any work of an expert character necessary for the case.

**O 16 r 3**—*Cancel Rule 3 Order XII and substitute therefore the following—*

3 The sum so fixed shall be tendered to the person summoned at the time of service of the summons if it can be served personally.

**O 16 r 4**—*Cancel clause (1) of Rule 4 Order XII and substitute therefore the following—*

(1) Where it appears to the Court or to such officer as it appoints in this behalf that the sum so fixed is not sufficient to cover such expenses or reasonable remuneration the Court may direct such further sum to be paid to the person summoned as appears

to be necessary on that account and in case of default in payment may order such sum to be levied by attachment and sale of the movable property of the party obtaining the summons or the Court may discharge the persons summoned without requiring him to give evidence or may both order such levy and discharge such person as aforesaid

**O 16 r 7 A—Insert the following after Rule 7 Order XI —**

Rule 7 (a) (i) Except where it appears to the Court that a summons under this Order should be served by the Court in the same manner as a summons to a defendant the Court shall make over for service all summonses under this Order to the party applying therefor. The service shall be effected by or on behalf of such party by delivering or tendering to the witness in person a copy thereof signed by the Judge or such officer as he appoints in this behalf and sealed with the seal of the Court

(ii) Rules 16 and 18 of Order V shall apply to summons personally served under this rule as though the person effecting service were a serving officer

(iii) If such summons when tendered is refused or if the person served refuses to sign an acknowledgment of service or if for any reason such summons cannot be served personally the Court shall on the application of the party re issue such summons to be served by the Court in like manner as a summons to a defendant

**O 16 r 8—Cancel Rule 8 Order XVI and substitute therefor the following —**

8 (1) Every summons under this Order not being a summons made over to a party for service under Rule 7 (a) (i) of this Order shall be served as nearly as may be in the same manner as a summons to a defendant and the rules in Order V as to proof of service shall apply thereto

(2) The party applying for a summons to be served under this rule shall before the summons is granted and within a period to be fixed pay into Court the sum fixed by the Court under Rule 2 of this Order

**O 16 r 21—Cancel Rule 21 Order XVI and substitute therefor the following —**

21 (1) When any party to a suit is required by any other party thereto to give evidence or to produce a document the provisions as to witnesses shall apply to him so far as applicable

(2) When any party to a suit gives evidence on his own behalf the Court may in its discretion permit him to include as costs in the suit a sum of money equal to the amount payable for travelling and other expenses to other witnesses in the case of similar standing

**O 18 r 2 A—Insert the following as Rule 2A Order XVIII —**

2A Notwithstanding anything contained in clauses (1) and (2) of Rule 2 the Court may for sufficient reason go on with the hearing although the evidence of the party having the right to begin has not been concluded and may also allow either party to produce any witness at any stage of the suit

**O 22 r 11—Add the following to Rule 11 Order XVII —**

Provided always that where an Appellate Court has made an order dispensing with service of notice of appeal upon legal representatives of any person deceased under Order XXI Rule 14 (3) the appeal shall not be deemed to abate as against such party and the decree made on appeal shall be binding on the estate or the interest of such party

**O 32 r 4—Substitute the word** Except as otherwise provided in this Order **for the words** Where there is no other person fit and willing to act as guardian for the suit in Clause (4) rule 4 Order XXII First Schedule to the Code of Civil Procedure 1908

## Rules—Cal

## App III

O 41 r 14—*Insert the following as clause (3) to Rule 14 Order VLI—*

(3) It shall be in the discretion of the Appellate Court to make an order at any stage of the appeal whether on its own motion or ex parte dispensing with service of such notice on any respondent who did not appear either at the hearing in the Court whose decree is complained of or at any proceeding subsequent to the decree of that Court or on the legal representatives of any such respondent

Provided that—

- (a) The Court may require notice of the appeal to be published in any new paper or newspapers as it may direct
- (b) No such order shall preclude any such respondent or legal representative from appearing to contest the appeal

Schedule I—Appendix B No 1 A—*Insert the following form in Appendix B and number it as 1A—*

No 1A

*Summons to defendant for ascertainment whether the suit will be contested (Order 5 rules 1 and 5)*

(Title)

To

(Name description and place of residence)

WHEREAS \_\_\_\_\_ has instituted a suit against you for \_\_\_\_\_ you are hereby summoned to appear in this Court in person or by a pleader duly instructed and able to answer all material questions relating to the suit on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_ at \_\_\_\_\_ o'clock in the \_\_\_\_\_ noon in order that on that day you may inform the Court whether you will or will not contest the claim either in whole or in part and in order that in the event of your decision to contest the claim either in whole or in part directions may be given you as to the date upon which your written statement is to be filed and the witness or witnesses upon whose evidence you intend to rely in support of your defence are to be produced and all the document or documents upon which you intend to rely

Take notice that in default of your appearance on the day before mentioned the suit will be heard and determined in your absence and take further notice that in the event of your admitting the claim either in whole or in part the Court will forthwith pass judgment in accordance with such admissions

Given under my hand and the seal of the Court \_\_\_\_\_ this day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_  
July

Seal

NOTICE—If you admit the claim either in whole or in part you should come prepared to pay into Court the money due by virtue of such admission together with the costs of the suit to avoid execution of any decree which may be passed against your person or property or both

Schedule I—Appendix B—Form No 10—*Insert the words (or proof of the above having been duly made by the declaration of \_\_\_\_\_) after the words proof of the above having been duly taken by me on the oath of \_\_\_\_\_ in Form No 10 Appendix B*

Schedule I—Appendix B—Form No 11—*Substitute the following for the end of Form No 11 Appendix B—*

Declaration of process server to accompany Return of a Summons or Notice (Order 5 Rule 18)

Rules

App

(Title)

I, \_\_\_\_\_ a process server of this Court declare —(1) On the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_ I received a summons/notice issued by the Court of \_\_\_\_\_ in suit No \_\_\_\_\_ of 19\_\_\_\_ in the said Court dated \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_ for service on \_\_\_\_\_ (2) The said \_\_\_\_\_ was at the time personally known to me and I served the said summons/ notice on him/ her on the day of 19\_\_\_\_ at about \_\_\_\_\_ o'clock in the \_\_\_\_\_ noon at \_\_\_\_\_ by tendering a copy thereof to him/her and requiring his/her signature to the original summons notice

(a)

(b)

(a) Here state whether the person served signed or refused to sign the process and in whose presence

(b) Signature of process server

Or

(2) The said \_\_\_\_\_ not being personally known to me pointed out to me a person whom he stated to be the said \_\_\_\_\_ and I served the said summons notice on him/her on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_ at about \_\_\_\_\_ o'clock in the \_\_\_\_\_ noon at \_\_\_\_\_ by tendering a copy thereof to him/her and requiring his/her signature to the original summons/ notice

(a)

(b)

(a) Here state whether the person served signed or refused to sign the process and in whose presence

(b) Signature of process server

Or

(3) The said \_\_\_\_\_ and the house in which he ordinarily resides being personally known to me I went to the said house in \_\_\_\_\_ and there on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_ at about \_\_\_\_\_ o'clock in the \_\_\_\_\_ noon I did not find the said \_\_\_\_\_

(a)

(b)

(a) Enter fully and exactly the manner in which the process was served with special reference to Order v Rules 10 and 11

(b) Signature of process server

Or

(4) One \_\_\_\_\_ at \_\_\_\_\_ pointed out to me \_\_\_\_\_ which he said was the house in which \_\_\_\_\_ ordinarily resides I did not find the said \_\_\_\_\_ there

(a)

(b)

(a) Enter fully and exactly the manner in which the process was served with special reference to Order v Rules 10 and 11

(b) Signature of process server



## Rules—Cal

## App III

Or

(3) If substituted service has been ordered state fully and exactly the manner in which the summons was served with special reference to the terms of the order for substituted service

**Schedule I—Appendix A—Form No 13**—In the form of Breach of agreement to purchase land No 13 of Appendix A to the First Schedule cancel the word *bekas* and substitute therefor the words  $\frac{\text{acres}}{\text{bighas}}$

**Schedule I—Appendix D—Form No 1**—Cancel the table under the head *costs of suit* in form No 1 Appendix D *ibid* and substitute therefor the following, —

| Plaintiff  | Rs & p | Defendant  | Rs & p |
|--|--------|--|--------|
| 1 Stamp for plaint   |        | 1 Stamp for power  |        |
| 2 Stamp for power  |        | 2 Stamp for petitions and affidavits   |        |
| 3 Stamp for petitions and affidavits   |        | 3 Cost of exhibits including copies made under the Banker's Books Evidence Act 1891                |        |
| 4 Cost of exhibits including copies made under the Banker's Books Evidence Act 1891                |        | 4 Pleaders fee   |        |
| 5 Pleaders fee on Rs   |        | 5 Subsistence and travelling allowance of witnesses (including those of party if allowed by Judge) |        |
| 6 Subsistence and travelling allowance of witnesses (including those of party if allowed by Judge) |        | 6 Process fees   |        |
| 7 Process fees   |        | 7 Commissioner's fees  |        |
| 8 Commissioner's fees  |        | 8 Demi paper   |        |
| 9 Demi paper   |        | 9 Cost of transmission of records  |        |
| 10 Cost of transmission of records   |        | 10 Other costs allowed under the Code and General Rules and Orders                                 |        |
| 11 Other costs allowed under the Code and General Rules and Orders                                 |        | 11 Adjournment costs not paid in cash (to be deducted or added as the case may be)                 |        |
| 12 Adjournment costs not paid in cash (to be added or deducted as the case may be)                 |        |  |        |

**Schedule I—Appendix D—Form No 2**—Cancel the table under the head *costs of suit* in form No 2 Appendix D *ibid* and substitute therefor the following, —

| Plaintiff  | Rs & p | Defendant  | Rs & p |
|--|--------|--|--------|
| 1 Stamp for plaint   |        | 1 Stamp for power  |        |
| 2 Stamp for power  |        | 2 Stamp for petition and affidavits  |        |
| 3 Stamp for petitions and affidavits   |        | 3 Cost of exhibits including copies made under the Banker's Books Evidence Act 1891                |        |
| 4 Cost of exhibits including copies made under the Banker's Books Evidence Act 1891                |        | 4 Pleader's fee  |        |
| 5 Pleaders fee on Rs   |        | 5 Subsistence and travelling allowance of witnesses (including those of party if allowed by Judge) |        |
| 6 Subsistence and travelling allowance of witnesses (including those of party if allowed by Judge) |        | 6 Process fees   |        |
| 7 Process fees   |        | 7 Commissioner's fees  |        |
| 8 Commissioner's fees  |        | 8 Demi paper   |        |
| 9 Demi paper   |        | 9 Cost of transmission of records  |        |
| 10 Cost of transmission of records   |        | 10 Other costs allowed under the Code and General Rules and Orders                                 |        |
| 11 Other costs allowed under the Code and General Rules and Orders                                 |        | 11 Adjournment costs not paid in cash (to be deducted or added as the case may be)                 |        |
| 12 Adjournment costs not paid in cash (to be added or deducted as the case may be)                 |        |  |        |

**Schedule I—Appendix G—Form No 9**—In the form of 'Decree in Appeal' No 9 of Appendix G to the First Schedule cancel the words from 'Memorandum of Appeal to the following reasons namely —'

## APPENDIX IV

### *Rules made by the High Court of Bombay, under s 122*

O 3 r 2 clause (a)—O 3 r 2 cl (a) be amended to read as follows —

Persons holding general power of attorney from parties not resident within the local limits of the jurisdiction of the Court within which limits the appearance application or act is made or done authorising them to make and do such appearances applications and acts on behalf of such parties (a)

O 3 r 4—In sub rule 3 of rule 4 of Order III as amended by Act XII of 1926 the words or any application relating to such appeal shall be inserted between the words order in the suit and and any application or act

O 5 r 22—The following proviso be added to O 5 r 22 —

Provided that where any such summons is to be served within the limits of the town of Bombay it may be addressed to the defendant at the place within such limits where he is residing and may be sent to him by the Court by post registered for acknowledgment An acknowledgment purporting to be signed by the defendant or an endorsement by a postal servant that the defendant refused service shall be deemed by the Court issuing the summons to be *prima facie* proof of service In all other cases the Court shall hold such enquiry as it thinks fit and either declare the summons to have been duly served or order such further service as may in its opinion be necessary

O 9 r 4—Order IX rule 4 shall be numbered Order IX rule 4 (1) and the sub rule (2) shall be added to it namely —

(2) The provisions of section 5 of the Indian Limitation Act 1908 shall apply to applications under this rule

O 9 r 9—The following shall be added as sub rule (3) to Order IX rule 9 namely —

(3) The provisions of section 5 of the Indian Limitation Act 1908 shall apply to applications under this rule

O 9 r 13—Rule 13 of Order IX shall be numbered as rule 13 (1) and the following sub rule shall be added to it namely —

(-) The provisions of section 5 of the Indian Limitation Act 1908 shall apply to applications made under this rule

O 9 r 15—The following shall be added to Order IX as rule 15 —

In the application of this Order to appeals so far as may be the word plaintiff shall be held to include an appellant the word defendant a respondent and the word 'suit' an appeal

O 13 r 9—Between the first and second proviso to sub rule (1) of rule 9 of Order XIII the following proviso shall be inserted namely —

Provided also that a copy of the decree and of the judgment filed with the memorandum of appeal under Order XII rule 1 may be returned after the appeal has been disposed of by the Court

O 16 r 1 (a)—The following shall be added as rule 14 to Order XVI —

14 (1) The Court may on the application of any party for a summons for the attendance of any person permit that service of such summons shall be effected by such party

## Rules—Bom

## App IV

(2) When the Court has directed service of the summons by the party applying, for the same and such service is not effected the Court may if it is satisfied that reasonable diligence has been used by such party to effect such service permit service to be effected by an officer of the Court.

O 16 r 2 (1) — *The following shall be inserted as proviso to sub rule (1) of rule of Order 16 —*

Provided that where Government or a public officer being a party to a suit or proceeding as such public officer supported by Government in the litigation applies for a summons to any public officer to whom the Civil Service Regulations apply to give evidence of facts which have come to his knowledge or of matters with which he has had to deal as a public officer or to produce any document from public records the Government or the aforesaid officer shall not be required to pay any sum of money on account of the travelling and other expenses of such witness.

O 16 r 3 — *The following shall be inserted as proviso to rule 3 of Order 16 —*

Provided that where the witness is a public officer to whom the Civil Service Regulations apply and is summoned to give evidence of facts which have come to his notice or of facts with which he has had to deal in his official capacity or to produce a document from public records the sum payable by the party obtaining the summons on account of his travelling and other expenses shall not be tendered to him.

O 21 r 22 — In rule 22 of Order XXI the words two years shall be substituted for the words one year wherever they occur.

O 21 r 44A — *After r 44 of O 21, the following shall be inserted namely —*

44A Where the property to be attached is agricultural produce a copy of the warrant or order of attachment shall be sent by post to the Office of the Collector of the District in which the land is situate.

O 21 r 45 — *The following words shall be added to sub rule (1) of rule 45 of Order XXI after substituting a semicolon for the full stop —*

and the applicant shall deposit in Court at the time of the application such sum as the Court shall deem sufficient to defray the cost of watching and tending the property at such time.

O 21 r 54 — *The following shall be added to sub rule (1) of rule 54 of Order XXI —*

Such order shall take effect where there is no consideration for such transfer or charge from the date of such order and where there is consideration for such transfer or charge from the date when such order came to the knowledge of the person to whom or in whose favour the property was transferred or charged.

O 21 r 69 (2) —

In sub rule (2) of rule 69 of Order XXI thirty days shall be substituted for seven days.

O 21 r 72A — *After r 72 of O 21 the following shall be inserted namely —*

72A If leave to bid is granted to the mortgagee of immovable property the reserve price as regard him shall be fixed (unless the Court shall otherwise think fit) at a sum not less than the amount then due for principal interest and costs in case the property is sold in one lot and not less in respect of each lot (in case the property is sold in lots) than such figure as shall appear to be properly attributable to it in relation to the amount aforesaid.

## Rules—

**O 21 r 91** —*The following rule shall be added as rule 91A in Order XXI of the Code of Civil Procedure —*

Where the execution of a decree has been transferred to the Collector and the sale has been conducted by the Collector or by an officer subordinate to the Collector an application under rules 89 90 or 91 and in the case of an application under rule 89 the deposit required by that rule if made to the Collector or the Officer to whom the decree is referred for execution in accordance with any rule framed by the local Government under section 10 of the Code shall be deemed to have been made to or in the Court within the meaning of rules 80 90 and 91

**O 25 r 2** —*The following shall be added as sub rule (4) to Order XXI rule 2 namely —*

(4) The provisions of section 19 of the Indian Limitation Act 1908 shall apply to applications under this rule

**O 32 r 3 (4)** —

The words to the minor and in line 2 of sub rule (4) of rule 3 of Order XXII shall be deleted

**O 33 r 1** —*The following sentence shall be added to the Explanation to rule 1 of Order XXVIII Civil Procedure Code namely —*

In determining whether he is possessed of sufficient means the subject matter of the suit shall be excluded

**O 34 r 2 (d)** —*Substitute for clause (d) of rule 2 of Order XXVI the following —*

(d) that if such payment is not made on or before the day to be fixed by the Court the plaintiff shall be entitled to apply for a final decree for foreclosure under rule 3

**O 34 r 4 (1)** —

In sub rule (1) of rule 4 of Order XXIV after the words as therein mentioned substitute the plaintiff shall be entitled to apply for a final decree for sale under rule 5

**O 34 r 5 (2)** —

In sub rule (2) of rule 5 of Order XXIV after the words proceeds of the sale substitute (after defraying the expenses of the sale) be paid into Court and applied in payment of what is declared due to the plaintiff as aforesaid together with subsequent interest at such rate as the Court deems reasonable and subsequent costs and that the balance (if any) be paid to the defendants or other persons entitled to the same

Provided that the Court may upon good cause shown and upon such terms (if any) as it thinks fit from time to time postpone the day fixed for such payment

**O 34 r 7 (d)** —

For clause (d) of rule 7 of Order XXIV substitute (d) that if such payment is not made on or before the day to be fixed by the Court the defendant shall be entitled to apply for a final decree for sale or foreclosure under rule 8

**O 37 r 2** —*In sub rule (1) of rule 2 of Order XXVII after the words promissory notes the following words shall be inserted namely —*

and all suits in which the plaintiff seeks only to recover a debt or liquidated demand in money payable by the defendant with or without interest arising on a contract express or implied or on an enactment where the sum sought to be recovered is a fixed sum of money or in the nature of a debt other than a penalty or on a guarantee where the claim against the principal is in respect of a debt or a liquidated demand only

## Rules—Bom

## App IV

(3) The provisions of section 5 of the Indian Limitation Act 1908 shall apply to applications under sub rule (1)

O 37 r 3—*In rule 3 of Order XLVIII the following sub rule (3) shall be inserted —*

(3) The provisions of section 5 of the Indian Limitation Act 1908 shall apply to applications under sub rule (1)

O 41 r 3 A—*After rule 3 of Order XLI the following rule shall be inserted namely —*

3 A Where an appellant applies for delay to be excused notice to show cause shall at once be issued to the respondent and the matter shall be finally decided before notice is issued to the Court from whose decree the appeal is preferred under rule 13

In sub rule (2) of rule 3 of Order XLV after the words to show cause why the said certificate should not be granted the following words shall be inserted namely — unless it thinks fit to refuse the certificate

O 43 r 1—

Clause (w) of rule 1 of Order XLIII shall be deleted

O 45 r 3 (2) —

In sub rule (2) of rule 3 of Order XLV after the words to show cause why the said certificate should not be granted the following words shall be inserted namely — unless it thinks fit to refuse the certificate

O 45 r 7 A—*After rule 7 of Order XLV the following rule shall be inserted namely —*

7 A No such security as is mentioned in rule 7 (1) clause (a) shall be required from the Secretary of State for India in Council or where the local Government has undertaken the defence of the suit from any public officer sued in respect of an act alleged to be done by him in his official capacity

O 47 r 5—

In Order XLVII rule 5 for the word six the word two shall be substituted

O 49 r 3—

In rule 3 of Order XLIX the word and immediately preceding paragraph (b) shall be omitted and the following paragraph shall be inserted between paras (c) and (d) namely —

(5a) rule 72A of Order XXI and

O 49 r 3—

For the words rule 35 occurring below item (6) of rule 3 of Order XLIX the words rules 31 and 3a shall be substituted.

O 49 r 4—*The following rule made under s 108 (2) (i) to be added as r 4 is*  
O 49 —

Where on a memorandum of appeal presented within the time prescribed for the same the whole or any part of the fee prescribed by the law for the time being in force relating to Court fees has not been paid, the Registrar may in his discretion allow the appellant to pay the whole or part as the case may be of such Court fees and may admit the appeal to the register even though the subsequent payment of Court fee may have been made after the time prescribed for presentation of the appeal.

Schedule I—Appendix B—Form No 10—*Form No 10 in Appendix B Ap*  
*Schedule I be amended to read as follows —*

To accompany Returns of Summons of another Court (Order V r 23)

(Title)

Read proceeding from the forwarding  
 for service on in Suit No of 19 of that Court  
 Read Serving Officer's endorsement stating that the and proof  
 of the above having been duly taken by me on the oath of and  
 it is ordered that the be returned to the with  
 this proceeding

I hereby declare that the said summons on has been duly  
 served

Judge

NOTE—This form will be applicable to process other than summons the service of  
 which may have to be effected in the same manner

Schedule I—Appendix D—Form No 4—

In line 4 of Form No 4 in Appendix D for realization substitute the day  
 hereinafter referred to

For clause (2) of the said form substitute (2) That if such payment is not made on  
 or before the said day of 19 the plaintiff shall be entitled to apply  
 to the Court for a final decree for sale

Delete Clause (3) of the said form

Schedule I—Appendix D—Form No. 5

For clause (2) of Form No 5 in Appendix D substitute (2) That if such payment  
 is not made on or before the said day of 19 the defendant  
 shall be entitled to apply for a final decree for foreclosure or sale

Schedule I—Appendix D—Form No 10-A—*Add the following form as Form*  
 No 10 A —

No 10 A.

Final Decree for sale

(Title)

Upon reading the decree passed in the above suit on the day of  
 19 and the application of the plaintiff dated the day of  
 19 and after hearing  
 pleader for the plaintiff and pleader for the defendant and it  
 appearing that the payment directed by the said decree has not been made

It is hereby decreed as follows —

(1) That the mortgaged property or a sufficient part thereof be sold and that the  
 proceeds of the sale (after defraying thereout the expenses of the sale) be paid into Court  
 and applied in payment of what is declared due to the plaintiff as afore-said together with  
 subsequent interest at per cent per annum and subsequent cost and that the  
 balance if any be paid to the defendant

(2) That if the net proceeds of the sale are insufficient to pay such amount and such  
 subsequent interest and costs in full the plaintiff shall be at liberty to apply for a personal  
 decree for the amount of the balance

## APPENDIX V

### *Rules made by the High Court of Allahabad, under s 100*

#### Order IV

1 (1) *For rule 1 (1) substitute the following —*

Every suit shall be instituted by presenting to the court or such officer as it appears in this behalf a plaint together with a true copy for service with the summons upon each defendant unless the Court for good cause shown allows time for filing such copies.

(2) The Court fee chargeable for such service shall be paid in the case of suits when the plaint is filed and in the case of all other proceedings when the process is applied for. And re number the present sub rule (2) as sub rule (3).

#### Order V

2 Omit the words *or if so permitted by a concise statement*

*Add the following rules 4-1 —*

4A Except as otherwise provided in every interlocutory proceeding and in every proceeding after decree in the trial Court the Court may either on the application of any party or of its own motion dispense with service upon any defendant who has not appeared or upon any defendant who has not filed a written statement.

15 *For the word* Where *in any suit the defendant cannot be found read* Where the defendant is absent or cannot be personally served.

25 *For the word* shall *in the third line read the word* may.

*Add the following rule 23A —*

23A When the defendant resides in British India but outside the limits of the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh the Court may in addition to or in substitution for any other mode of service send the summons by post to the defendant at the place where he is residing or carrying on business. An acknowledgment purporting to be signed by the defendant or an endorsement by a postal servant that the defendant refused service may be deemed by the Court issuing the summons to be *prima facie* proof of service.

26 *After the word* the summons may *insert the words* in addition to or in substitution for the method permitted by rule 25.

27 *To O V r 27 add the following as note 1 and note 2 —*

1 A list of heads of offices to whom summonses shall be sent for service on the servants of Railway Companies working in whole or in part in the five Provinces is given in Appendix (2) to the General Rules (Civil) of 1911.

2 In every case where a Court sees fit to issue a summons direct to any public servant other than a soldier under Order XXI simultaneously with the issue of the summons notice shall be sent to the head of the office in which the person concerned is employed in order that arrangements may be made for the performance of the duties of such person.

**Illustration** If the Court sees fit to issue a summons to a *lanungo* or *patwari* it shall inform the Collector of the district and if to a *sub registrar* it shall inform the District Registrar to whom the *sub registrar* is subordinate

*Add the following rules at the end of O 5 —*

28 1 The present rule 28 shall be numbered 28 (1)

2 *Add the following as rule 28 (?) —*

Where the address of such Commanding Officer is not known the Court may apply to the officer commanding the station in which the defendant was serving when the cause of action arose to supply such address in the manner prescribed in sub rule (4) of this rule

3 *Add the following sub rules (3) (4) and (5) —*

(3) Where the defendant is an officer of His Majesty's military force wherever it is practicable service shall be made on the defendant in person

(4) Where such defendant reside outside the jurisdiction of the Court in which the suit is instituted or outside British India the Court may apply over the seal and signature of the Court to the Officer Commanding the station in which the defendant was residing when the cause of action arose for the address of such defendant and the Officer Commanding to whom such application is made shall supply the address of the defendant or all such information that it is in his power to give as may lead to the discovery of his address

(5) Where personal service is not practicable the Court shall issue the summons to the defendant at the address so supplied by registered post

29 In rule 29 sub rule (1) line 2 for the word rule 28 read rule 28 (1)

31 An application for the issue of a summons for a party or a witness shall be made in the form prescribed for the purpose No other forms shall be received by the Court

32 Ordinarily every process except those that are to be served on Europeans shall be written in the Court vernacular But where a process is sent for execution to the Court of a district where a different language is in ordinary use it shall be written in English and shall be accompanied by a letter in English requesting its execution

In cases where the return of service is in a language different from that of the district from which it is issued it shall be accompanied by an English translation.

## Order VII

9 In rule 9—(a)—for the *semicolon* after *it* in clause (1) substitute a *fullstop* and delete the rest of this clause as well as clause (2) and (3) and

(b) *Re number* clause 4 as clause ( ) *deleting* the words *or statement* therein

17 At the end of clause 2 of rule 17 of Order VII *add* the following proviso —

Provided that if the copy is not written in English or is written in a character other than the ordinary Persian or Nagri character in use the person producing it or someone on his behalf shall attest it as a true copy and in that case the Court or its officer need not examine or compare the copy with the original.



## APPENDIX V

### *Rules made by the High Court of Allahabad, under s 100*

#### Order IV

1 (1) *For rule 1 (1) substitute the following —*

Every suit shall be instituted by presenting to the court or such officer as it appoints in this behalf a plaint together with a true copy for service with the summons upon each defendant unless the Court for good cause shown allows time for filing such copies.

(2) The Court fee chargeable for such service shall be paid in the case of suits where the plaint is filed and in the case of all other proceedings when the process is applied for. And re number the present sub rule (2) as sub rule (3).

#### Order V

2 Omit the word or if so permitted by a concise statement

*Add the following rules 4 & 1 —*

4A Except as otherwise provided in every interlocutory proceeding and in every proceeding after decree in the trial Court the Court may either on the application of any party or of its own motion dispense with service upon any defendant who has not appeared or upon any defendant who has not filed a written statement.

15 For the words Where in any suit the defendant cannot be found read Where the defendant is absent or cannot be personally served.

25 For the word shall in the third line read the word may

*Add the following rule 25A —*

25A When the defendant resides in British India but outside the limits of the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh the Court may in addition to or in substitution for any other mode of service send the summons by post to the defendant at the place where he is residing or carrying on business. An acknowledgment purporting to be signed by the defendant or an endorsement by a postal servant that the defendant refused service may be deemed by the Court issuing the summons to be *prima facie* proof of service.

26 After the words the summons may insert the words in addition to or in substitution for the method permitted by rule 25.

27 To O V r 27 add the following as note 1 and note 2 —

1 A list of head of offices to whom summonses shall be sent for service on the servants of Railway Companies working in whole or in part in the Provinces is given in Appendix (2) to the General Rules (Civil) of 1911.

2 In every case where a Court sees fit to issue a summons direct to any public servant other than a soldier under Order XVI simultaneously with the issue of the summons notice shall be sent to the head of the office in which the person concerned is employed in order that arrangements may be made for the performance of the duties of such person.

Rule:

Appr

**Illustration.** If the Court sees fit to issue a summons to a *kanungo* or *patwari* it shall inform the Collector of the district and if to a sub-registrar it shall inform the District Registrar to whom the sub-registrar is subordinate.

*Add the following rules at the end of O 5 —*

28 1 The present rule 23 shall be numbered 23 (1)

2 *Add the following as rule 23 (—) —*

Where the address of such Commanding Officer is not known the Court may apply to the officer commanding the station in which the defendant was serving when the cause of action arose to supply such address in the manner prescribed in sub-rule (4) of this rule.

3 *Add the following sub-rules (3) (4) and (5) —*

(3) Where the defendant is an officer of His Majesty's military forces wherever it is practicable service shall be made on the defendant in person.

(4) Where such defendant resides outside the jurisdiction of the Court in which the suit is instituted or outside British India the Court may apply over the seal and signature of the Court to the Officer Commanding the station in which the defendant was residing when the cause of action arose for the address of such defendant and the Officer Commanding to whom such application is made shall supply the address of the defendant or all such information that it is in his power to give which may lead to the discovery of his address.

(5) Where personal service is not practicable the Court shall issue the summons to the defendant at the address so supplied by registered post.

29 In rule 29 sub-rule (1) line 2 for the words "rule 23" read "rule 23 (1)".

31 An application for the issue of a summons for a party or a witness shall be made in the form prescribed for the purpose. No other forms shall be received by the Court.

32 Ordinarily every process except those that are to be served on Europeans shall be written in the Court vernacular. But where a process is sent for execution to the Court of a district where a different language is in ordinary use it shall be written in English and shall be accompanied by a letter in English requesting its execution.

In cases where the return of service is in a language different from that of the district from which it is issued it shall be accompanied by an English translation.

## Order VII

9 In rule 9—(a)—for the *sem* colon after it in clause (1) substitute a full stop and delete the rest of this clause as well as clauses (2) and (3) and

(b) *Re-number* clause 4 as clause ( ) *deleting* the words "or statements" therein.

17 At the end of clause — of rule 17 of Order VII add the following proviso —

Provided that if the copy is not written in English or is written in a character other than the ordinary Persian or Nagari character in use the person producing it or someone on his behalf shall attest it as a true copy and in that case the Court or its officer need not examine or compare the copy with the original.

s—All  
op V

*Add the following rules at the end of O 7 —*

19 Every plaint or original petition shall be accompanied by a proceeding giving an address at which service of notice summons or other process may be made on the plaintiff or petitioner. Plaintiffs or petitioners subsequently added shall immediately on being so added file a proceeding of this nature.

20 An address for service filed under the preceding rule shall be within the local limits of the District Court within which the suit or petition is filed or of the District Court within which the party ordinarily resides if within the limits of the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh.

21 Where a plaintiff or petitioner fails to file an address for service he shall be liable to have his suit dismissed or his petition rejected by the Court *suo motu* or any party may apply for an order to that effect and the Court may make such order as it thinks just.

22 Where a party is not found at the address given by him for service and no agent or adult male member of his family on whom a notice or process can be served is present a copy of the notice or process shall be affixed to the outer door of the house. If on the date fixed such party is not present another date shall be fixed and a copy of the notice summons or other process shall be sent to the registered address by registered post and such service shall be deemed to be as effectual as if the notice or process had been personally served.

23 Where a party engages a pleader notices or processes for service on him shall be served in the manner prescribed by Order III rule 5 unless the Court directs service at the address for service given by the party.

24 A party who desires to change the address for service given by him as aforesaid shall file a verified petition and the Court may direct the amendment of the record accordingly. Notice of such petition shall be given to such other parties to the suit as the Court may deem it necessary to inform and may be either served upon the pleaders for such parties or be sent to them by registered post as the Court thinks fit.

25 Nothing in these rules shall prevent the Court from directing the service of a notice or process in any other manner if for any reasons it thinks fit to do so.

### Order VIII

*Add the following rules at the end of O 8 —*

11 Every party whether original added or substituted who appears in any suit or other proceeding shall on or before the date fixed in the summons or notice served on him as the date of hearing file in Court a proceeding at his address for service and if he fails to do so he shall be liable to have his defence if any struck out and to be placed in the same position as if he had not defended. In this respect the Court may act *suo motu* or on the application of any party for an order to such effect and the Court may make such order as it thinks just.

12 Rules 20 22 23 24 25 and 26 of Order VII shall apply so far as may be to addresses for service filed under the preceding rule.

### Order IX

13 (2) *Add the following proviso —*

Provided also that no such decree shall be set aside merely on the ground of irregularity in the service of summons if the Court is satisfied that the defendant knew or but for his wilful conduct would have known of the date of hearing in sufficient time to enable him to appear and answer the plaintiff's claim.

After the words in the fourth line for such service insert the words or that the plaintiff has failed to comply with the rules for filing the copy of the plaint for service on the defendant

### Order XIII

Add the following rules at the end of O 13 —

12 Every document not written in the Court vernacular or in English which is produced (a) with a plaint or (b) at the first hearing or (c) at any other time tendered in evidence in any suit appeal or proceeding shall be accompanied by a correct translation of the document into the Court vernacular. If any such document is written in the Court vernacular but in characters other than the ordinary Persian or Nasth characters in use it shall be accompanied by a correct transliteration of its contents into the Persian or Nasth character.

13 When a document included in the list prescribed by rule 1 has been admitted in evidence the Court shall in addition to making the endorsement prescribed in rule 1 (1) mark such document with serial figures in the case of documents admitted in evidence for a plaintiff and with serial letters in the case of documents admitted in evidence for a defendant and shall initial every such serial number or letter. When there are two or more parties defendants the documents of the first party defendant may be marked A1 B1 C1 &c. A1 B1 &c. and those of the second A2 B2 C2 &c. &c. When a number of documents of the same nature is admitted as for example a series of receipts for rent the whole series shall bear one figure or capital letter or letter and a small figure or small letter shall be added to distinguish each paper of the series.

### Order XVI

1 The following proviso to be added —

Provided that no party who has begun to call his witnesses shall be entitled to obtain process to enforce the attendance of any witness against whom process has previously issued or to call any witness not named in a list which must be filed before the hearing of evidence on his behalf has commenced without an order made in writing and stating the reasons therefor.

8 For the words in line 1 under this order shall be served read the order may by leave of the Court be served by the party or his agent, and failing such service shall be served.

Add the following to O 16 r 2 —

2 (4) This rule shall not apply in cases to which Government servants whose salary exceeds Rs. 1000 and who are summoned to give evidence in their public capacity at a distance of more than five miles from their headquarters.

Add the following rules at the end of O 16 —

22 (1) Save as provided in this rule and in rule 2 the Court shall award costs and other expenses on the following scale —

- (a) In the case of witnesses of the class of cultivators labourers &c. six annas a day
- (b) In the case of witnesses of a better class such as zamindars, talukdars and persons of corresponding rank from eight annas as the Court may direct and

—All

V

- (c) In the case of witnesses of superior rank including officers of Government in receipt of salary of not less than Rs 200 a month from three to five rupees a day

(2) If a witness demands any sum in excess of what has been paid to him such sum shall be allowed if he satisfies the Court that he has actually and necessarily incurred the additional expense

#### *Illustration*

A post office employee summoned to give evidence is entitled to demand from the party on whose behalf or at whose instance he is summoned, the travelling and other expenses allowed to witnesses of the class or rank to which he belongs and in addition the sum for which he is liable as payment to the substitute officiating during his absence from duty. The sum so payable in respect of the substitute will be certified by the official superior of the witness on a slip which the witness will present to the Court from which the summons was issued

(3) If a witness be detained for a longer period than one day the expenses of his detention shall be allowed at such rate not usually exceeding that payable under clause (1) of this rule as may seem to the Court to be reasonable and proper

Provided that the Court may for reasons stated in writing allow expenses on a higher scale than that hereinbefore prescribed

23 In cases to which Government is a party Government servants not being police constables whose salary exceeds Rs 10 per mensem and who are summoned to give evidence in their official capacity at a Court situated more than five miles from their headquarters shall be given a certificate of attendance by the Court in lieu of travelling and other expenses

### **Order XVII**

- 1 (2) *Add the following further proviso —*

Provided further that no such adjournment shall be granted for the purpose of calling a witness not previously summoned or named nor shall any adjournment be utilised by any party for such purpose unless the Judge has made an order in writing under the proviso to Order XVI rule I

- 2 *Order XIII add to rule 2 —*

Where on any such day the evidence or a substantial portion of the evidence of any party has been recorded and such party fails to appear the Court may in its discretion proceed with the case as if such party were present and may dispose of it on the merits

*Explanation —* No party shall be deemed to have failed to appear if he is either present or is represented in court by an agent or pleader though engaged only for the purpose of making an application

- 3 *Amend rule 3 —*

Where any party to a suit to whom time has been granted fails without reasonable excuse to produce his evidence or to cause the attendance of his witnesses or to comply with any previous order or to perform any other act necessary to the further progress of the suit for which time has been allowed, the Court may whether such party is present or not proceed to decide the suit on the merits

**Order XVIII**

*Add the following rules at the end of O 18 —*

19 (1) The Judge shall record in his own hand in English all orders passed on applications other than orders of a purely routine character

(2) The Judge shall record in his own hand in English all admissions and denials of documents and the English proceedings shall show how all documents tendered in evidence have been dealt with from the date of presentation down to the final order admitting them in evidence or rejecting them

(3) The Judge shall record the issues in his own hand in English and the issues shall be signed by the Judge and shall form part of the English proceedings

**Order XIX**

*Add the following rules at the end of O 19 —*

4 Affidavits shall be entitled in the Court of \_\_\_\_\_ at \_\_\_\_\_ (naming such Court) If the affidavit be in support of or in opposition to an application respecting any case in the Court it shall also be entitled in such case If there be no such case it shall be entitled *In the matter of the petition of*

5 Affidavits shall be divided into paragraphs and every paragraph shall be numbered consecutively and as nearly as may be shall be confined to a distinct portion of the subject.

6 Every person making any affidavit shall be described therein in such manner as shall serve to identify him clearly and where necessary for this purpose it shall contain the full name the name of his father of his caste or religious persuasion his rank or degree in life his profession calling occupation or trade and the true place of his residence

7 Unless it be otherwise provided an affidavit may be made by any person having cognizance of the facts deposed to Two or more persons may join in an affidavit each shall depose separately to those facts which are within his own knowledge and such facts shall be stated in separate paragraphs

8 When the declarant in any affidavit speaks to any fact within his own knowledge he must do so directly and positively using the words I affirm or I make oath and say

9 Except in interlocutory proceedings affidavits shall strictly be confined to such acts as the declarant is able of his own knowledge to prove In interlocutory proceedings when the particular fact is not within the declarant's own knowledge but is stated from information obtained from others the declarant shall use the expression I am informed and if such be the case and verily believe to be true and shall state the name and address of and sufficiently described for the purposes of identification the person or persons from whom he received such information. When the application or the opposition thereto rests on facts disclosed in documents or copies of document produced from any Court of Justice or other source the declarant shall state what is the source from which they were produced and his information and belief as to the truth of the facts disclosed in such documents.

10 When any place is referred to in an affidavit it shall be correctly described. When in an affidavit any person is referred to such person the correct name and address of such person and such further description as may be sufficient for the purpose of the identification of such person shall be given in the affidavit.

es—All  
pp V

11 Every person making an affidavit for use in a Civil Court shall, if not personally known to the person before whom the affidavit is made be identified to that person by some one known to him and the person before whom the affidavit is made shall state at the foot of the affidavit the name address and description of him by whom the identification was made as well as the time and place of such identification.

11A Such identification may be made by a person—

(a) personally acquainted with the person to be identified or

(b) satisfied from papers in that person's possession or otherwise of his identity

Provided that in case (b) the person so identifying shall sign on the petition or affidavit a declaration in the following form after there has been affixed to such declaration in his presence the thumb impression of the person so identified —

#### Form

*I (name address and description) declare that the person verifying this petition (or making this affidavit) and alleging himself to be A B has satisfied me (here state what means e.g. from papers in his possession or otherwise) that he is A B*

12 No verification of a petition and no affidavit purporting to have been made by a *pardah nashin* woman who has not appeared unveiled before the person before whom the verification or affidavit was made shall be used unless she has been identified in a manner already specified and unless such petition or affidavit be accompanied by an affidavit of identification of such woman made at the time by the person who identified her

13 The person before whom any affidavit is about to be made shall before the same is made ask the person proposing to make such affidavit if he had read the affidavit and understands the contents thereof and if the person proposing to make such affidavit states that he has not read the affidavit or appears not to understand the contents thereof or appears to be illiterate the person before whom the affidavit is about to be made shall read and explain or cause some other competent person to read and explain in his presence the affidavit to the person proposing to make the same and when the person before whom the affidavit is about to be made is thus satisfied that the person proposing to make such affidavit understands the contents thereof the affidavit may be made

14 The person before whom an affidavit is made shall certify at the foot of the affidavit the fact of the making of the affidavit before him and the time and place when and where it was made and shall for the purpose of identification mark and initial any exhibits referred to in the affidavit

15 If it be found necessary to correct any clerical error in any affidavit such correction may be made in the presence of the person before whom the affidavit is about to be made and before but not after the affidavit is made Every correction so made shall be initialled by the person before whom the affidavit is made and shall be made in such manner as not to render it impossible or difficult to read the original word or words figure or figures in respect of which the correction may have been made

#### Order XX

*Add the following rule at the end of O 20 —*

21 (1) Every decree and order as defined in section 2 other than a decree or order of a Court of Small Causes or of a Court in the exercise of the jurisdiction of a Court of Small Causes shall be drawn up in the Court vernacular As soon as an

decree or order has been drawn up and before it is signed the Munsarim shall cause a notice to be posted on the notice board stating that the decree or order has been drawn up and that any party or the pleader of any party may within six working days from the date of such notice peruse the draft decree or order and may sign it or may file with the Munsarim an objection to it on the ground that there is in the judgment a verbal error or some accidental defect not affecting a material part of the case or that such decree or order is at variance with the judgment or contains some clerical or arithmetical error. Such objection shall state clearly what is the error defect or variance alleged and shall be signed and dated by the person making it.

(2) If any such objection be filed on or before the date specified in the notice the Munsarim shall enter the case in the earliest weekly list practicable and shall on the date fixed put up the objection together with the record before the Judge who pronounced the judgment or if such Judge has ceased to be the Judge of the Court before the Judge then presiding.

(3) If no objection has been filed on or before the date specified in the notice or if an objection has been filed and disallowed the Munsarim shall date the decree as of the day on which the judgment was pronounced and shall lay it before the Judge for signature in accordance with the provisions of rules 7 and 8.

(4) If an objection has been duly filed and has been allowed the correction or alteration directed by the Judge shall be made. Every such correction or alteration in the judgment shall be made by the Judge in his own handwriting. A decree amended in accordance with the correction or alteration directed by the Judge shall be drawn up and the Munsarim shall date the decree as of the day on which the judgment was pronounced and shall lay it before the Judge for signature in accordance with the provisions of rules 7 and 8.

(5) When the Judge signs the decree he shall make an autograph note stating the date on which the decree was signed.

### Order XXI

5 For the word District where it occurs after the words same and different read Province.

#### Rule 6

6 Rule 6 be re numbered 6 (1) and the following sub rule 6 (?) be added —

Such copies and certificates may at the request of the decree holder be handed over to him or to such person as he appoints in a sealed cover to be taken to the court to which they are to be sent.

11 For clause (f) of sub rule ( ) of this rule substitute the following —

(f) The date of the last application if any. And add the following proviso to sub rule (?) —

Provided that when the applicant files with his application a certified copy of the decree the particulars specified in clauses (b) (c) and (h) need not be given in the application.

17 Between the words been complied with and the court may insert the words and if the decree holder fails to remedy the defect within a time to be fixed by the court.

22 For the words one year wherever they occur in this rule read the words three years.



## Rules—All

## App V

*To sub rule (2) of this rule shall be added the following proviso —*

*Provided that no order for the execution of a decree shall be invalid by reason of the omission to issue a notice under this rule unless the judgment debtor has sustained substantial injury by reason of such omission*

24 (3) *After the words at the end of the sub rule be executed add the word and a day shall be specified on or before which it shall be returned to court*

*Substitute the following for paragraph (2) in rule 20 —*

25 (2) 2 *Where the endorsement is to the effect that such officer is unable to execute the process the Court may examine him personally or upon affidavit touching his alleged inability and may, if it thinks fit summon and examine witnesses as to such inability and shall record the result*

26 (3) *For the words the court may read the words the court shall unless good cause to the contrary is shown*

29 *After the words the person against whom the decree was passed, insert the words or any person whose interests are affected by the decree or by any order made in execution thereof*

31 (2) and (3) *For the words wherever they occur in each sub rule six months read the words three months or such extended time as the court may for good cause direct*

32 (3) *For the words one year read the words three months and after the words at the end of the sub rule on his application add the words the court may if good cause extend the time*

39 (5) *Delete the words in the Civil Prison.*

53 *In sub rule (1) (b) in the third line and in sub rule (4) in the eighth line delete the words to such other court add the words and to any other court to which the decree has been transferred for execution.*

*And in sub rule (6) for the words after receipt of notice thereof read the words after receipt of notice or with the knowledge thereof*

54 *Add the following sub rule (54) (3) —*

*The order shall take effect as against purchasers for value in good faith from the date when a copy of the order is affixed on the property and against all other transferees from the judgment debtor from the date on which such order is made*

*Substitute the following for rule 55 —*

55 (1) *Notice shall be sent to the sale officer executing a decree of all applications for rateable distribution of assets made under section 73 (1) in respect of the property of the same judgment debtor by persons other than the holder of the decree for the execution of which the original order was passed*

(2) *Where—*

- (a) *the amount decreed (which shall include the amount of any decree passed against the same judgment debtor) notice of which has been sent to the sale officer under sub section (1) with cost and all charges and expenses arising from the attachment of any property are paid into Court or*
- (b) *satisfaction of the decree (including any decree passed against the same judgment debtor) notice of which has been sent to the sale officer under subsection (1) is otherwise made through the Court or certified to the Court or*

- (c) the decree (including any decree passed against the same judgment debtor) notice of which has been sent to the sale officer under sub section (1) is set aside or reversed

the attachment shall be deemed to be withdrawn and in the case of immovable property the withdrawal shall if the judgment debtor so desires be proclaimed at his expense and a copy of the proclamation shall be affixed in the manner prescribed by the last preceding rule

58 *Add the following words to sub rule (3) (2) —*

(or objection) or may in its discretion make an order postponing the delivery of the property after the sale pending such investigation And in no case shall the sale become absolute until the claim or objection has been decided

68 *For the words fifteen days read the words seven days*

69 (2) *For the word seven read the word fourteen and add the following proviso —*

Provided that the court may dispense with the consent of any judgment debtor who has failed to attend in answer to a notice issued under rule 60

72 *In sub rule (3) for the words with such permission read the words property sold and re number this sub rule 72 and delete sub rules (1) and (3)*

89 *In sub rule (1) of this rule for the words any person before such sale read the words the judgment debtor or any person deriving title through the judgment debtor or any person holding an interest in the property*

90 *For the words Provided that no read the words provided that—*

(a) no

*and add the following proviso —*

(b) no such application shall be entertained upon any ground which could have been taken by the applicant on or before the date on which the sale proclamation was drawn up

92 *In sub rule (1) after the words the court shall insert the words subject to the provisions of rules 38 (2)*

*After the words at his instigation wherever they occur add the words or on his behalf and after the words at the end of the rule thirty days add the words (thirty days) and may order the person or persons whom it holds responsible for such resistance or obstructions to pay jointly or severally in addition to cost reasonable compensation to the decree holder for the delay and expense caused to him in obtaining possession The order made thereon shall have the same force and be subject to the same conditions as to appeal or otherwise as if it were a decree*

99 *For the words in brackets (other than the judgment debtor) read the words in brackets (other than the persons mentioned in rules 90 and 93 hereof)*

*Add the following rules at the end of O 21 —*

104 *When the certificate prescribed by section 41 is received by the Court which sent the decree for execution it shall cause the necessary details as to the result of execution to be entered in its register of civil suits before the papers are transmitted to the record room*

## Rules—All

## App V

105 Every attachment of movable property under rule 43 of the *Table of Contents* under rule 51 and of immovable property under rule 54 shall be made through a Civil Court Amin or bailiff unless special reasons render it necessary that another agency should be employed in which case those reasons shall be stated in the handwriting of the presiding Judge himself in the order for attachment

106 When the property which it is sought to bring to sale is immovable property within the definition of the same contained in the law for the time being in force relating to the registration of documents the decree holder shall file with his application a certificate from the sub registrar within whose sub district such property is situated, stating that the sub registrar has searched his book nos I and II and their indices for the past twelve years and stating the encumbrances if any which he has found on the property

107 Where an application is made for the sale of land or of any interest in land the Court shall before ordering sale thereof call upon the parties to state whether such land is or is not ancestral land within the meaning of Notification No 188/11-23 dated 7th October 1911 of the Local Government and shall fix a date for determining the said question

On the day so fixed or on any date to which the enquiry may have been adjourned the Court may take such evidence by affidavit or otherwise as it may deem necessary and may also call for a report from the Collector of the district as to whether or not any portion thereof is ancestral land

After considering the evidence and the report if any the Court shall determine whether such land or any and what part of it is ancestral land.

The result of the enquiry shall be noted in an order made for the purpose by the presiding Judge in his own handwriting

108 When the property which it is sought to bring to sale is revenue property or revenue free land or any interest in such land and the decree is not sent to the Collector for execution under section 69 the Court before ordering a sale shall also call upon the Collector in whose district such property is situated to report whether the property is subject to any (and if so to what) outstanding claims on the part of the Government

109 The certificate of the sub registrar and the report of the Collector shall be open to the inspection of the parties or their pleaders free of charge between the date of the receipt by the Court and the declaration of the result of the enquiry

No fees are payable in respect of the report by the Collector

110 The result of the enquiry under rule 66 shall be noted in an order made for the purpose by the presiding Judge in his own handwriting The Court may in its discretion adjourn the enquiry provided that the reasons for the adjournment are stated in writing and that no more adjournments are made than are necessary for the purpose of the inquiry

111 If after proclamation of the intended sale has been made any matter is brought to the notice of the Court which it considers material for purchasers to know the Court shall cause the same to be notified to intending purchasers when the property is put up for sale

112 The costs of the proceedings under rules 66 106 and 108 shall be paid in the first instance by the decree holder but they shall be charged as part of the costs of execution unless the Court for reasons to be specified in writing shall order that they shall wholly or in part be omitted therefrom

113 Whenever any Civil Court has sold in execution of a decree or other order any house or other building situated within the limits of a Military Cantonment or station it shall as soon as the sale has been confirmed forward to the Commanding Officer of such cantonment or station for his information and for record in the Brigade or other proper office a written notice that such sale has taken place and such notice shall contain full particulars of the property sold and of the name and address of the purchaser

114 Whenever guns or other arms in respect of which licenses have to be taken by purchasers under the Indian Arms Act (Act No VI of 1878) are sold by public auction in execution of decrees by order of a Civil Court the Court directing the sale shall give due notice to the Magistrate of the district of the names and addresses of the purchasers and of the time and place of the intended delivery to the purchasers of such arms so that proper steps may be taken by the police to enforce the requirements of the Indian Arms Act

115 When an application is made for the attachment of live stock or other movable property the decree holder shall pay into Court in cash such sum as will cover the costs of the maintenance and custody of the property for fifteen days If within three clear days before the expiry of any such period of fifteen days the amount of such costs or such further period as the Court may direct be not paid into Court the Court on receiving a report thereof from the proper officer may issue an order for the withdrawal of the attachment and direct by whom the costs of the attachment are to be paid

116 Live stock which has been attached in execution of a decree shall ordinarily be left at the place where the attachment is made either in custody of the judgment debtor on his furnishing security or in that of some landholder or other respectable person willing to undertake the responsibility of its custody and to produce it when required by the Court

117 If the custody of live stock cannot be provided for in the manner described in the last preceding rule the animals attached shall be removed to the nearest pound established under the Cattle Trespass Act 1871 and committed to the custody of the pound keeper who shall enter in a register—

- (a) the number and description of the animals
- (b) the day and hour on and at which they were committed to his custody
- (c) the name of the attaching officer or his subordinate by whom they were committed to his custody and shall give such attaching officer or subordinate a copy of the entry

118 For every animal committed to the custody of the pound keeper as aforesaid a charge shall be levied as rent for the use of the pound for each fifteen or part of fifteen days during which such custody continue according to the scale prescribed under section 12 of Act No 1 of 1871

And the sum so levied shall be sent to the Treasury for credit to the Municipal or District Board as the case may be under whose jurisdiction the pound is All such sums shall be applied in the same manner as fine levied under section 12 of the said Cattle Trespass Act

119 The pound keeper shall take charge of feed and water animals attached and committed as aforesaid until they are withdrawn from his custody as hereinafter provided and he shall be entitled to be paid for their maintenance at such rates as may be from time to time prescribed under proper authority Such rates shall for animals specified in the section mentioned in the last preceding rule not exceed the rates for

## Rules—All

**App V** the time being fixed under section 5 of the same Act. In any case if special reasons to be recorded in writing the Court may require payment to be made for maintenance at higher rates than those prescribed.

120 The charges herein authorized for the maintenance of live stock shall be paid to the pound keeper by the attaching officer for the first fifteen days at the time the animals are committed to his custody and thereafter for such further period as the Court may direct at the commencement of such period. Payments for such maintenance so made in excess of the sum due for the number of days during which the animals may be in the custody of the pound keeper shall be refunded by him to the attaching officer.

121 Animals attached and committed as aforesaid shall not be released from custody by the pound keeper except on the written order of the Court or of the attaching officer or of the officer appointed to conduct the sale. The person receiving the animals on their being so released shall sign a receipt for them in the form mentioned in rule 118.

122 For the safe custody of movable property other than live stock which is under attachment the attaching officer shall subject to approval by the Court make such arrangements as may be most convenient and economical.

123 With the permission of the Court the attaching officer may place one or more persons in special charge of such property.

124 The fee for the services of each such person shall be payable in the manner prescribed in rule 116. It shall not be less than two annas and shall ordinarily not be more than three and a half annas per diem. The Court may at its discretion allow a higher fee but if it do so it shall state in writing its reasons for allowing an exceptional rate.

125 When the services of such person are no longer required the attaching officer shall give him a certificate on a counterfoil form of the number of days he has served and of the amount due to him and on the presentation of such certificate to the Court which ordered the attachment the amount shall be paid to him in the presence of the presiding Judge. Provided that where the amount does not exceed Rs 5 it may be paid to the Sahna by money order on requisition by the Amin and the presentation of the certificate may be dispensed with.

126 When in consequence of an order of attachment being withdrawn or for some other reasons the person has not been employed or has remained in charge of the property for a shorter time than that for which payment has been made in respect of his services the fee paid shall be refunded in whole or in part as the case may be.

127 Fees paid into Court under the foregoing rules shall be entered in the Register of Petty Receipts and Repayments.

128 When any sum levied under rule 119 is remitted to the treasury it shall be accompanied by an order in triplicate (in the form given as form 9 of the Municipal Account Code) of which one part will be forwarded by the Treasury Officials to the District or Municipal Board as the case may be. A note that the same has been paid into the Treasury as rent for the use of the pound will be recorded on the extract from the pass book.

129 The cost of repairing attached property for sale or of conveying it to the place where it is to be kept or sold shall be payable by the decree holder to the attaching officer. In the event of the decree holder failing to provide the necessary funds,

attaching officer shall report his default to the Court and the Court may thereupon issue an order for the withdrawal of the attachment and direct by whom the costs of the attachment are to be paid

130 Nothing in the e rules shall be deemed to prevent the Court from issuing and serving on the judgment debtor simultaneously the notices required by Order XXI rules 2, 66 and 107

*Add the following rules —*

### *Garnishee order*

131 The court may in the case of any debt due to the judgment debtor (other than a debt secured by a mortgage or a charge or a negotiable instrument or a debt recoverable only in a revenue court) or any movable property not in the possession of the judgment debtor issue a notice to any person (hereinafter called the garnishee) liable to pay such debt or to deliver or account for such movable property calling upon him to appear before the court and show cause why he should not pay or deliver into court the debt due from or the property deliverable by him to such judgment debtor or so much thereof as may be sufficient to satisfy the decree and the cost of execution

132 If the garnishee does not forthwith or within such time as the court may allow pay or deliver into court the amount due from or the property deliverable by him to the judgment debtor or so much as may be sufficient to satisfy the decree and the cost of execution and does not dispute his liability to pay such debt or deliver such movable property or if he does not appear in answer to the notice then the court may order the garnishee to comply with the terms of such notice and on such order execution may issue as though such order were a decree against him

133 If the garnishee dispute his liability the court instead of making such order may order that any issue or question necessary for determining his liability be tried as though it were an issue in a suit and upon the determination of such issue shall pass such order upon the notice as shall be just

134 Whenever in any proceedings under these rules it is alleged or appears to the court to be probable that the debt or property attached or sought to be attached belongs to some third person or that any third person has a lien or charge upon or an interest in it the court may order such third person to appear and state the nature of his claim if any upon such debt or property and prove the same if necessary

135 After hearing such third person and any other person who may subsequently be ordered to appear or in the case of such third or other person not appearing when ordered the court may pass such order as is hereinbefore provided or make such other order as it shall think fit upon such terms in all cases with respect to the lien charge or interest if any of such third or other person as to such court shall seem just and reasonable

136 Payment or delivery made by the garnishee whether in execution of an order under the e rules or otherwise shall be a valid discharge to him as against the judgment debtor or any other person ordered to appear as afore said for the amount paid, delivered or realized although such order or the judgment may be set aside or reversed

137 Debts owing from a firm carrying on business within the jurisdiction of the court may be attached under the e rules although one or more members of such firm may be resident out of the jurisdiction provided that any person having the control or management of the partnership business or any member of the firm within the jurisdiction is served with the garnishee order. An appearance by any member pursuant to an order shall be a sufficient appearance by the firm

## Rules—All

## App. V

120. The court of the State of New York and of the County of New York, do hereby certify that the following is a true and correct copy of the original of the same as the same is now on file in the office of the Clerk of the Court.

121. (1) That the plaintiff of the County of New York and of the State of New York, do hereby certify that the following is a true and correct copy of the original of the same as the same is now on file in the office of the Clerk of the Court.

(2) That the defendant of the County of New York and of the State of New York, do hereby certify that the following is a true and correct copy of the original of the same as the same is now on file in the office of the Clerk of the Court.

122. That the plaintiff of the County of New York and of the State of New York, do hereby certify that the following is a true and correct copy of the original of the same as the same is now on file in the office of the Clerk of the Court.

123. That the defendant of the County of New York and of the State of New York, do hereby certify that the following is a true and correct copy of the original of the same as the same is now on file in the office of the Clerk of the Court.

124. That the plaintiff of the County of New York and of the State of New York, do hereby certify that the following is a true and correct copy of the original of the same as the same is now on file in the office of the Clerk of the Court.

125. That the defendant of the County of New York and of the State of New York, do hereby certify that the following is a true and correct copy of the original of the same as the same is now on file in the office of the Clerk of the Court.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 19th day of May 1901.

Plaintiff

Defendant

126

To

THAT the plaintiff of the County of New York and of the State of New York, do hereby certify that the following is a true and correct copy of the original of the same as the same is now on file in the office of the Clerk of the Court.

127

On this 19th day of May 1901, the plaintiff of the County of New York and of the State of New York, do hereby certify that the following is a true and correct copy of the original of the same as the same is now on file in the office of the Clerk of the Court.

On

to the plaintiff of the County of New York and of the State of New York, do hereby certify that the following is a true and correct copy of the original of the same as the same is now on file in the office of the Clerk of the Court.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 19th day of May 1901.

Plaintiff

Defendant

128

## Order XXV

That the plaintiff of the County of New York and of the State of New York, do hereby certify that the following is a true and correct copy of the original of the same as the same is now on file in the office of the Clerk of the Court.

## ALLAHABAD HIGH COURT RULES

### Order XXVI

16 In clause (1) after the words "and plaintiffs and pleaders" *substitute* "and the full top and add the following word" and shall direct the party applying for examination of the witness or in it directs any other party to the suit to comply with a copy of the pleadings and issues.

### Order XXVII

*Add the following rule at the end of Order 27 —*

9 In every case in which the Government Pleader appears for the Government as a party on its own account or for the Government as undertaking undertakings of rule 8 (1) the defence of a suit against an officer of the Government in lieu of a vakalatnama file a memorandum on unstamped paper signed by the officer stating on whose behalf he appears. Such memorandum shall be as nearly as possible in the terms of the following form

#### TITLE OF THE SUIT ETC

1 A B Government Pleader appear on behalf of the Secretary of State in Council (or the Government of the United Provinces or as the case may be) respondent (or &c) in the suit

for on behalf of the Government (which under Order 27 rule 8 (1) of the Rules has undertaken the defence of the suit) respondent (or &c) in the

### Order XXXII

3 *Add the following proviso to rule 3 (4) —*

Provided that if the minor is under ten years of age no such notice shall be given to him

*Substitute the following for rule 4 —*

4 (1) Where a minor has a guardian appointed or declared by competent court no person other than such guardian shall act as next friend except by leave of the court

(2) Subject to the provisions of sub-rule (1) any person who is of full age and has attained majority may act as next friend of a minor unless the interest of the minor is adverse to that of the minor or he is a defendant or the court for reasons to be recorded considers him unfit to act

(3) Every next friend shall except as otherwise provided by clause (5) be entitled to be reimbursed from the estate of the minor any expenses incurred while acting for the minor

(4) The court may in its discretion, for reasons to be recorded in writing, award costs of the suit or compensation under section 33A or section 33B against the next friend personally as if he were a plaintiff

(5) Costs or compensation awarded under clause (4) shall not be recoverable by the guardian from the estate of the minor unless the decree expressly directs otherwise shall be so recoverable

*Add the following rule 4A —*

4A (1) Where a minor has a guardian appointed by competent court no person other than such guardian shall be appointed as next friend for the suit unless the court considers fit to be recorded that it is for the minor's welfare that he should be appointed



2. The second step is to identify the specific areas of the curriculum that need to be revised. This involves a thorough review of the current curriculum and a comparison with the standards and best practices in the field. The areas that need to be revised may include content, structure, and assessment methods.

1. The first step is to identify the problem or question that needs to be answered. This involves understanding the context and the specific requirements of the task.

[illegible][illegible]

— 222 —

7.2.1. Theorem.

13. \_\_\_\_\_

**Cheng, H. S.**

— 100 —

\_\_\_\_\_

০৬৩৩৩

*[Illegible text]*

12

... ..

تاریخ

• 2000 •

2. The [redacted] [redacted]

1. The first step in the process is to identify the problem or issue that needs to be addressed. This involves gathering information and understanding the context of the problem.

1. 凡在本市行政区域内从事经营活动的个体工商户、企业法人、其他经济组织（以下统称“经营者”），均应当依法取得营业执照，并遵守相关法律法规的规定。

77. *Chrysomelidae* (continued)

[illegible]

shall within two weeks of the admission of the appeal or within such time as the court may for special reasons allow deposit in the appellate court security for the costs of the appeal and for all costs ordered by the courts below to be paid by him which remain unpaid

2 Add (-) —

(2) In the second proviso to clause (1) of this rule costs of the appeal mean advocate's fee calculated on the valuation of the appeal together with a sum of Rs 2 for Court fee on Vakalatnama to be filed by the respondent. Rule 1 in section for appeal in case of second of appeals outside the jurisdiction of a single Judge a further sum of Rs 10 for printing charges payable by Respondent

3 Clause (-) of the rule shall be numbered as (3)

14 Add the following sub rule (3) —

(3) Notwithstanding anything in sub rule (1) it shall not be necessary to serve notice of any proceeding incidental to an appeal on any respondent other than a personimpleaded for the first time in the appellate court unless he has appeared and furnished an address for service either in the trial court or in the case of a second appeal in a lower appellate court or has appeared in the appeal

Add the following rule at the end of O 41 —

38 (1) An address for service filed under Order VII rule 10 or Order VIII rule 11 or subsequently altered under Order VII rule 24 or Order VIII rule 12 shall hold good during all appellate proceedings arising out of the original suit or application

(2) Every memorandum of appeal shall state the addresses for service of the opposite parties in the Court below and notices and processes shall serve on the appellate Court to such addresses

(3) Rules 21 22 23 and 24 of Order VII shall apply so far as may be in appellate proceedings

## Order XLII

Substitute the following for r 1 —

1 The rules of Order XLI shall apply so far as may be to appeals from decrees subject to the following provisions

Every memorandum of appeal from an appellate decree shall be accompanied by a copy of the decree appealed from and (unless the Court dispenses therewith) a statement on which it is founded and also of the judgment of the Court from which the decree is appealed

## Order XLIII

1 (u) For the words "an order under rule 23 of Order XLI" in rule 23 of Order XLI

Add the following rule at the end of O 43 —

3 In every appeal under rule 1 in every miscellaneous case dismissed for default a formal order shall be drawn up stating the facts of the case and the reasons for the dismissal

les—All

App V of the appeal or case the costs incurred and the parties if any by whom such costs are to be paid

### Order XLV

For Order XLI rule 15 (1) substitute —

15 (1) Whoever desires to obtain —

(a) execution of any order of His Majesty in Council or

(b) where an appeal has been dismissed by His Majesty in Council for want of prosecution an order of the Court from which the appeal to His Majesty was preferred terminating proceedings and determining the costs

shall apply to the said Court by a petition accompanied by a certified copy of the decree passed or order made by His Majesty in Council of which execution is desired or to which effect is to be given and a memorandum of all costs incurred in India that are claimed in pursuance thereof

### Order XLVI

Add the following rule at the end of O 46 —

8 Rule 3b of Order XLI shall apply so far as may be to proceedings under this order

### Order XLVII

Add the following rule at the end of O 47 —

10 Rule 3a of Order XLI shall apply so far as may be to proceedings under this order

### Order XLVIII

1 Before the words "Every process issued" prefix the words "Except as provided in Order IV rule 1 (2)"

### Order LII

1 Rule 3a of Order XLI shall apply so far as may be to proceedings under section 115 of the Code

## FORMS.

### APPENDIX B.

Form No. 1—An order of the Court of Session or of the District Court (Order No. 21) is hereby cancelled.

### APPENDIX B.

Form No. 1—An order of the Court of Session or of the District Court (Order No. 21) is hereby cancelled.

## APPENDIX B

No 20

## APPLICATION FOR ISSUE OF SUBJIONS TO A PARTY OR WITNESS

No OF SUIT

Name of parties

In the Court of the

Date fixed for hearing

| 1                                  | 2   | 3                  | 4                                |      | 5                   |               | 6   |
|------------------------------------|---|--------------------|----------------------------------|------|---------------------|---------------|---|
| Number of witnesses to be summoned | Name and full address of each person to be summoned | Rank or occupation | Distance of residence from Court |      | Cash paid for       |               | Name and address of person to whom unexpended travelling expenses and diet money should be returned |
|                                    |   |                    | Foot                             | Road | Travelling expenses | Diet expenses |   |
|                                    |   |                    |                                  |      |                     |               |   |

## APPENDIX E

No 29

In form no 29 (Proclamation of Sale) of Appendix E to the Code of Civil Procedure 1908 delete the sentence No bid by previously given in the paragraph above conditions of sale

No 43

The security to be furnished under section 50 (4) shall be as nearly as may be by a bond in the following form —

In the Court of

at

Suit No

of 19

against

Plaintiff

Defendant

C D of

WHEREAS in execution of the decree in the suit afore said the said C D has been arrested under a warrant and brought before the Court of

and whereas the said C D has applied for his discharge on the ground that he undertakes within one month to apply under section 5 of Act No III of 1907 to be declared an insolvent and the said Court has ordered that the said C D shall be released from custody if the said C D furnish good and sufficient security in the sum of Rs

that he will appear when called upon and that he will within one month from this date apply under section 5 of Act No III of 1907 to be declared an insolvent Therefore I E F inhabitant of

have voluntarily become security and do hereby bind my self my heirs and executors to as Judge of the said Court and his successors in office that the said C D will appear at any time when called upon by the said Court and will apply in the manner and within the time heretofore set forth and in default of such appearance or of such application I bind myself my heirs and executors to pay to the said Court on its order the sum of Rs

Witness my hand at

this

day of

19

(sd) E F

Surety

Witnesses

## Rules—All

## App V

## APPENDIX F

## No 11

The security to be furnished under Order XXXIII rule 9 shall be as nearly as may be by a bond in the following form —

In the Court of \_\_\_\_\_ at \_\_\_\_\_ of 19 \_\_\_\_\_  
Suit No \_\_\_\_\_ Plaintiff  
Defendant

Amount of suit Rupees \_\_\_\_\_

WHEREAS in the suit above specified the plaintiff aforesaid has applied to the said Court that the said defendant may be called on to furnish sufficient security to fulfil any decree that may be passed against him in the said suit or that on his failure so to do certain property of the said defendant may be attached

And whereas on the failure of the said defendant to furnish such security or show cause why it should not be furnished the property aforesaid of the said defendant has been attached by order of the said Court

Therefore I \_\_\_\_\_ inhabitant of \_\_\_\_\_ have voluntarily become security and hereby bind my self my heirs and executors to as Judge of the said Court and his successors in Office that the said defendant shall produce and place at the disposal of the said Court when required the property herein below specified namely *(here give description of property or refer to an annexed schedule)* of the value of the same or such portion thereof as may be sufficient to fulfil such decree and shall when required pay the costs of the attachment and in default of his so doing I bind my self my heirs and executors to pay to \_\_\_\_\_ as Judge of the said Court and his successors in office on its order such sum to the extent of rupees *(here enter a sufficient sum to cover the amount of suit with costs and the costs of the attachment)* as the said Court may adjudge against the said defendant

Witness my hand at \_\_\_\_\_ this \_\_\_\_\_ day of 19 \_\_\_\_\_ (Signed) \_\_\_\_\_

Witness \_\_\_\_\_ Surety (Signed) \_\_\_\_\_

## No 12

The security to be furnished under Order XXXIX rule 2 (a) shall be as far as may be by a bond in the following form —

In the Court of \_\_\_\_\_ at \_\_\_\_\_ of 19 \_\_\_\_\_  
Suit No \_\_\_\_\_ Plaintiff  
Defendant

WHEREAS in the suit above specified instituted by the said plaintiff to restrain the said defendant from *(here state the breach of contract or other injury)* the said Court has on the application of the said plaintiff granted an injunction to restrain the said defendant from the repetition *(or the continuance)* of the said breach of contract *(or wrongful act complained of)* and required security from the said defendant against such repetition *(or continuance)* :

Rule

Therefore I inhabitant of have voluntarily Rule  
 become security and do hereby bind myself my heirs and executors to as Ap  
 Judge of the said Court and his successors in office that the said defendant  
 shall abstain from the repetition (or continuance) of the breach of contract aforesaid  
 (or wrongful act or from the committal of any breach of contract or injury of a like kind  
 arising out of the same contract or relating to the same property or right) and in default  
 of his obtaining I bind myself my heirs and executors to pay into Court on the  
 order of the Court such sum to the extent of rupees as the Court  
 shall adjudge against the said defendant

Witness my hand at this day of 19

Witnesses

Surety

### APPENDIX H

No 4

Notice to show cause (General Form)

IN THE COURT OF

AT DISTRICT

CIVIL SUIT No

of 19

Miscellaneous No

of 19

versus

resident of

resident of

To

WHEREAS the abovenamed  
 has made application to this Court that  
 you are hereby warned to appear in this Court in person or by a pleader duly instructed  
 on the day of 19 at o'clock in the forenoon  
 to show cause against the application failing wherein the said application will be heard  
 and determined *ex parte* and it will be presumed that you consent to be appointed guar-  
 dian for the suit

Given under my hand and the seal of the Court this day of  
 19 Judge

### APPENDIX H

No 5

(List of documents produced by <sup>plaintiff</sup>~~defendant~~ Order 13, rule 1)

IN THE COURT OF

AT

DISTRICT

SUIT No

of 19

Plaintiff.

versus

Defendant

## Rules—All.

## App V

List of documents produced with the plaint (or at first hearing) on behalf of plaintiff (or defendant)

| This list was filed by _____ this _____ day of _____ 19 _____ |   |   |         |
|---|---|---|---------|
| 1   | 2   | 3   | 4       |
| Serial number   | Description and date if any of the document | What became of the document   | Remarks |
|   |   | If brought on the record the exhibit must put on the document<br>If rejected date of return to party and signature of party or pleader to whom the document was returned<br>If it remains on the record after decision of the case and is enclosed in an envelope under rule 24 Chapter III the date of enclosure in the envelope |         |

Signature of party or pleader producing the list

## APPENDIX H

No 11

Notice to minor defendant and guardian

In the Court \_\_\_\_\_ at \_\_\_\_\_ district.

Suit No \_\_\_\_\_ of 19 \_\_\_\_\_

resident of \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ Plaintiff

versus

resident of \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ Defendant

To—

(1) \_\_\_\_\_ Minor defendant

and

(2) \_\_\_\_\_ <sup>Natural</sup>  
~~Certificated~~ guardian the person in whose

Or

care the minor is alleged to be Whereas an application has been presented on the part of the plaintiff in the above suit for the appointment of a guardian for the suit to the minor defendant you said minor and you (2) \_\_\_\_\_ the <sup>natural</sup>  
~~certificated~~ guardian or the person in whose care the minor is alleged to be are hereby

required to take notice that unless within \_\_\_\_\_ days from the service upon you of this notice an application is made to this Court to show cause why the person named below should not be appointed or for the appointment of any other person willing to act as guardian for the suit the Court will proceed to appoint the person named below or some other person to act as the guardian of the minor for the purposes of the said suit

Proposed guardian

son of

resident of

Given under my hand and the seal of the Court this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19

Judge

NOTE.—\*Cut out the word natural if the certificated guardian is named cut out the word certificated if the natural guardian be intended and cut out both natural and certificated and the word OR if the guardian be of neither class but one with whom the minor lives

## APPENDIX H

## No 16

The security to be furnished under Order XXX rule 1 shall be as nearly as may be by bond in the following form —

In the Court of

at

Suit No

of 19

Plaintiff

Defendant

WHEREAS a suit has been instituted in the said Court by the said plaintiff to recover from the said defendant

the sum of rupees \_\_\_\_\_ and the said plaintiff \_\_\_\_\_ is residing out of British India (or is a woman) and does not possess any sufficient immovable property within British India independent of the property in the suit

Therefore I inhabitant of \_\_\_\_\_ have voluntarily become security and do hereby bind myself my heirs and executors to \_\_\_\_\_ as Judge of the said Court and to his successors in office that the said plaintiff \_\_\_\_\_ his heirs and executors shall whenever called on by the said Court pay all costs that may have been or may be incurred by the said defendant \_\_\_\_\_ in the said suit and in default of such payment I bind myself my heirs and executors to pay all such costs to the said Court on its order

Witness my hand at \_\_\_\_\_ this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19

(Signed)

Witnesses

Surety



Rules—All  
App V

## APPENDIX H.

No 17

## ADDRESS FOR SERVICE

Under Order VII rules 19 to 26 Order VIII rules 11 and 12 Order XLI rule 38  
Order XLVI rule 8 Order XLVII rule 10 Order LII rule 1

IN THE COURT OF THE

OF

ORIGINAL  $\frac{\text{Suit}}{\text{or Case}}$  No OF 19

Plaintiff

VERSUS

Defendant.

This address shall be within the local limits of the district Court within which the suit is filed or of the district Court within which the party ordinarily resides if within the limits of the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh but not within the limits of any other province —

| Name parentage and caste | Residence | Pargans or tahsil | Post office | District |
|--------------------------|-----------|-------------------|-------------|----------|
|                          |           |                   |             |          |

Dated

Any summon notice or process in the case may henceforward be issued to me at the above address until I file notice of change If this address is changed I shall forthwith file a notice of change containing all the new particulars

Signature of party { Plaintiff  
Defendant  
Appellant  
Respondent

Or

I file the above address according to the instructions given by my client  
(name) \_\_\_\_\_ (and capacity) \_\_\_\_\_

Signature of pleader

A B—This form when received by the Court must be stamped with the date of its receipt and filed with the record of the pending suit or matter

## APPENDIX H

No 18

## NOTICE OF CHANGE OF ADDRESS FOR SERVICE

Under Order VII rules 19 to 26 Order VIII rules 11 and 12 Order XLI rule 38 Order XLVI rule 9 Order XLVII rule 10 Order LII rule 1

IN THE COURT OF THE

OF

Suit  
ORIGINAL—No  
or Case

OF 19

Plaintiff

Defendant

This address shall be within the local limits of the district Court within which the suit is filed or of the district Court within which the party ordinarily resides if within the limits of the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh but not within the limits of any other provinces —

| Name parentage and caste | Residence | Pargana or tahsil | Post office | District |
|--------------------------|-----------|-------------------|-------------|----------|
|                          |           |                   |             |          |

Dated

Any summons notice or process in the case may henceforward be issued to me at the above address until I file notice of change. If this address is again changed I shall forthwith file a notice of change containing all the new particulars

Signature of party { Plaintiff  
Defendant  
Appellant  
Respondent

Or

I file the above address according to the instructions given by my client  
(name) ————— (and capacity) —————

Signature of pleader

N B—This form when received by the Court must be stamped with the date of its receipt and filed with the record of the pending suit or matter

## APPENDIX VI

### *Rules made by the High Court of Madras under s 122*

#### Order III

4 *Insert the following words at the commencement of sub rule (3) of rule 4 of Order III in the First Schedule*

No Government or other Pleader appearing on behalf of the Secretary of State for India in Council and

*Add the following as sub rule (4) to O 3 r 4 —*

(4) Notwithstanding the termination of all proceedings in the suit so far as regards the client the appointment of a pleader shall unless otherwise provided therein or determined by the death of the client or the pleader or by revocation in accordance with the provisions of clause (2) of this rule be deemed to authorise him to appear or to make any application or to do any act in connection with getting copies of documents and obtaining return of documents produced or filed in the suit or refund of money paid into Court in the suit

#### Order IV

2 *In O 4 r 2 number the present rule 2 (1) and add as rule 2 (2)—*

Registers in accordance with Forms Nos 14 15 16 17 and 18 in Appendix here prescribed for use in all Civil Courts having jurisdiction over the classes of suits and cases specified therein

[NOTE—For the new Forms Nos 14 15 16 17 and 18 see below Appendix II]

#### Order V

*Substitute the following for rr 25 and 26 in O 5 —*

25 Where the defendant resides out of British India and has no Agent in British India empowered to accept service the summons may be addressed to the defendant at the place where he is residing and sent to him by post if there is postal communication between such place and the place where the Court is situate

Provided that if by any arrangement between the Local Government of the Province in which the Court issuing the summons is situate and the Government of the foreign territory in which the defendant resides the summons can be served by an officer of the Government of such territory the summons may be sent to such officer in such manner as by the said arrangement may have been agreed upon

26 Where—

(a) in the exercise of any foreign jurisdiction vested in His Majesty or in the Governor General in Council a Political Agent has been appointed or a Court has been established or continued with power to serve a summons issued by a Court under this Code in any foreign territory in which the defendant resides or

Service in foreign territory through Political Agent or Court or by special arrangement

(b) the Governor General in Council has by notification in the *Gazette of India* declared in respect of any Court situate in any such territory and not established or continued in the exercise of any such jurisdiction as aforesaid that service by such Court of any summons issued by a Court under this Code shall be deemed to be valid service or

(c) by any arrangement between the Local Government of the Province in which the Court situate and the Government of the foreign territory in which the defendant resides the summons can be served by an officer of the Government of such territory

the summons may be sent to such Political Agent or Court or in such manner as may have been agreed upon to the proper officer of the Government of the foreign territory by post or otherwise for the purpose of being served upon the defendant and if the summons is returned with an endorsement signed by such Political Agent or by the Judge or other officer of the Court or by the officer of the Government of the foreign territory that the summons has been served on the defendant in manner herein before directed such endorsement shall be deemed to be evidence of service

*Make the following amendments and additions to Order —*

- 27 In rule 27 after the words "send it" insert the words "by registered post prepaid for acknowledgment"
- 28 In rule 28 after the words "shall send" insert the words "by registered post prepaid for acknowledgment"
- 29A Insert as rule 29A—

Notwithstanding anything contained in the foregoing rules where the defendant is a public officer (not belonging to His Majesty's Military or Naval forces or His Majesty's Indian Marine Service) sued in his official capacity service of summons shall be made by sending a copy of the summons to the defendant by registered post prepaid for acknowledgment together with the original summons which the defendant shall sign and return to the Court which issued the summons

### Order IX

13—*Make the following amendments to Order 13 —*

- (1) Delete number rule 13 as rule 13 (1)
- (2) Add the following as sub rule (2) to rule 12 —
  - (2) The provisions of Section 10 of the Indian Limitation Act 1908 shall apply to applications under sub rule (1)

### Order XIII

7—*Add the following proviso to rule 7 (2) —*

Provided that no document shall be returned which by force of the decree has become wholly void or useless

9—*Add the following as sub rule (3) —*

Every application under the first proviso to sub rule (1) above shall be made by a verified petition setting forth facts justifying the immediate return of the original and the Court may make such order as it thinks fit for costs of any or all the parties to the application including any costs incidental to the preparation of the certified copy to be substituted for the original and may further direct that any party against whom any order for costs is made shall have such costs if paid included as costs in the cause

## Rules—Mad.

## App VI

## Order XVI

*Insert as rule 4 A —*

4 A (1) Notwithstanding anything contained in the foregoing rules in any suit by or against the Secretary of State for India in Council no payment in accordance with rule 2 or rule 4 shall be required when an application on behalf of Government is made for summons to a Government servant whose salary exceeds Rs 10 per mensem and whose attendance is required in a Court situate more than five miles from his headquarters and the expenses incurred by Government in respect of the attendance of the witness shall not be taken into consideration in determining costs incidental to the suit

(2) When any other party to such a suit applies for a summons to such an officer he shall deposit in Court along with his application a sum of money for the travelling and other expenses of the officer according to the scale prescribed in the Civil Service Regulations and shall also pay any further sum that may be required under rule 4 according to the same scale and the money so deposited or paid shall be credited to Government

(3) In all cases where a Government servant appears in accordance with this rule the Court shall grant him a certificate of attendance

## Order XX.

1 — *Make the following amendments to O 20 r 1 —*

(1) Re number rule 1 as sub rule (1)

(2) Add the following as sub rule (2) —

(2) The judgment may be pronounced by dictation to a shorthand writer in open Court where the presiding Judge has been specially empowered in that behalf by the High Court

3 — *For O 20 r 3 substitute the following rule —*

The judgment shall bear the date on which it is pronounced and shall be signed by the Judge and when once signed shall not afterwards be altered or added to save as provided by section 103 or on review provided also that where the presiding judge is specially empowered by the High Court to pronounce his judgment by dictation to a shorthand writer in open Court the transcript of the judgment so pronounced shall after such revision as may be deemed necessary be signed by the judge

12 — *Add the following to O 20 r 12 —*

(3) Where an Appellate Court directs such an inquiry it may direct the Court of first instance to make the inquiry and in every case the Court of first instance shall on the application of the decree holder inquire and pass the final decree

## Order XXI

17 — *In O 21 r 1<sup>st</sup> add as r 17 (c) —*

Registers in accordance with Forms Nos 19 20 and 21 in Appendix II are prescribed for use in all Civil Courts having jurisdiction over the classes of cases specified therein

[NOTE — *For the new Forms Nos 19 20 and 21 see below Appendix II*]

25 (2) — (1) Amend O 21 r 1 (2) as follows —

*Insert the words "or cause him to be examined by any other Court" after the words "examine him"*

(2) *Add the following proviso to r 20 (2) —*

Provided that an examination of the officer entrusted with the execution of a process by the Nazir or the Deputy Nazir under the general or special orders of the Court shall be deemed to be sufficient compliance with the requirements of this clause

39 *Delete the present sub rules 4 and 5 of rule 39 of Order XVI and substitute the following —*

(4) Such sum (if any) as the Judge thinks sufficient for the subsistence and cost of conveyance of the judgment debtor for his journey from the Court house to the civil prison and from the civil prison on his release to his usual place of residence together with the first of the payments in advance under sub rule (3) for such portion of the current months as remains unexpired shall be paid to the proper officer of the Court before the judgment debtor is committed to the civil prison and the subsequent payments (if any) shall be paid to the officer in charge of the civil prison

(5) Sums disbursed under this rule by the decree holder for the subsistence and cost of conveyance (if any) of the judgment debtor shall be deemed to be costs in the suit

40 *Add the following as a proviso to O 21 r 40 (a) —*

Provided that in order to give the judgment debtor an opportunity of satisfying the decree the Court before making the order of committal may leave the judgment debtor in the custody of an officer of the Court for a specified period not exceeding ten days or release him on his furnishing security to the satisfaction of the Court for his appearance at the expiration of the specified period if the decree be not sooner satisfied

*Add the following as sub rule (6) to O 21 r 40 —*

(6) No judgment debtor shall be committed to the civil prison or brought before the Court from the prison to which he has been committed pending the consideration of any of the matters mentioned in sub rule (5) unless and until the decree holder pays into Court such sum as the judge may think sufficient to meet the travelling and subsistence expenses of the judgment debtor and the escort for the journey to and from the prison

Sub-rule (5) of rule 39 shall apply to such payments

*For O 21 r 43 substitute the following rules —*

43 (1) Where the property to be attached is movable property other than agricultural produce in the possession of the judgment debtor the attachment shall be made by actual seizure and the attaching officer shall keep the property in his own custody or in the custody of one of his subordinates and shall be responsible for the due custody thereof

provided that when the property seized is subject to speedy and natural decay or when the expenses of keeping it in custody is likely to exceed its value the attaching officer may sell it at once and

provided also that when the property attached consists of live stock agricultural implements or other articles which cannot conveniently be removed and the attaching officer does not act under the first proviso to this rule he may at the instance of the judgment debtor or of the decree holder or of any person claiming to be interested in such property leave it in the village or place where it has been attached—

(a) in the charge of the person at whose instance the property is retained in such village or place if such person enters into a bond in the form No 15-A of Appendix E to this schedule with one or more sufficient sureties for its production when called for or

## Rules—Mad

## App VI

- (b) in the charge of an officer of the Court if a suitable place for its safe custody be provided and the remuneration of the officer for a period of 10 days at such rate as may from time to time be fixed by the High Court be paid in advance

(2) Whenever an attachment made under the provisions of this rule ceases for any of the reasons specified in rule 55 or rule 57 or rule 60 of this order the Court may order the restitution of the attached property to the person in whose possession it was before attachment

*Insert the following rules —*

43 A (1) Whenever attached property is kept in the village or place where it is attached the attaching officer shall forthwith report the fact to the Court and shall with his report forward a list of the property seized

(2) If attached property is not sold under the first proviso to rule 43 or retained in the village or place where it is attached under the second proviso to that rule it shall be brought to the Court house and delivered to the proper officer of the Court.

43 B (1) Whenever attached property kept in the village or place where it is attached is live stock the person at whose instance it is retained shall provide for its maintenance and if he fails to do so and if it is in charge of an officer of the Court it shall be removed to the Court house

Nothing in this rule shall prevent the judgment debtor or any person claiming to be interested in such stock from making such arrangements for feeding the same as may not be inconsistent with its safe custody

(2) The Court may direct that any sums which have been expended by the attaching officer or are payable to him if not duly deposited or paid be recovered from the proceeds of property if sold or be paid by the persons declared entitled to delivery before he receives the same The Court may also order that any sums deposited or paid under these rules be recovered as costs of the attachment from any party to the proceedings

[NOTE.—An Additional form being form No 15 A has been inserted in Appendix E.]

53 Add the following as sub rule 1 (c) to O 21 r 53 —

(c) If the decree sought to be attached has been sent for execution to another Court the Court which passed the decree shall send a copy of the said notice to the former Court and thereupon the provisions of clause (b) shall apply in the same manner as if the former Court had passed the decree and the said notice had been sent to it by the Court which issued it

5 Add the following as a proviso to O 22 r 5 —

Provided that an appellate Court before determining it may direct any lower Court to take evidence thereon and to return the evidence so taken together with its finding and reasons and may take such findings and reasons into consideration in determining the question

11 A.—In O 22 after r 11 add the following as r 11 A —

11 A. The entry on the record of the name of the representative of a deceased appellant or respondent in a matter pending before the High Court in its appellate jurisdiction except in cases under appeal to the King in Council shall be deemed to be a quasi-judicial act within the meaning of section 128 (2) (i) of the Code of Civil Procedure and may be performed by the Registrar provided that contested applications and applications presented out of time shall be posted before a Judge for disposal

## Order XXVI-A

1 The Court may in any suit issue a commission to such persons as it thinks fit to translate accounts and other documents which are not in the language of the Court

2 The report of the Commissioner shall be evidence in the suit and shall form part of the record

3. Before issuing any commission under this Order the Court may order such sum (if any) as it thinks reasonable for the expense of the commission to be within a time to be fixed paid into Court by the party at whose instance or for whose benefit the commission is issued

## Order XXVII

5—*For O 27 r 5 substitute the following rule —*

The Court in fixing the day for the Secretary of State for India in Council to answer the plaint shall allow not less than three months time from the date of summons for the necessary communication with the Government through the proper channel and for the issue of instructions to the Government Pleader to appear and answer on behalf of the said Secretary of State for India in Council or the Government and may extend the time at its discretion

## Order XXIX

1 A—*Insert as Rule 1 A of Order 23 —*

In suits against a Local Authority the Court in fixing the day for the defendant to appear and answer shall allow not less than two months time between the day of summons and the date for appearance

## Order XXXII

3—*For O 32 r 3 substitute the following rule —*

3 (1) Where the defendant is a minor the Court on being satisfied of the fact of his minority shall appoint a proper person to be guardian for the suit for the minor

(2) An order for the appointment of a guardian for the suit may be obtained upon application in the name and on behalf of the minor or by the plaintiff

(3) The application shall be supported by an affidavit verifying the fact that the proposed guardian has no interest in the matters in controversy in the suit adverse to that of the minor and that he is a fit person to be so appointed. The affidavit shall further state the name of the person or persons on whom notice has to be served under the provisions of sub-rule (5)

(4) An application for the appointment of a guardian for the suit of a minor shall not be combined with an application for bringing on record the legal representative of a deceased plaintiff or defendant. The application shall be by separate petitions

(5) No order shall be made on any application under this rule except upon notice to any guardian of the minor appointed or declared by an authority competent in that behalf or where there is no guardian upon notice to the father or other natural guardian of the minor or where there is no father or other natural guardian to the person



## Rule.—Mad

**App VI** in whose care the minor is and after hearing any objection which may be urged on behalf of any person served with notice under this sub rule. The notice required by this sub rule shall be served six clear days before the day named in the notice for the hearing of the application and may be in form No 11 set forth in appendix H hereto

4—*For O 32 r 4 substitute the following rule —*

4 (1) Any person who is of sound mind and has attained majority may act as next friend of a minor or as his guardian for the suit

Provided that the interest of that person is not adverse to that of the minor and that he is not in the case of a next friend a defendant or in the case of a guardian for the suit a plaintiff

(2) Where a minor has a guardian appointed or declared by competent authority no person other than the guardian shall act as the next friend of the minor or be appointed as guardian for the suit unless the Court considers for reasons to be recorded that it is for the minor's welfare that another person be permitted to act or be appointed as the case may be

(3) No person shall without his consent be appointed guardian for the suit. Whenever an application is made proposing the name of a person as guardian for the suit a notice in form No 11 A set forth in appendix H hereto shall be served on the proposed guardian unless the applicant himself be the proposed guardian or the proposed guardian consents

(4) Where there is no other person fit and willing to act as guardian for the suit the Court may appoint any of its officers to be the guardian and may direct that the costs to be incurred by that officer in the performance of his duties as guardian shall be borne either by the parties or by any one or more of the parties to the suit or out of any fund in Court in which the minor is interested and may give directions for the repayment or allowance of the costs as justice and the circumstance of the case may require

(5) When a guardian for the suit of a minor defendant is appointed and it is made to appear to the Court that the guardian is not in possession of any or sufficient funds for the conduct of the suit on behalf of the defendant and that the defendant will be prejudiced in his defence thereby the Court may from time to time order the plaintiff to advance moneys to the guardian for the purpose of his defence and all moneys so advanced shall form part of the costs of the plaintiff in the suit. The order shall direct that the guardian as and when directed shall file in Court an account of the moneys so received by him

7—*Add the following in O 32 r 7 —*

**Rule—(1 A)** Where an application is made to the Court for leave to enter into an agreement or compromise or for withdrawal of a suit in pursuance of a compromise or for taking any other action on behalf of a minor or other person under disability and such minor or other person under disability is represented by counsel or pleader the counsel or pleader shall file in Court with the application a certificate to the effect that the agreement or compromise or action proposed is in his opinion for the benefit of the minor or other person under disability. A decree or order for the compromise of a suit appeal or matter to which a minor or other person under disability is a party shall recite the sanction of the Court thereto and shall set out the terms of the compromise as in the following Form which shall be numbered as Form No 24 in Appendix D to this Schedule

14A—*In O 2, after r 14 add the following as rule 14 A —*

14 A The appointment or discharge of a next friend or guardian for the suit of a minor in a matter pending before the High Court in its appellate jurisdiction except in case under appeal to the King in Council shall be deemed to be a quasi judicial act within the meaning of section 128 (2) (i) of the Code of Civil Procedure and may be performed by the Registrar provided that contested applications and applications presented out of time shall be posted before a judge for disposal

17—*Add as rule 17 of Order 32 —*

In suit relating to the person or property of a minor or other person under the superintendence of the Court of Wards the Court in fixing the day for the defendant to appear and answer shall allow not less than two months time between the date of summon and the date for appearance

## Order XLI

1—(1) *Add the following sentence to sub-r (1) of r 1 —*

The copy of the judgment shall be a printed copy in every case in which the High Court has prescribed that the judgment shall be printed when a copy is applied for the purpose of appeal

*Add the following as a proviso to O 41 r 1 (1) —*

Provided that in appeals from decrees or orders under any special or local Act to which the provisions of Parts II and III of the Limitation Act IV of 1908 do not apply and in which certified copies of such decrees or orders have not been granted within the time prescribed for preferring an appeal the Appellate Court may admit the memorandum of appeal subject to the production of the copy of the decree or order appealed from within such time as may be fixed by the Court

(2) *Add the following sentence to sub-r (2) of r 1 —*

The memorandum shall also contain a statement of the valuation of the appeal for the purpose of the Court Fees Act

(3) When an appeal is presented after the period of limitation prescribed therefore it shall be accompanied by a petition supported by affidavit setting forth the facts on which the appellant relies to satisfy the Court that he had sufficient cause for not preferring the appeal within such period and the Court shall not proceed to deal with the appeal in any way (otherwise than by dismissing it either under rule 11 of this Order or on the ground that it is not satisfied as to the sufficiency of the reasons for extending the period of limitation) until notice had been given to the respondent and his objection, if any to the Court acting under the provisions of section 3 of Act of 1908 have been heard

9—*Substitute the following for r 9 (2) —*

Returners in accordance with Forms Nos 22 23 24 and 25 in Appendix H are prescribed for use in all Civil Courts having jurisdiction over the classes of suits specified therein

[NOTE—For the new forms Nos 22 23 24 and 25 see Appendix H below]

18—*In O 41 r 18 after the words cost of serving the notice insert the words or if the notice is returned unserved to deposit within any subsequent period fixed the sum required to defray the cost of any further attempt to serve the notice*

## Rules—Mad.

## App VI

31—*Substitute the following for r 31 —*

31 The judgment of the Appellate Court shall be in writing and shall state—

(a) the points for determination

(b) the decision thereon

(c) the reasons for the decision and

(d) where the decree appealed from is reversed or varied the relief to which the appellant is entitled

and shall bear the date on which it is pronounced and shall be signed by the Judge or the Judges concurring therein provided that where the presiding Judge is specially empowered by the High Court to pronounce his judgment by dictation to a shorthand writer in open Court the transcript of the judgment so pronounced shall after such revision as may be deemed necessary be signed by the Judge

## Order XLI-A (new)

*Appeals to the High Court from original decrees of Subordinate Courts*

1 The rules contained in Order XLI shall apply to appeals in the High Court of Judicature at Madras with the modifications contained in this order

2 (1) The memorandum of appeal shall be accompanied by the prescribed fee for service of notice of appeal and the receipt of the accountant of the Court for the sum prescribed by the rules of Court

(2) Notwithstanding anything contained in rule 22 of Order XLI the period prescribed for entry of appearance by the respondent and filing by him of Memorandum of Cross Objections if any shall unless otherwise ordered be thirty days from the service of notice upon him

3 (1) If the respondent intends to appear and defend the appeal he shall within the period specified in the notice of appeal enter an appearance by filing in Court a memorandum of appearance

(2) If a respondent fails to enter an appearance within the time and in the manner provided by the sub rule above he shall not be allowed to translate or print any part of the record

Provided that a respondent may apply by petition for further time and the Court may thereupon make such order as it thinks fit The application shall be supported by evidence to be given on affidavit as to the reason for the applicant's default and notice thereof shall be given to the appellant and all parties who have entered an appearance Unless otherwise ordered the applicant shall pay the costs of all parties appearing upon the application

4 (1) The memorandum of appeal and the memorandum of appearance shall state an address for service within the City of Madras at which service of any notice order or process may be made on the party filing such memorandum

(2) If a party appears in person the address for service may be within the local limits of the jurisdiction of the Court from whose decree the appeal is preferred.

Provided that if such party subsequently appears by a pleader he shall state in the vakalat an address for service within the City of Madras and shall give notice thereof to each party who has appeared.

(3) If a party appears by a pleader his address for service shall be that of his pleader and all notices to the party shall be served on his pleader at that address.

5 The Court may direct that service of a notice of appeal or other notice or process shall be made by sending the same in a registered cover prepaid for acknowledgment and addressed to the address for service of the party to be served which has been filed by him in the lower Court. Provided that after a party has given notice of an address for service in accordance with Rule 4 service of any notice or process shall be made at such address.

6 All notices and process other than a notice of appeal shall be sufficiently served if left by a party or his pleader or by a person employed by the pleader or by an officer of the Court between the hour of 11 a.m. and 5 p.m. at the address for service of the party to be served.

7 Notices which may be served by a party or his pleader under Rule 6 or which are sent from the office of the Registrar may unless the Court otherwise directs be sent by registered post and the time at which the notice is posted would be delivered in the ordinary course of post shall be considered as the time of service thereof and the posting thereof shall be a sufficient service.

8 If there are several respondents and all do not appear by the same pleader they shall give notice of appearance to each of the other respondents as appear separately.

9 A list of all cases in which notice is to be issued to the respondent shall be affixed to the Court notice board after the case has been registered.

10 (1) If upon a case being called on for hearing by the Court it appears that the record has not been translated and printed in accordance with the rules of Court the Court may hear the appeal or dismiss it or may adjourn the hearing and direct the party in default to pay costs or may make such order as it thinks fit.

(3) If the Court proceeds to hear the appeal it may refuse to read or refer to any part of the record which is not included in the printed papers.

11 When costs are awarded unless the Court otherwise orders the costs of a party appearing upon any application before the Registrar or the Court shall be Rs. 15 and the cost of appearing when the appeal is in the daily cause list for final hearing and is adjourned shall be Rs. 30. At the request of any party the Registrar shall cause the order to be drawn up and the said costs to be inserted therein.

#### *Memorandum of Objections*

12 (1) If the acknowledgment mentioned in Rule 22 (3) of Order VII is not filed the respondent shall together with the memorandum of objections file so many copies thereof as there are parties affected thereby.

(2) The prescribed fees for service shall be presented together with the memorandum to the Registrar.

13 If any party or the pleader of any party to whom a memorandum of objections has been tendered has refused or neglected for three days from the date of tender to give the acknowledgment mentioned in Rule 22 (3) of Order VII the respondent may file an affidavit stating the facts and the Registrar may dispense with service of the copies mentioned in Rules 12 (1).

## Rules—Mad.

## App VI

14. Rule 31 of Order XLI shall not apply to the High Court. If judgment is given orally a shorthand note thereof shall be taken by an officer of the Court and a transcript made by him shall be signed or initialled by the Judge or by the Judges concurring therein after making such correction, as may be considered necessary.

## Order XLI-B (new)

1. The rules of Order XLI A shall apply so far as may be to appeals to the High Court of Madras under clause 1a of the Letters Patent of the said Court.

Provided that it shall not be necessary to file copies of the judgment and decree appealed from.

2. Notice of the appeal shall be given in manner prescribed by Order XLI A Rule 4, or if the party to be served has appeared in person, in manner prescribed by Rule 5 of the said order.

## Order XLII (new)

*Appeals from appellate decrees.*

1. The rules of Order XLI and Order XLI A shall apply so far as may be to appeal to the High Court of Judicature at Madras from appellate decrees with the modifications contained in this Order.

2. (1) The memorandum of appeal shall be printed or type-written and shall be accompanied by the following papers—

A copy thereof one certified copy and one plain printed or type-written copy of the decrees of Court of first instance and of the Appellate Court and four printed copies of each of the judgment of the said Courts, one copy of each judgment being a certified copy.

(2) If any ground of appeal is based upon the construction of a document, a printed or type-written copy of such document shall be presented with the memorandum of appeal.

Provided that if such document is not in the English language and the appellant appears by a pleader an English translation of the document certified by the pleader to be a correct translation shall be presented.

(3) If the appellant fails to comply with this rule the appeal may be dismissed.

## Order XLIII

2.—*Substitute the following for r 2—*

2. The rules of Order XLI and of Order XLI A shall apply so far as may be to appeals from the orders specified in Rule 1 and other orders of any Civil Court from which an appeal to the High Court is allowed under any provision of law.

Provided that in the case of appeals against interlocutory orders made prior to decree the Court which passed the order appealed from shall not send the records of the case unless an order has been made in favour of further proceedings in that Court.

3.—*Add the following as r 3 of O 43—*

3. A memorandum of appeal of an appellate order shall be accompanied by a printed or typed copy of the memorandum or application and of any papers filed therewith.

Rules—

App

## Appendix B to Schedule I

Form No 1—*In cert the following note in red ink in form No 1 namely —*

Also take notice that in default of your filing an address for service before the day before mentioned you are liable to have your defence struck out

Form No 13 A—*In cert the following as form No 13 A after form No 13 in Appendix B of Schedule I —*

No 13 A

*Certificate of attendance to an officer of Government summoned as a witness in a suit to which the Government is a party*

(ORDER XVI r 4 A)

(CAUSE TITLE)

This is to certify that \_\_\_\_\_ (name)  
(designation) being a Government servant was summoned to give evidence in his official capacity on behalf of the pl intif in the above suit and was in attendance in this court from the day of \_\_\_\_\_ to the \_\_\_\_\_ day of 19\_\_\_\_  
(inclusive) and that a sum of Rupees \_\_\_\_\_ has been paid into Court by the plaintiff defendant towards his travelling and subsistence allowance for days according to article 1133 of the Civil Service Regulations and that the said amount has been will be remitted to the Government treasury at \_\_\_\_\_ to be credited to Government under the head

VIIA—Miscellaneous Fees and Fines

Dated the \_\_\_\_\_ day of 19\_\_\_\_

Presiding Judge or Chief Ministerial Officer

## Appendix D to Schedule I

Form No 10 A—*Insert in Appendix D the following as Form No 10 A —*

FORM No 10 A

FINAL DECREE FOR SALE [ORDER 34 RULE 4 (2) OR ORDER 34 RULE 8 (4)]

(Title)

Upon reading the preliminary decree passed in the above suit and the application of the plaintiff dated \_\_\_\_\_ and upon hearing Mr

for plaintiff and Mr

for defendant and it appearing that the payment directed by the said decree has not been made

It is hereby decreed as follows —

(1) that the mortgaged property or a sufficient part thereof be sold and the proceeds of the sale (after defraying thereout the expenses of the sale) be applied in payment of what is declared due to plaintiff defendant in the aforesaid preliminary decree together with subsequent interest and subsequent cost and that the balance if any be paid

## Rules—Mad

App VI to the  $\frac{\text{defendant}}{\text{pl i int}}$  or other person entitled to receive it (2) that if the net proceeds of the sale is insufficient to pay such amount and such subsequent interests and costs in full the  $\frac{\text{pl i int}}{\text{def i int}}$  be at liberty to apply for a personal decree for the amount of the balance and (3) that the  $\frac{\text{def i int}}{\text{pl i int}}$  do also pay  $\frac{\text{pl i int}}{\text{def i int}}$  Rs for the costs of this application.

(Here enter description of mortgaged property in English or in the language of the Court)

NOTE—(1) In the case of a decree under Order 34 rule 5 (2) score out the words plaintiff and defendant below the lines and in the case of a decree under Order 34 rule 8 (4) score out the same words occurring above the lines

(2) Direction No (2) should be struck out if the personal liability has not been adjudicated in the suit or has been declared not to exist

Form No 10 B—Insert in Appendix D the following as Form No 10 B —

## FORM No 10 B

FINAL DECREE FOR REDEMPTION [ORDER 34 RULE 3 (1) ORDER 34 RULE 5 (1)  
AND ORDER 34 RULE 8 (1)]

## (Title)

Upon reading the preliminary decree in the above suit on and  
the application of the  $\frac{\text{def i int}}{\text{pl i int}}$  I A No dated  
and after hearing Mr

and Mr  
and it appearing that the payment directed by the  
pleader for the  
pleader for the  
aforesaid decree has been made —

It is hereby decreed as follows —

That the  $\frac{\text{pl i int}}{\text{def i int}}$  do deliver up to the  $\frac{\text{defendant}}{\text{pl i int}}$  or to such person as he appoints all documents in his possession or power relating to the mortgaged property and do also retransfer the property to the  $\frac{\text{defendant}}{\text{plaintiff}}$  free from the mortgage and from all incumbrances created by the  $\frac{\text{plaintiff}}{\text{defendant}}$  or any person claiming under him (or by those under whom he claims) and do also put the  $\frac{\text{defendant}}{\text{pl i int}}$  in possession of the property

## SCHEDULE

## Description of the mortgaged property

The costs of the  $\frac{\text{defendant}}{\text{plaintiff}}$  in these proceedings —

Particulars.

Amount

NOTE—(1) In the case of a decree under Order 34 rule 8 (1) score out the words plaintiff and defendant above the lines in the case of decree under Order 34 rule 3 (1) and rule 4 (1) score out the words plaintiff and defendant below the lines

(2) The words or by those under whom the claims will be inserted only if the mortgage derives title from an original mortgagee

Rules—

App

Form No 24 — *Add the following as Form No 24 in Appendix D —*

## FORM No 24

[DECREE SANCTIONING A COMPROMISE OF A SUIT ON BEHALF OF A MINOR OR LUNATIC]

(Title)

This suit coming on this day for final disposal in the presence of etc and C D the defendant a minor by E F his guardian *ad litem* applying that this suit may be compromised in the terms of an agreement in writing dated the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ and made between A B the plaintiff of the one part and the said C D by the said guardian *ad litem* of the other part (or on terms hereafter set forth) and, it appearing to this Court that the said compromise is fit and proper and for the benefit of the said minor this Court doth sanction the said compromise on behalf of the said minor and with the consent of all parties hereto It is ordered as follows —

(Set out the terms of the compromise)

## Appendix E to Schedule I

Form No 15 — *For the word Dated substitute the words given under my hand and the seal of the Court this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_*

Form No 15 A — *Add the following as Form No 15 A in Appendix E —*

## FORM No 15 A

BOND FOR SAFE CUSTODY OF MOVABLE PROPERTY ATTACHED AND LEFT  
IN CHARGE OF PERSON INTERESTED AND SURETIES

(Order XXI rule 43)

In the Court of \_\_\_\_\_ at \_\_\_\_\_

Civil Suit No \_\_\_\_\_ of \_\_\_\_\_

A B of \_\_\_\_\_

against \_\_\_\_\_

C D of \_\_\_\_\_

KNOW all men by the e presents that we I J of \_\_\_\_\_ etc and K L of \_\_\_\_\_ etc and M N of \_\_\_\_\_ etc are jointly and severally bound to the Judge of the Court of \_\_\_\_\_ in Rupees \_\_\_\_\_ to be paid to the said Judge for which payment to be made we bind ourselves and each of us in the whole our and each of our heirs executors and administrators jointly and severally by these presents

Dated this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_

AND WHEREAS the movable property specified in the schedule hereunto annexed had been attached under a warrant from the said Court dated the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_ in execution of a decree in favour of \_\_\_\_\_ in suit No \_\_\_\_\_ of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_ on the file of \_\_\_\_\_ and the said property has been left in the charge of the said I J

Now the condition of this obligation is that if the above bounden I J shall duly account for and produce when required before the said Court all and every the property aforesaid and shall obey any further order of the Court in respect thereof then this obligation shall be void otherwise it shall remain in full force

I J

K L

M N

Signed and delivered by the above bounden \_\_\_\_\_ in the presence of \_\_\_\_\_



## Rules—Mad

## App VI

Form No 17—*add* the following as a Note to Form No 29—(Proclamation of Sale)—of Appendix E to Schedule I of the Code of Civil Procedure 1908—

*Note*—The title deeds relating to the property have not been filed in Court and the purchaser will take the property subject to the risk of there being mortgage by deposit of title deeds or mortgages not disclosed in the encumbrance certificate

## Appendix F to Schedule I

Form No 9—*For Form No 9 of Appendix F substitute—*

FORM No 9

APPOINTMENT OF A RECEIVER

(O N L r I)

(Title)

WHEREAS it appears to the Court that in the above suit it is just and convenient to appoint a receiver of the properties specified below (or whereas the properties specified below have been attached in execution of a decree passed in the above suit on the day of 19 in favour of

It is hereby ordered that AB be appointed (subject to his giving security to the satisfaction of the Court) the receiver of the said property and of the rents issues and profits thereof under Order XL of the Code of Civil Procedure 1908 with all power under the provisions of that order except that he shall not without leave of the Court (1) grant leases for a term exceeding three years or (2) institute suits in any Court (except suits for rent) or (3) institute appeals in any Court (except from a decree in a rent suit) where the value of the appeal is over Rs 1 000 or (4) expend on the repairs of any property in any period of two years more than half of the net annual rental of the property to be repaired such rental being calculated at the amount at which the property to be repaired would be let when in a fair state of repair provided that such amount shall not exceed Rs 1 000

And it is further ordered that the <sup>parties</sup>~~defendant~~ to the above suit and all persons claiming under them to deliver up quite possession of the properties movable and immovable specified below together with all leases agreements for lease tabulats account books papers memoranda and writings relating thereto to the said receiver And it is further ordered that the receiver do take possession of the said property movable and immovable and collect the rents issues and profits of the said immovable property and that the tenants and occupiers do attend and pay their rents in arrear and growing rents to the said receiver And it is further ordered that the said receiver shall have power to bring and defend suits in his own name and shall have power to use the names of the plaintiffs and defendants where necessary And it is further ordered that the receipt or receipts of the said receiver shall be a sufficient discharge for all such sum or sums of money or property as shall be paid or delivered to him as such receiver

And it is further ordered that the said receiver do out of the first monies to be received by him pay the debts due from the said and shall be entitled  
to retain in his hands the sum of Rs for current expenses but subject  
thereto shall pay his net receipt as soon as the same come to his hand into Court to the credit of this suit He shall once in every months file his accounts  
and vouchers in Court the first account to be filed on the day of

Rules—

App

and to be paid on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ He shall be entitled  
to commission at the rate of R \_\_\_\_\_ per cent on the net amounts collected  
by him or to the sum of Rs \_\_\_\_\_ per month (or as the case may be) as his  
remuneration (or he shall act without any remuneration)

And it is further ordered (where an additional office establishment is required) that  
the said receiver shall be allowed to charge to the State in addition to his own office  
establishment the following further establishment —

(Here enter specification of property)

Given under my hand and the seal of the Court this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_  
19 \_\_\_\_\_

### Appendix G to Schedule I

Form No 6 — *Insert the following note in red ink in Form No 6 namely —*

Also take notice that if an address for service is not filed before the aforesaid  
date this appeal is liable to be heard and decided as if you had not made an appear-  
ance

Form No 6 A — *In Appendix G insert the following as Form No 6 A —*

Form No 6 A (Order NLI A rule 2)

NOTICE TO RESPONDENT

(Cause title)

Appeal from the \_\_\_\_\_ of the Court  
of \_\_\_\_\_ dated the \_\_\_\_\_ day  
of \_\_\_\_\_  
To \_\_\_\_\_

*Respondents*

Take notice that an appeal from the above decree (order) has been presented by  
the abovenamed appellants and registered in this Court and that if you intend to  
defend the same you must enter an appearance in this Court and give notice thereof to  
the appellant or his pleader within 30 days after service of this notice on you

If no appearance is entered on your behalf by yourself your pleader or some one  
by law authorized to act for you in this appeal it will be heard and decided in your  
absence

The address for service of the appellant is that of his pleader Mr A B of (insert  
address) Madras

(If the appellant appears in person insert his address for service)

Given under my hand and the seal of the Court this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_  
19 \_\_\_\_\_

*Registrar*

[Interlocutory application No \_\_\_\_\_ of 19 \_\_\_\_\_ has been made by appellant and  
execution has been stayed (or other order made) by order dated the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_  
19 \_\_\_\_\_]

## Rules—Mad

## App VI

Form No 6 B—In Appendix G insert the following as Form No 6 B —

Form No 6 B (Order XXI A rule 3)

## MEMORANDUM OF APPEARANCE.

(Cause title)

Take notice that the Respondent intends to appear and defend the above appeal and that his address for service of all notices and process is (insert address)

The said respondent requires a list of the papers which the appellant proposes to translate and print

Dated the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_ (Signed) C D  
*Att' for Respondent*

To the Registrar High Court of Judicature Madras

## APPENDIX G

No 9

Omit from Form 9 in Appendix G to the First Schedule to the Code of Civil Procedure the entire portion beginning with the words Memorandum of Appeal and ending with the words the following reasons namely

## CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE 1903

## APPENDIX G

No 12 A

## CERTIFICATE OF LEAVE TO APPEAL TO HIS MAJESTY IN COUNCIL.

O XXI r 7 C C P

(In cases where the subject matter of the appeal is of sufficient value and the findings of the courts are not concurrent)

Read petition presented under O XXI r 3 of the Code of Civil Procedure praying for the grant of a certificate to enable the petitioner to appeal to His Majesty in Council against the decree of this Court in suit No \_\_\_\_\_ of 19\_\_\_\_

The petition coming on for hearing upon perusing the petition and the ground of appeal to His Majesty in Council and the other papers material to the application and upon hearing the arguments of \_\_\_\_\_ for the petitioner and of \_\_\_\_\_ for the respondent (if he appears) this court doth certify that the amount of the subject matter of the suit in the court of first instance is Rs 10,000 upward of Rs 10,000 and the amount of the subject matter in dispute on appeal to His Majesty in Council is also of the value of Rs 10,000 upwards of Rs 10,000 or that the decree appealed from involved directly some claim or question to respecting property of the value of Rs 10,000 upwards of Rs 10,000 and that the decree appealed from does not affirm the decision of the lower court.

## APPENDIX C

## No 12 B

## CERTIFICATE OF LEAVE TO APPEAL TO HIS MAJESTY IN COUNCIL.

## O XLV r 7 C C P

(In cases where the subject matter is of sufficient value and the findings of the court are concurrent)

Read petition presented under O XLV r 3 of the Code of Civil Procedure praying for the grant of a certificate to enable the petitioner to appeal to His Majesty in Council against the  $\frac{\text{decree}}{\text{final order}}$  of this court in suit No of 192

The petition coming on for hearing upon perusing the petition and the grounds of appeal to His Majesty in Council and other papers material to the application and upon hearing the arguments of for the petitioner and of for the respondent (if he appears) this court doth certify that the  $\frac{\text{amount value}}{\text{Rs 10 000}}$  of the subject matter of the suit in the court of first instance is  $\frac{\text{Rs 10 000}}{\text{upwards of Rs 10 000}}$  and the  $\frac{\text{amount value}}{\text{Rs 10 000}}$  of the subject matter in dispute on appeal to His Majesty in Council is also of the value of  $\frac{\text{Rs 10 000}}{\text{upwards of Rs 10 000}}$  or that the  $\frac{\text{decree}}{\text{final order}}$  appealed against involves  $\frac{\text{directly}}{\text{indirectly}}$  some claim or question  $\frac{\text{to}}{\text{respecting}}$  property of the value of  $\frac{\text{Rs 10 000}}{\text{upwards of Rs 10 000}}$  and that the affirming  $\frac{\text{decree}}{\text{final order}}$  appealed from involves the following substantial question (s) of law is:—

- (1)
- (2)

## APPENDIX G

## No 12 C

## CERTIFICATE OF LEAVE TO APPEAL TO HIS MAJESTY IN COUNCIL.

## O XLV r 7 C C P

(In cases where the subject matter in dispute is either not of sufficient value or if incapable of money valuation)

Read petition presented under O XLV r 3 of the Code of Civil Procedure praying for the grant of a certificate to enable the petitioner to appeal to His Majesty in Council against the  $\frac{\text{decree}}{\text{final order}}$  of this court in suit No of 19

The petition coming on for hearing upon perusing the petition and the grounds of appeal to His Majesty in Council and other papers material to the application and upon hearing the arguments of for the petitioner and of for the respondent (if he appears) this court doth certify that the  $\frac{\text{amount value}}{\text{below Rs 10 000 in value}}$  of the subject matter of the suit both in the court of first instance and in this court is  $\frac{\text{below Rs 10 000 in value}}{\text{incapable of money valuation}}$  this court in the exercise of the discretion vested in it is satisfied that the case is a fit one for appeal to His Majesty in Council for the reasons set forth below viz:—

- (1)
- (2)

## Rules—Mad

## App VI

## Appendix H to Schedule I

Form No 11—*Substitute the following for Form No 11 of Appendix H —*

## FORM No 11

NOTICE TO GUARDIAN APPOINTED OR DECLARED OR TO FATHER OR OTHER NATURAL  
GUARDIAN OR TO THE PERSON IN CHARGE OF THE MINOR.

[Order XXXII rule 3 (5)]

(Title)

To

Guardian appointed or declared or father or other natural guardian or person in  
charge of the minor

Whereas an application has been presented on the part of the  
in the above suit for the appointment of a guardian for the suit for the said minor you  
are hereby required to take notice that unless within \_\_\_\_\_ days from the  
service upon you of this notice an application is made to this Court for the appointment  
of you or of some friend of the said minor to act as <sup>his</sup><sub>her</sub> guardian for the purposes of  
the said suit the Court will proceed to appoint some other person to act as guardian  
of the said minor for the purposes of the said

Given under my hand and the seal of the Court the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19

Form No 11 A—*In Appendix H insert the following Form as Form No 11 A —*

## FORM No 11 A

NOTICE TO PROPOSED GUARDIAN OF A MINOR <sup>DEFENDANT</sup>  
RE PONDENT

[Order XXXIII r 4 (3)]

To

(Name description and place of residence of proposed guardian.)

Take notice that X—<sup>plaintiff</sup><sub>appellant</sub> has presented a petitionto the Court praying that you be appointed guardian *ad litem* to the minor <sup>defendant (s)</sup>  
and that the same will be heard on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19

2. The affidavit of X has been filed in support in this application.

3. If you are willing to act as guardian for the said <sup>defendant (s)</sup>  
respondent (s) you are requested  
to sign (or affix your mark to) the declaration on the back of this notice4. In the event of your failure to signify your express consent in the manner in-  
dicated above take further notice that the Court may proceed under Order XXXIII  
r 4 Code of Civil Procedure to appoint some other suitable person or one of its officers as  
guardian *ad litem* of the minor <sup>defendant (s)</sup>  
respondent (s) aforesaid.

Dated the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19

(Signed)

(To be printed on the reverse.)

I hereby acknowledge receipt of a duplicate of this notice and consent to act as  
guardian of the minor <sup>defendant (s)</sup>  
respondent (s) therein mentioned.

Witnesses,

(Signed)

Y.Z.

1

2.

Form No 14—*For Form No 14 of Appendix H sub title —*

FORM No 14

## REGISTER OF ORDINARY SUIT INSTITUTED

Court—

Year—

*Instructions*

If the suit has been received by transfer or instituted under Order XXXVII Schedule I C C P a note should be made to that effect at the head of the page

2 If a suit is remanded under rule 23 Order XLI or restored to file under rule 9 or rule 13 Order IV Schedule I C C P note under item 2 the date of restoration to file

3 Under the head *Particulars of claim* enter particulars required by clauses (g) and (h) of rule I Order VII Schedule I C C P and also the *value* of the suit as required by clause (i) of that Order and with special reference to Judicial Statements Nos VII and VIII and H C Circulars Nos 1054 of 1870 and 253 of 1894 Entries under heads 3 4 and 5 should be full for embodiment in the decree as required by rule 6 Order XX Schedule I C C P

4 Note carefully the new heads 8 and 10 and fresh additions to heads 9 and 12

5 The certified copies of Judgment and Decree in Second Appeal sent to the lower Appellate Court should be forwarded by it to the Court of First Instance which will return them to the former Court after recording the necessary entries under head 9 of this Register

6 A note should be made of all parties brought on or struck off the record under Order I or XXII Schedule I C C P and also of any withdrawal of the claim or a portion of the claim against any of the defendants

7 Any amendments or alterations made during the progress of the suit in the value or particulars of the claim or as to the date or place of cause of action should appear under head 5

1 Ordinary Suit No

of 19

2 Date of { Presentation  
Filing

3 PLAINTIFF—Name description and place of abode

4 DEFENDANT—Name description and place of abode

5 PARTICULARS OF CLAIM—*Claim* for  
Cause of action arose at

6 Da Defendant's first appearance

Vakil of { Plaintiff  
Defendant

7 Date of JUDGMENT and result

8 Number of application (for review or re hearing) with result and date  
Fresh Judgment if any with date

Rules—Mad

App VI

11 *Execution—*

| No | Date of application | Order and date | Against whom | For what and amount if for money | Amount of co ts. |   |   |
|----|---------------------|----------------|--------------|----------------------------------|------------------|---|---|
|    |                     |                |              |                                  | Rs               | A | P |
|    |                     |                |              |                                  |                  |   |   |

12 *Return of Execution—*

| Amount paid into Court |   |   | Persons arrested | Minute of other return than payment of arrest and date of every return |
|------------------------|---|---|------------------|--|
| Rs.                    | A | P |                  |  |
|                        |   |   |                  |  |











Form No 21—1dd the following as Form No 21 in App II —

FORM No 21

REGISTER OF EXECUTION PETITION DISPOSED OF

Court—

Year—

In Instructions

1 The date to be entered in column 4 will always be the latest date. In the case of petitions restored to file the date of original institution should be entered and the date of restoration noted in the column of remark.

2 Note in the remarks column the number of judgment debtors imprisoned in each case the value of decree under which judgment-debtor was imprisoned and date when sent to jail and date of release for the purposes of columns 34 to 37 of Statement No XI

| Serial Number       | Number of the execution petition | Number of connected case | Date of institution or of receipt of the order of transfer | Date when proceedings were finally closed | Whether application rejected or not for execution | Transfer to          | Application on writ proceedings were finally closed |                               |                     | Amount                            |   | How the   |                       |
|---------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|---|----------------------|---|-------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|---|-----------|-----------------------|
|                     |                                  |                          |  |   |   |                      | Application obtained                                | Application refused           | Application allowed | Amount                            | Refracted   | Impounded | Arrested but released |
| 1                   | 2                                | 3                        | 4  | 5   | 6   | 7                    | 8   | 9                             | 10                  | 11                                | 12  | 13        | 14                    |
|                     |                                  |                          |  |   |   |                      |   |                               |                     |                                   |   |           |                       |
|                     |                                  |                          |  |   |   |                      |   |                               |                     |                                   |   |           |                       |
|                     |                                  |                          |  |   |   |                      |   |                               |                     | Rs                                | Rs  |           |                       |
| decree was executed |                                  |                          |  |   |   |                      |   |                               |                     |                                   | REMARKS<br><br>(If the petition is only for partial satisfaction of the decree note the fact) |           |                       |
| Movable property    |                                  | Immovable property       |  | Possession given of                       |   | Specific performance |   | Arrest effected (Section 100) |                     | Arrest not effected (Section 100) |   |           |                       |
| 15                  | 16                               | 17                       | 18   | 19  | 20  | 21                   | 22  | 23                            | 24                  | 25                                | 26  | 27        | 28                    |
| 29                  | 30                               | 31                       | 32   | 33  | 34  | 35                   | 36  | 37                            | 38                  | 39                                | 40  | 41        | 42                    |
|                     |                                  |                          |  |   |   |                      |   |                               |                     |                                   | Corresponding column to Statement No XI Part I  |           |                       |

## Rules—Mad

## App VI

FORM No 22—Add the following as Form No 22 in App II —

FORM No 22

## REGISTER OF APPEALS RECEIVED

Court—

Year—

## Instructions

Appeals from orders which have the force of decrees should be shown in this register and not in the Register of Miscellaneous Appeals Received (Form No 24) in which appeals from other orders should be entered—vide H C Circular No 3400 dated 2 nd December 1893 and section 2 (2) and Rules of Order XXXI Schedule I CCP

2 Under item 5 Particulars of suit and decree appealed from enter also Nature and Value of appeal with special reference to the information required by annual statement No 1 Parts 3 and 4 and H C Circulars Nos 1054 of 1890 and 1003 of 1894 In cases of appeals against orders having the force of decrees substitute the word Order for Decree and add after date the words passed under CCI on MP No of 19

3 If the appeal has been received by transfer a note should be made to that effect at the head of the page

4 If an appeal is remanded under Rule 23 Order XLI Schedule I CCP note under head 2 the date of restoration to file

5 A note should be made of all parties brought on or struck off the record under Order I or XVII Schedule I CCP

1 Appeal No of 19

2 Date of { Pre entation  
Filing

3 APPELLANT—Name description and place of abode

4 RESPONDENT—Name description and place of abode

5 PARTICULARS OF SUIT AND DECREE APPEALED AGAINST Decree of  
the Court of dated 19  
in Original Suit No of 19  
Value of relief

Particulars of relief

Claimed

Decreed

Appealed against

Rs A R

Rs A R

R A P

6 Hearing if any under Rule 11 Order XLI Schedule I CCP and result with date

7 Date for respondent's first appearance

Valid for { Appellant  
Respondent

8 JUDGMENT result and date

9 Objection under Rule 22 Order XLI Schedule I CCP if any filed by whom on 1 value

10 Number of Application for review (re hearing) with result and date  
Free h J dyme t if any with date

11 Second Appeal No of 19 Result with date

Form No 23 — Add the following as Form No 23 in App II —

## FORM No 23

## REGISTER OF APPEALS DISPOSED OF

## Instructions

Year—

Court—

1. There must be three separate registers of appeals disposed of: (1) for money or moveables (2) under the Madras Estates Land Act 1908 and (3) for title and other appeals.  
 2. The date to be entered in column 2 will always be the latest date. In the case of appeals restored to file the date of original institutions should be entered.

| Serial number | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 32 | 33 | 34 | 35 | 36 | 37 | 38 | 39 | 40 | 41 | 42 | 43 | 44 | 45 | 46 | 47 | 48 | 49 | 50 | 51 | 52 | 53 | 54 | 55 | 56 | 57 | 58 | 59 | 60 | 61 | 62 | 63 | 64 | 65 | 66 | 67 | 68 | 69 | 70 | 71 | 72 | 73 | 74 | 75 | 76 | 77 | 78 | 79 | 80 | 81 | 82 | 83 | 84 | 85 | 86 | 87 | 88 | 89 | 90 | 91 | 92 | 93 | 94 | 95 | 96 | 97 | 98 | 99 | 100 | 101 | 102 | 103 | 104 | 105 | 106 | 107 | 108 | 109 | 110 | 111 | 112 | 113 | 114 | 115 | 116 | 117 | 118 | 119 | 120 | 121 | 122 | 123 | 124 | 125 | 126 | 127 | 128 | 129 | 130 | 131 | 132 | 133 | 134 | 135 | 136 | 137 | 138 | 139 | 140 | 141 | 142 | 143 | 144 | 145 | 146 | 147 | 148 | 149 | 150 | 151 | 152 | 153 | 154 | 155 | 156 | 157 | 158 | 159 | 160 | 161 | 162 | 163 | 164 | 165 | 166 | 167 | 168 | 169 | 170 | 171 | 172 | 173 | 174 | 175 | 176 | 177 | 178 | 179 | 180 | 181 | 182 | 183 | 184 | 185 | 186 | 187 | 188 | 189 | 190 | 191 | 192 | 193 | 194 | 195 | 196 | 197 | 198 | 199 | 200 | 201 | 202 | 203 | 204 | 205 | 206 | 207 | 208 | 209 | 210 | 211 | 212 | 213 | 214 | 215 | 216 | 217 | 218 | 219 | 220 | 221 | 222 | 223 | 224 | 225 | 226 | 227 | 228 | 229 | 230 | 231 | 232 | 233 | 234 | 235 | 236 | 237 | 238 | 239 | 240 | 241 | 242 | 243 | 244 | 245 | 246 | 247 | 248 | 249 | 250 | 251 | 252 | 253 | 254 | 255 | 256 | 257 | 258 | 259 | 260 | 261 | 262 | 263 | 264 | 265 | 266 | 267 | 268 | 269 | 270 | 271 | 272 | 273 | 274 | 275 | 276 | 277 | 278 | 279 | 280 | 281 | 282 | 283 | 284 | 285 | 286 | 287 | 288 | 289 | 290 | 291 | 292 | 293 | 294 | 295 | 296 | 297 | 298 | 299 | 300 | 301 | 302 | 303 | 304 | 305 | 306 | 307 | 308 | 309 | 310 | 311 | 312 | 313 | 314 | 315 | 316 | 317 | 318 | 319 | 320 | 321 | 322 | 323 | 324 | 325 | 326 | 327 | 328 | 329 | 330 | 331 | 332 | 333 | 334 | 335 | 336 | 337 | 338 | 339 | 340 | 341 | 342 | 343 | 344 | 345 | 346 | 347 | 348 | 349 | 350 | 351 | 352 | 353 | 354 | 355 | 356 | 357 | 358 | 359 | 360 | 361 | 362 | 363 | 364 | 365 | 366 | 367 | 368 | 369 | 370 | 371 | 372 | 373 | 374 | 375 | 376 | 377 | 378 | 379 | 380 | 381 | 382 | 383 | 384 | 385 | 386 | 387 | 388 | 389 | 390 | 391 | 392 | 393 | 394 | 395 | 396 | 397 | 398 | 399 | 400 | 401 | 402 | 403 | 404 | 405 | 406 | 407 | 408 | 409 | 410 | 411 | 412 | 413 | 414 | 415 | 416 | 417 | 418 | 419 | 420 | 421 | 422 | 423 | 424 | 425 | 426 | 427 | 428 | 429 | 430 | 431 | 432 | 433 | 434 | 435 | 436 | 437 | 438 | 439 | 440 | 441 | 442 | 443 | 444 | 445 | 446 | 447 | 448 | 449 | 450 | 451 | 452 | 453 | 454 | 455 | 456 | 457 | 458 | 459 | 460 | 461 | 462 | 463 | 464 | 465 | 466 | 467 | 468 | 469 | 470 | 471 | 472 | 473 | 474 | 475 | 476 | 477 | 478 | 479 | 480 | 481 | 482 | 483 | 484 | 485 | 486 | 487 | 488 | 489 | 490 | 491 | 492 | 493 | 494 | 495 | 496 | 497 | 498 | 499 | 500 | 501 | 502 | 503 | 504 | 505 | 506 | 507 | 508 | 509 | 510 | 511 | 512 | 513 | 514 | 515 | 516 | 517 | 518 | 519 | 520 | 521 | 522 | 523 | 524 | 525 | 526 | 527 | 528 | 529 | 530 | 531 | 532 | 533 | 534 | 535 | 536 | 537 | 538 | 539 | 540 | 541 | 542 | 543 | 544 | 545 | 546 | 547 | 548 | 549 | 550 | 551 | 552 | 553 | 554 | 555 | 556 | 557 | 558 | 559 | 560 | 561 | 562 | 563 | 564 | 565 | 566 | 567 | 568 | 569 | 570 | 571 | 572 | 573 | 574 | 575 | 576 | 577 | 578 | 579 | 580 | 581 | 582 | 583 | 584 | 585 | 586 | 587 | 588 | 589 | 590 | 591 | 592 | 593 | 594 | 595 | 596 | 597 | 598 | 599 | 600 | 601 | 602 | 603 | 604 | 605 | 606 | 607 | 608 | 609 | 610 | 611 | 612 | 613 | 614 | 615 | 616 | 617 | 618 | 619 | 620 | 621 | 622 | 623 | 624 | 625 | 626 | 627 | 628 | 629 | 630 | 631 | 632 | 633 | 634 | 635 | 636 | 637 | 638 | 639 | 640 | 641 | 642 | 643 | 644 | 645 | 646 | 647 | 648 | 649 | 650 | 651 | 652 | 653 | 654 | 655 | 656 | 657 | 658 | 659 | 660 | 661 | 662 | 663 | 664 | 665 | 666 | 66 |
|---------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|
|---------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|

## Rules—Mad

## App VI

Form No 24—Add the following as Form No 24 in App II—

FORM No 24.

## REGISTER OF MISCELLANEOUS APPEALS RECEIVED

Court—

Year—

*Instructions*

Appeals from orders which have the force of decree *should not be shown* in this register. Appeals from other appealable orders only should find place in this register.

2 If necessary give value of appeal under head

3 A note should be made of all parties brought on or struck off the record under Order I or VIII Schedule I C C P

1 Miscellaneous Appeal No \_\_\_\_\_ of 19 \_\_\_\_\_

2 Date of {

3 APPELLANT—Name description and place of abode

4 RESPONDENT—Name description and place of abode

5 PARTICULARS OF ORDER APPEALED AGAINST—Order of the \_\_\_\_\_ Court of  
dated \_\_\_\_\_ 19 \_\_\_\_\_ passed  
on M P No \_\_\_\_\_ of 19 \_\_\_\_\_ in Original Suit No \_\_\_\_\_

Appeal under \_\_\_\_\_ of \_\_\_\_\_

6 Hearing if any under Rule 11 Order VI Schedule I C C P and result with date

7 Date for Repon lent a first appearance

asked for { Appellant  
Respondent

8 JUDGMENT—Result and date

9 Objections under Rule 2 Order VI Schedule I C C P if any filed by whom,

10 Number of applications for review (or re-hearing) with result and date

Fresh Judgment if any with date





## APPENDIX VII

### *Rules made by the High Court of Lahore under s 122*

#### Order II

8—After rule 7 of Order II insert —

8 (1) Where an objection duly taken has been allowed by the Court the plaintiff shall be permitted to select the cause of action with which he will proceed and shall within a time to be fixed by the Court amend the plaint by striking out the remaining causes of action

(2) When the plaintiff has selected the cause of action with which he will proceed the Court shall pass an order giving him time within which to submit amended plaints for the remaining causes of action and for making up the Court fees that may be necessary. Should the plaintiff not comply with the Court's order the Court shall proceed as provided in rule 18 of Order VI and as required by the provisions of the Court Fees Act

#### Order V

10 Service of the summons shall be made by delivering or tendering a copy thereof signed by the Judge or such officer as he appoints in this behalf and sealed with the seal of the Court

Provided that in any case if the plaintiff so wishes the Court may serve the summons in the first instance by registered post (acknowledgment due) instead of in the mode of service laid down in this rule

15 Where in any suit the defendant cannot be found or is absent from his residence and has no agent empowered to accept service of the summons on his behalf service may be made on any adult male member of the family of the defendant who is residing with him.

Where service may be on male member of defendant's family

*Explanation*—A servant is not a member of the family within the meaning of this rule

#### Order VII

2 Where the plaintiff seeks the recovery of money the plaint shall state the precise amount claimed

But where the plaintiff sues for mesne profits or for an amount which will be paid due to him on taking unsettled accounts between him and the defendant or for moral or in the possession of the defendant or for debts of which the value he cannot after the exercise of reasonable diligence estimate the plaint shall state approximately the amount or value sued for

19 Every plaint or original petition shall be accompanied by a proceeding giving an address at which service of notice summons or other process may be made on the plaintiff or petitioner. Plaintiffs or petitioners subsequently added shall immediately on being so added file a proceeding of this nature

20 An address for service filed under the proceeding rule shall be within the local limits of the District Court within which the suit or petition is filed, or of the District Court within which the party ordinarily resides if within the limit of the territorial jurisdiction of the High Court of Judicature at Lahore

21 Where a plaintiff or petitioner fails to file an address for service he shall be liable to have his suit dismissed or his petition rejected by the Court *suo motu* or any party may apply for an order to that effect and the Court may make such order as it thinks just

22 Where a party is not found at the address given by him for service and no agent or adult male member of his family on whom a notice summons or other process can be served is present a copy of the notice summons or other process shall be fixed to the outer door of the house. If on the date fixed such party is not present another date shall be fixed and a copy of the notice summons or other process shall be sent to the registered address by registered post and such service shall be deemed to be as effectual as if the notice summons or other process had been personally served

23 Where a party engages a pleader notices summonses or other processes for service on him shall be served in the manner prescribed by Order III rule 5 unless the Court directs service at the address for service given by the party

24 A party who desires to change the address for service given by him as aforesaid shall file a verified petition and the Court may direct the amendment of the record accordingly. Notice of such petition shall be given to such other parties to the suit as the Court may deem it necessary to inform and may be either served upon the pleaders for such parties or be sent to them by registered post as the Court thinks fit

25 Nothing in the foregoing rules shall prevent the Court from directing the service of a notice summons or other process in any other manner if for any reasons it thinks fit to do so

### Order VIII

1 (1) The defendant may and if so required by the Court shall at or before the first hearing or within such time as the Court may permit pre-ent a written statement of his defence and with such written statement shall produce in Court all documents in his possession or power on which he bases his defence or any claim for set off

(2) Where he relies on any other documents (whether in his possession or power or not) as evidence in support of his defence or claim for set off he shall enter such documents in a list to be added or annexed to the written statement

11 Every party whether original added or substituted who appears in any suit or other proceeding shall on or before the date fixed in the summons notice or other process served on him as the date of hearing file in Court a proceeding stating his address for service and if he fails to do so he shall be liable to have his defence if any struck out and to be placed in the same position as if he had not defended. In this respect the Court may act *suo motu* or on the application of any party for an order to such effect and the Court may make such order as it thinks just

12 Rules 20 21 23 24 and 25 of Order VII shall apply so far as may be to addresses for service filed under the preceding rule

### Order IX

9 (1) Where a suit is wholly or partly dismissed under rule 8 the plaintiff shall be precluded from bringing a fresh suit in respect of the same cause of action. But he may apply for an order to set the dismissal aside and if he satisfies the Court that there was sufficient cause for his non appearance when the suit was called on for hearing the

Decree against plaintiff  
t default bars fresh suit

## Rules—Lahore

**App VII** Court shall make an order setting aside the dismissal upon such terms as to costs or otherwise as it thinks fit and shall appoint a day for proceeding with the suit. Provided that the plaintiff shall not be precluded from bringing another suit for redemption of a mortgage although a former suit may have been dismissed for default.

(2) No order shall be made under this rule unless notice of the application has been served on the opposite party.

## Order XIII

**9** (1) Any person on whom a document produced by him in the suit and placed on the record shall, unless the document is impounded under rule 8, be entitled to receive back the same—

(a) where the suit is one in which an appeal is not allowed when the suit has been disposed of and

(b) where the suit is one in which an appeal is allowed when the Court is satisfied that the time for preferring an appeal has elapsed and that no appeal has been preferred or if an appeal has been preferred when the appeal has been disposed of.

Provided that a document may be returned at any time earlier than that provided by this rule if the person applying therefor delivers to the proper officer a certified copy to be substituted for the original and undertakes to produce the original if required to do so.

Provided also that no document shall be returned which by force of the decree has become wholly void or useless.

Provided further that the cost of such certified copy shall be recoverable as a fine from the party at whose instance the original document has been produced.

(2) On the return of a document admitted in evidence a receipt shall be given by the person receiving it.

## Order XVI

**2** (1) The party applying for a summons shall, before the summons is granted and within a period to be fixed pay into Court such a sum of money as appears to the Court to be sufficient to defray the travelling and other expenses of the person summoned in going to and from the Court in which he is required to attend and for one day's attendance.

*Exception*—When applying for a summons for any of its own officers Government will be exempt from the operation of clause (1).

(2) In determining the amount payable under this rule the Court may, in the case of any person summoned to give evidence as an expert, allow reasonable remuneration for the time occupied by him in giving evidence and in performing any work of an expert character necessary for the case.

(3) Where the Court is subordinate to a High Court regard shall be paid in fixing the scale of such expenses to any rules made in that behalf.

3 (1) The sum paid into a Court shall except in the case of a Government servant Tender of expenses to be tendered to the person summoned at the time of serving the summons if it can be served personally

(2) When the person summoned is a Government servant the sum so paid into Court shall be credited to Government

*Exception (1)*—In cases in which Government servants have to give evidence at a Court situate not more than five miles from their headquarters actual travelling expenses incurred by them may when the Court considers it necessary be paid to them

*Exception (2)*—A Government servant whose salary does not exceed Rs 10 per mensem may receive his expenses from the Court

4 (1) Where it appears to the Court or to such officer as it appoints in this behalf that the sum paid into Court is not sufficient to cover such expense or reasonable remuneration the Court may direct such further sum to be paid to the person summoned or when such person is a Government servant to be paid into Court as appears to be necessary on that account and in case of default in payment may order such sum to be levied by attachment and sale of the movable property of the party obtaining the summons or the Court may discharge the person summoned without requiring him to give evidence or may both order such levy and discharge such person as aforesaid

### Order XVII

1 (1) The Court may if sufficient cause is shown at any stage of the suit grant Court may grant time time to the parties or to any of them and may from time and adjournment adjourn to time adjourn the hearing of the suit

(2) In every such case the Court shall fix a day for the further hearing of the suit and may make such order as it thinks fit with respect to the costs occasioned by the adjournment

I provided that when the hearing of evidence has once begun the hearing of the suit shall be continued from day to day until all the witnesses in attendance have been examined unless the Court finds the adjournment of the hearing beyond the following day to be necessary for reasons to be recorded

(3) Where sufficient cause is not shown for the grant of an adjournment under sub rule (1) the Court shall proceed with the suit forthwith

### Order XXI

29 A Which was added by Chief Court Notification No 2212 G dated the 12th May 1909 has been omitted by High Court Notification No 363 G dated 24th November 1921.

75 (1) Where the property to be sold is a growing crop and the crop from its nature admits of being stored but has not yet been stored the day of the sale shall be so fixed as to admit of its being made ready for storing before the arrival of such day and the sale shall not be held until the crop has been cut or gathered and is ready for storing

(2) Where the crop from its nature does not admit of being stored or can be sold to great advantage in an unripe state such as green wheat or gram it may be sold before it is cut and gathered and the purchaser shall be entitled to enter on the land and to do all that is necessary for the purpose of tending and cutting or gathering it

## Rules—Lahore

## App VII

101 For the purpose of all proceedings under this order service on any party shall be deemed to be sufficient if effected at the address for service referred to in Order VIII rule 11 subject to the provisions of Order VII rule 24 provided that this rule shall not apply to the notice prescribed by Rule 22 of this Order

## Order XXX

1 (1) Any two or more persons claiming or being liable as partners and carrying on business in British India may sue or be sued in the name of the firm (if any) of which such persons were partners at the time of the accruing of the cause of action and any party to a suit may in such case apply to the Court for a statement of the names and addresses of the persons who were at the time of the accruing of the cause of action partners in such firm to be furnished and verified in such manner as the Court may direct

(2) Where persons sue or are sued as partners in the name of their firm under sub-rule (1) it shall in the case of any pleading or other document required by or under this Code to be signed, verified or certified by the plaintiff or the defendant suffice if such pleading or other document is signed, verified or certified by any one of such person.

*Explanation*—This rule applies to a joint Hindu family trading partnership

## Order XXXII

1 Every suit by a minor shall be instituted in his name by a person who in such suit shall be called the next friend of the minor. Such person may be ordered to pay any costs in the suit as if he were the plaintiff

3 (1) Where the defendant is a minor the Court on being satisfied of the fact of his minority shall appoint a proper person to be guardian for the suit for such minor

(2) An order for the appointment of a guardian for the suit may be obtained upon application in the name and on behalf of the minor or by the plaintiff

(3) The plaintiff shall file with his plaint a list of relatives of the minor and other persons with their addresses who *prima facie* are most likely to be capable of acting as guardian for the suit for a minor defendant. The list shall constitute an application by the plaintiff under sub-rule (2) above

(4) The Court may at any time after institution of the suit call upon the plaintiff to furnish such a list and in default of compliance may reject the plaint

(5) Any application for the appointment of a guardian for the suit and any list furnished under this rule shall be supported by an affidavit verifying the fact that the proposed guardian has no interest in the matters in controversy in the suit adverse to that of the minor and that each person proposed is a fit person to be so appointed

(6) No order shall be made on any application under this rule except upon notice to any guardian of the minor appointed or declared by an authority competent in that behalf or where there is no such guardian upon notice to the father or other natural guardian of the minor or where there is no father or other natural guardian to the person in whose care the minor is and after hearing any objection which may be urged on behalf of any person served with notice under this sub-rule

It is provided that the Court may if it sees fit give notice to the minor also.

4 (1) Any person who is of sound mind and has attained majority may act as <sup>Who may act as next</sup> next friend of a minor or as his guardian for the suit <sup>friend or be appointed</sup> guardian for the suit.

Provided that the interest of such person is not adverse to that of the minor and that he is not in the case of a next friend a defendant or in the case of a guardian for the suit a plaintiff

(2) Where a minor has a guardian appointed or declared by competent authority no person other than such guardian shall act as the next friend of the minor or be appointed his guardian for the suit unless the Court considers for reasons to be recorded that it is for the minor's welfare that another person be permitted to act or be appointed as the case may be

(2) (4) Where a minor defendant has no guardian appointed or declared by competent authority the Court may subject to the proviso to sub rule (1) appoint as his guardian for the suit a relative of the minor

If no proper person be available who is a relative of the minor the Court shall appoint one of the other defendants if any and failing such other defendant shall ordinarily proceed under sub rule (4) of this Rule to appoint one of its officers

(3) No person shall without his consent be appointed guardian for the suit but the Court may presume such consent to have been given unless it is expressly refused

(4) Where there is no other person fit and willing to act as guardian for the suit the Court may appoint any of its officers to be such guardian and may direct that the cost to be incurred by such officer in the performance of his duties as such guardian shall be borne either by the parties or by any one or more of the parties to the suit or out of any fund in Court in which the minor is interested and may give direction for the repayment or allowance of such costs as justice and the circumstances of the case may require

### Order XXXVII

#### *Summary Procedure on Negotiable Instruments*

1 This Order shall apply only to—

Application of order

- (a) the High Courts of Judicature at Fort William Madras and Bombay
- (b) the Chief Court of Lower Burma
- (c) the Court of the Judicial Commissioner of Sind
- (d) any other Court to which sections 32 to 37 of the Code of Civil Procedure 1887 have been already applied and
- (e) the Courts of the District Judge and Subordinate Judges of the First Class of the Delhi Province

### Order XLI

35 (1) The decree of the appellate Court shall bear the day on which the judgment was pronounced

Date and contents of decree

(2) The decree shall contain the number of the appeal the names and descriptions of the appellant and respondent and a clear specification of the relief granted or other adjudication made

(3) The decree shall also state the amount of costs incurred in the appeal and by whom or out of what property and in what proportions such costs and the costs in the suit are to be paid

## Rules—Lahore

## App VII

(4) The decree shall be signed and dated by the Judge or Judges who passed it

Provided that where there are more Judges than one and there is a difference of opinion among them it shall not be necessary for any Judge dissenting from the judgment of the Court to sign the decree

Provided also in the case of the High Court that in the absence of a Judge who passed a decree or one or more Judges who passed a decree either the Registrar or the Deputy Registrar of the Court shall sign the decree on behalf of such absent Judge or Judges but that neither the Registrar nor the Deputy Registrar shall sign such decree on behalf of a Judge who dissented from the judgment of the Court

38 (1) An address for service filed under Order VII rule 19 or Order VIII rule 11 or subsequently altered under Order VII rule 24 or Order VIII rule 12 shall hold good during all appellate proceedings arising out of the original suit or petition

(2) Every memorandum of appeal shall state the addresses for service given by the opposite parties in the Court below and notices and processes shall issue from the appellate Court to such addresses

(3) Rules 22 23 24 and 25 of Order VII shall apply so far as may be to appellate proceedings

## Order XLII

Add the following as Rule 2 —

2—In addition to the copies specified in Order XLII Rule 1 the memorandum of appeal shall be accompanied by a copy of the judgment of the Court of first instance unless the appellate Court dispenses therewith

O 5 r 18—Form No 11 of Appendix B

No 11

Affidavit of Process server to accompany return of a Summons or Notice (O 5 r 18)

(TITLE)

The Affidavit of \_\_\_\_\_ son of \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ I \_\_\_\_\_ make oath and say as follows —

(1) I am a process server of this Court

(2) On the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_ I received a summons issued by the Court of \_\_\_\_\_ in suit No \_\_\_\_\_ of 19\_\_\_\_ in the said Court dated the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_ for service on \_\_\_\_\_

(3) The said \_\_\_\_\_ was at the time personally known to me and I served the said summons on him on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ at about \_\_\_\_\_ o'clock on the \_\_\_\_\_ noon at \_\_\_\_\_ by tendering a copy thereof to him and requiring his signature to the original summons

(a) \_\_\_\_\_

(b) \_\_\_\_\_

(a) Here state whether the persons served signed or refused to sign the process and in whose presence

(b) Signature of process-server

Rules—Lah

App

Or

(3) The said \_\_\_\_\_ not being personally known to me \_\_\_\_\_ accompanied to \_\_\_\_\_ and pointed out to me a person whom he stated to be the said \_\_\_\_\_ and I served the said summons on him \_\_\_\_\_ on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_ at about \_\_\_\_\_ o'clock in the \_\_\_\_\_ noon at \_\_\_\_\_ by tendering a copy thereof to him \_\_\_\_\_ and requiring him \_\_\_\_\_ signature to the original summons notice

(a) \_\_\_\_\_

(b) \_\_\_\_\_

(a) Here state whether the person served attended or refused to sign the process and in whose presence

(b) Signature of process server

Or

(3) The said \_\_\_\_\_ and his house in which he ordinarily resides being personally known to me \_\_\_\_\_ pointed out to me by \_\_\_\_\_ I went to the said house in \_\_\_\_\_ and there on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_ at \_\_\_\_\_ o'clock in the \_\_\_\_\_ fore \_\_\_\_\_ after \_\_\_\_\_ noon I did not find the said \_\_\_\_\_

I enquired { (a) \_\_\_\_\_ } neighbours  
{ (b) \_\_\_\_\_ }

I was told that \_\_\_\_\_ had gone to \_\_\_\_\_ and would not be back till \_\_\_\_\_

Signature of process server

Or

*If substituted service has been ordered state fully and exactly the manner in which the summons was served with special reference to the terms of the order for substituted service*

sworn Affirmed by the said \_\_\_\_\_ before me this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 19\_\_\_\_

Empowered under section 139 of the Code of Civil Procedure to administer the oath to deponents



## APPENDIX VIII

### *Rules made by the High Court of Patna under s 122*

#### Order III

4 Notwithstanding anything contained in Order III rule 4 (3) of the First Schedule of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 no advocate shall be entitled to make or do any appearance application or act for any person unless he presents an appointment in writing duly signed by such person or his recognised agent or by some other agent duly authorised by power of attorney to act in this behalf or unless he is instructed by an attorney or pleader duly authorised to act on behalf of such person

#### Order V

*Add the following to rule 10 Order V —*

(1) Provided that in any case the Court may of its own motion or on the application of the plaintiff send the summons to the defendant by post in addition to the mode of service laid down in this rule An acknowledgment purporting to be signed by the defendant or an endorsement by postal servant that the defendant refused to take delivery may be deemed by the Court issuing the summons to be *prima facie* proof of service

#### Order VII

*Add the following Rules to Order VII —*

19 Every plaint or original petition shall be accompanied by a statement giving an address at which service of notice summons or other process may be made on the plaintiffs or petitioner and every plaintiff or petitioner subsequently added shall immediately on being so added file a similar statement

20 An Address for service filed under the preceding rule shall state the following particulars —

- 1 the name of the street and number of the house (if in a town)
- 2 the name of the town or village
- 3 the post office
- 4 the district and
- 5 the munsifi (if in Bihar and Orissa) or the district Court (if outside Bihar and Orissa)

21 Where a plaintiff or petitioner fails to file an address for service he shall be liable to have his suit dismissed or his petition rejected by the Court *suo motu* or any party may apply for an order to that effect and the Court may make such order as it thinks just

22 A party who desires to change the address for service given by him as aforesaid shall file a verified petition and the Court may direct the amendment of the record accordingly Notice of such petition shall be given to such other parties to the suit as the Court may deem it necessary to inform and may be either served upon the pleaders for such parties or be sent to them by registered post as the Court thinks fit

#### Order VIII

(1) To Order VIII rule 6 (1) should be added the words

and the provisions of Order VIII rules 14 to 18 shall *mutatis mutandis* apply to a defendant claiming set off as if he were a plaintiff

Rules—

Ap

*Add the following Rules to Order VIII —*

11 Every party whether original added or substituted who appears in any suit or other proceedings shall at the time of entering appearance to the summons notice or other process served on him file in Court a statement stating his address for service and if he fail to do so he shall be liable to have his defence if any struck out and to be placed in the same position as if he had not defended. In this respect the Court may act *suo motu* or on the application of any party for an order to such effect and the Court may make such order as it thinks just.

12 Rules 20 and 22 of Order VII shall apply so far as may be to addresses for service filed under the preceding rule.

### Order XII

*Substitute the following for rule 6 in Order XII —*

6 Where admissions of fact have been made either on the pleadings or otherwise the Court may at any stage of a suit on the application of any party or of its own motion without waiting for the determination of any other question between the parties make such order or give such judgment as it may think just.

### Order XIII

1 In Order XIII Rule 1 after the words *at the first hearing of the suit* should be added the words

or where issues are framed on the day when issues are framed or within such further time as the Court may permit.

*Add the following as sub rule (1 A) in rule 9 Order XIII —*

9 (1A) Where a document is produced by a person who is not a party in the proceeding the Court may require the party on whose behalf the document is produced to substitute a certified copy for the original as hereinbefore provided.

### Order XVI

2 (1)—*Add the following proviso to O 16 r 2 (1) —*

Provided that the Secretary of State shall not be required to pay any expenses into Court under this rule when he is the party applying for the summons and the person to be summoned is an officer serving under Government who is summoned to give evidence of facts which have come to his knowledge or of matters with which he has had to deal in his public capacity.

(3)—*Add the following proviso to rule 3 —*

Provided that when the person summoned is an officer of Government who has been summoned to give evidence in a case to which Government is a party of facts, which have come to his knowledge or of matters with which he has had to deal in his public capacity then

(i) if the officer's salary does not exceed Rs 10 a month the Court shall at the time of the service of the summons make payment to him of his expenses as determined by rule 2 and recover the amount from the Treasury

(ii) if the officer's salary exceed Rs 10 a month and the Court is situated not more than 5 miles from his headquarter the Court may at its discretion on his appearance pay him the actual travelling expenses incurred —

## Rules—Patna

## App VIII

(iii) if the officer's salary exceed Rs 10 a month and the Court is situated more than 5 miles from his headquarters no payment shall be made to him by the Court. In such cases any expenses paid into Court under Rule 2 shall be credited to Government.

8 *Add the following to Rule 8 Order XXI —*

Provided that a summons under this Order may by leave of the Court be served by the party or his agent applying for the same by personal service. If such service is not effected and the Court is satisfied that reasonable diligence has been used by the party or his agent to effect such service then the summons shall be served by the Court in the usual manner.

## Order XXI

*Add the following Rule to Order XXI —*

104 For the purpose of all proceedings under this Order service on any party shall be deemed to be sufficient if effected at the address for service referred to in Order VIII rule 11 subject to the provisions of Order VII rule 22 provided that this rule shall not apply to the notice prescribed by rule 22 of this Order.

## Order XXXII

4 (4) *In sub rule (4) to rule 4 of Order XXXII for the words "where there is no person fit and willing to act as guardian for the suit" in the first sentence of the sub rule substitute the following*

Where the person whom the Court after hearing objections if any under sub rule (4) of rule 3 proposes to appoint as guardian for the suit fails within the time fixed in a notice to him to express his consent to be so appointed.

## Order XLI

*Add the following as rule 14 (1) in Order XLI —*

14 (A) The appellate Court may in its discretion dispense with the service of notice hereinbefore required on a respondent or on the legal representative of a deceased respondent in a case where such respondent did not appear either at any stage of the proceedings in the Court whose decree is appealed from or in any proceedings subsequent to the decree of that Court and no relief is claimed against such opposite party or respondent or his legal representative either in the original case or appeal.

*Add the following Rule to Order XLI —*

38 (1) An address for service filed under Order VII rule 19 or Order VIII rule 11 or subsequently altered under Order VII rule 22 or Order VIII rule 12 shall hold good for all notices of appeals and all appellate proceedings arising out of the original suit or petition.

(2) Every memorandum of appeal shall state the addresses for service given by the opposite parties in the Court below and notices and processes shall issue from the Appellate Court to such addresses.

# INDEX

---

## Abandonment—

- of a sue by pleader 16
- of point in lower Court 987
- of issue by guardian ad litem 876
- of part of claim by plaintiff 897 [O 23 r 1 (11)]

## Abatement 778 807 [O —]—

- appeal of 806 [O 22 r 11]
- application to set aside 799 [O 22 r 9 (2)]
- death of party no abatement by
  - if right to sue survives 778 [O 22 r 1]
  - if after hearing and before judgment 796 [O 22 r 6]
- either party pending appeal 780 781
- party pending suit relating to public charities 282
- plaintiff or defendant 781 [O 22 r 2] 781 [O 22 r 3] 788 [O 22 r 4]
- effect of abatement or dismissal under O — p 799 [O 22 r 9]
- execution proceedings no abatement in 806 [O 22 r 12]
- extent of abatement 781 [O 22 r 3 (2)] 788 [O 22 r 4 (3)]
- inherent power to add legal representative after abatement 793
- insolvency of plaintiff suit not abated by 97 [O 22 r 8]
  - defendant procedure on 793
- legal representative of deceased applicant when to be made a party 784
- legal representative when two or more whether all to be made parties 784
  - effect of decree against person alleged to be 793
  - determination of question as to 793 [O 22 r 5]
- marriage of female party suit not abated by 794 [O 22 r 7]
- objection as to representative character when to be taken 796
- pauper applicant death of 796
- representative suit 424
- revision when High Court may interfere in 787
- right to sue survival of 787 788
- setting aside for sufficient cause 800 801
- suit or appeal when to abate as a whole 788 790

## Abuse of process—

- inherent jurisdiction to stay suit which is an 396
- inherent powers of Court to prevent 396 [s 141]
- witness summons in case of 594

## Accounts—

- account books cannot be attached 191 [s 60 (1) (d)]
  - in current use receiving in evidence copies of 583 [O 13 r 3]
- agent and principal accounts in suits between 623 [O 20 r 16]
- appeal from preliminary decree directing accounts 68
- commission to examine accounts 244 [s 75] 842 [O 26 r 11]
- Collector when to render accounts to Court 1206 1206 [Sch III para 9]
- legal representative power of Court executing decrees to compel to produce
  - accounts 176 [s 50 (2)]
- mode of taking special directions as to 678 [O 20 r 17]
- mortgagor account against how taken 908
- mortgagee in possession account against 910



# INDEX

## Abandonment—

- of line by pleader 16
- of point in lower Court 937
- of issue by guardian ad litem 876
- of part of claim by plaintiff 89 [O 23 r 1 (11)]

## Abatement 778 80, [O 22]—

- appeal of 806 [O 22 r 11]
- application to set aside 799 [O 22 r 9 (—)]
- death of party no abatement by if right to sue survives 778 [O 22 r 1]
  - if after hearing and before judgment 796 [O 22 r 6]
  - either party pending appeal 760 781
  - party pending suit relating to public charities 282
- plaintiff or defendant 781 [O 22 r —] 781 [O 22 r 3] 788 [O 22 r 4]
- effect of abatement or dismissal under O 22 p 799 [O 22 r 9]
- execution proceedings no abatement in 806 [O 22 r 12]
- extent of abatement 781 [O 22 r 3 (2)] 788 [O 22 r 4 (3)]
- inherent power to add legal representative after abatement 793
- insolvency of plaintiff suit not abated by 79 [O 22 r 8]
  - defendant procedure on 93
- legal representative of deceased applicant when to be made a party 784
- legal representative when two or more whether all to be made parties 784
  - effect of decree against person alleged to be 793
  - determination of question as to 793 [O 22 r 8]
- marriage of female party suit not abated by 797 [O 22 r 7]
- objection as to representative character when to be taken 796
- proper applicant death of 786
- representative suit 424
- revival when High Court may interfere in 787
- right to sue survival of 778 780
- setting aside for sufficient cause 800 801
- suit or appeal when to abate as a whole 782 790

## Abuse of process—

- inherent jurisdiction to stay suit which is an 396
- inherent powers of Court to prevent 394 [r 1 1]
- witness summons in case of 594

## Accounts—

- account books cannot be attached 191 [s 60 (1) (d)]
  - in current use receiving in evidence copies of 583 [O 13 r —]
- agent and principal accounts in suits between 623 [O 99 r 16]
- appeal from preliminary decree directing accounts 628
- commission to examine accounts 244 [s 7.] 847 [O 26 r 11]
- Collector when to render accounts to Court 1205 1906 [Sch III para 9]
- legal representative power of Court executing decree to compel to produce accounts 176 [s 50 (—)]
- mole of taking special directions as to 678 [O 20 r 17]
- mortgagor account against how taken 903
- mortgagee in possession account against 910



**Administrator—**

- claims by or against not to be joined with claims by or against him personally 456 [O 1 r 5]
- letters of administration when necessary before filing suit 507 509
- res judicata decree against 59
- suits by or against 561 562 [O 31] See Executor

**Admiralty—See Chartered High Court**

- appeal from decision of a single judge exercising jurisdiction 1208
- assessors in admiralty cases 30 [s 140]
- fees to be paid to assessors in admiralty cases 370 [s 140 (2)]

**Admissibility—**

- of documents produced before commissioner 940
- evidence taken on commission 839 [O 16 r 8]
- statements made on belief in affidavits 612 [O 19 r 3]

**Admission—See 576 [O 12]**

- co-defendants between 530
- constructive what are 579
- costs of proving document in certain cases 576 [O 12 r 2] 581 [O 12 r 9]
- counsel pleader or solicitor by 10
- interpleader suits admissions of parties in 942 [O 30 r 4 (2)]
- judgment on 577 [O 12 r 6] 578-580
- mistake made by in pleadings may be allowed to be withdrawn 497
- notice to admit document 577 [O 12 r 3]
- opponent made by need not be pleaded 480
- procedure to obtain from opposite party 506
- pleadings in 576 577 579
- withdrawal of 581

**Adoption—**

- valuation of suit to set aside 91

**Advertisement—**

- notice by public where numerous parties 418 [O 1 r 8 (1)]
- proclamation of sale of 729 [O 21 r 67]

**Advocate—See Barrister Counsel and Chartered High Courts**

- when not required to file vakalatnamah 461 [O 3 r 4 (3)]

**Advocate General—**

- affidavit of documents cannot be required from 569
- appointment of 1224
- information power of to exhibit 246 [s 79 (-)] 247
- limitation as against in suits relating to public charities 583
- nuisance suit relating to public may institute 261 [s 91]
- public charities suit relating to may institute 261 [s 91]
- review by High Court on certificate of in criminal trials 1263 [Charter cl 26]

**Affidavits—611 612 [O 19] See Affidavit of documents**

- affidavits when and how allowed 611
- belief grounds of to be set forth in 612
- documents of—See Affidavit of Documents
- interrogatories as to 560 [O 11 r 6] 562 563 [O 11 rr 8 11]
- form of in answer to 563 [O 11 r 9]
- objections to in answer 560 [O 11 r 6]
- oath on by whom to be administered 369 [s 139]
- pleader of about signature of admissions 581 [O 12 r 7]



**Accounts—*contd***

- particulars of when to be given in pleadings 482 483
- partnership 6-7 [O 20 r 10]
- partner's share attachment of and accounts 697 [O 21 r 49(2)]
- receiver liability of to account, 981 [O 40 r 3 (b)]
- trusts suits relating to public directing accounts in 263 [s 92 (1) (d)]
- unsettled plaint in suits for recovery of amount due on 507 [O 7 r 2]

**Acknowledgment—*See* service****Acquiescence in place of suing—*See* Jurisdiction****Act of State—**

- decree act of State is not 318
- judgment act of State is not 81
- not actionable 246

**Action—*See* Suits**

- real personal and mixed 100

**Addition—*See* Parties****Addressing Court—**

- right of 336 [s 119]

**Aden—**

- Court of President of how far subordinate to Bombay High Court 343
- is within British India 4

**Adjournment—**

- inherent power to adjourn hearing pending decision of a selected action 393
- of hearing 601 603 [O 17]
- of suits pleader applying for adjournment only and appearance 530
- sale in execution adjournment of 730 [O 21 r 69]

**Adjustment of accounts—**

- commission for 842 [O 26 r 11]

**Adjustment of decree—633 643 [O 21 r 2]**

- appeal from order regarding 644
- attached decree adjustment of when ineffectual 703 [O 21 r 53 (6)] 707
- certified must be 633 [O 21 r 2 (2)] 636
- criminal proceedings not affected 644 645
- fraud in not certifying to Court 641 642
- liquidation effect of uncertified adjustment on 642 643
- minor by guardian of without Court's sanction 643
- suit by judgment debtor upon uncertified adjustment 639
- decree holder upon uncertified adjustment 639

**Adjustment of suits—818 83 [O 23 r 3] *See* Compromise of Suits****Administration suit—**

- costs in 131
- decree in 623 [O 20 r 13]
- effect of upon prior attachments 624
- forms of plaint in 1090 1051 [Sch 1 App A Forms Nos 41 43]
- Insolvency Act applicability of where estate insolvent 6-4
- nature of 6-3
- preliminary decree in 624
- who can maintain 6-4

**Administrator—**

- claims by or against not to be joined with claims by or against him personally 456 [O 1 r 5]
- letter of administration when necessary before filing suit 507 509
- res judicata decree against 59
- suits by or against 861 862 [O 31] See Executor

**Admiralty—See Chartered High Court**

- appeal from decision of a single judge exercising jurisdiction 1258
- assessors in admiralty cases 30 [s 140]
- fees to be paid to a assessor in admiralty cases 370 [s 140 (2)]

**Admissibility—**

- of documents produced before commissioner 840
- evidence taken on commission 839 [O 26 r 8]
- statements made on belief in affidavits 612 [O 19 r 3]

**Admission—See 651 [O 1—]**

- co defendants between 535
- constructive what are 579
- costs of proving document in certain cases 576 [O 12 r 2] 581 [O 12 r 9]
- counsel pleader or solicitor by 15
- interpleader suits admissions of parties in 942 [O 35 r 4 (—)]
- judgment on oath [O 12 r 6] 578 580
- notice made by in pleadings may be allowed to be withdrawn 497
- notice to admit document 577 [O 12 r 3]
- opponent made by need not be pleaded 490
- procedure to obtain from opposite party 506
- pleadings in 522 523 579
- withdrawal of 581

**Adoption—**

- valuation of suit to set aside 91

**Advertisement—**

- notice by public where numerous parties 418 [O 1 r 8 (1)]
- proclamation of sale of 729 [O 21 r 6]

**Advocate—See Barrister Counsel and Chartered High Courts**

- when not required to file vakalatnamah 461 [O 3 r 4 (3)]

**Advocate General—**

- affidavit of documents cannot be required from 569
- appointment of 124
- Information power of to exhibit 246 [s 79 (2)] 247
- limitation as against in suits relating to public charities 783
- nuisance suit relating to public may institute 261 [s 91]
- public charities suit relating to may institute 261 [s 92]
- review by High Court on certificate of in criminal trials 1263 [Charter cl 26]

**Affidavits—611 612 [O 19] See Affidavit of documents**

- affidavits when and how allowed 611
- belief grounds of to be set forth in 612
- documents of—See Affidavit of Documents
- interrogatories as to 560 [O 11 r 6] 562 563 [O 11 rr 8 11]
- form of in answer to 563 [O 11 r 9]
- objections to in answer 560 [O 11 r 6]
- oath on by whom to be administered 369 [s 139]
- pleader of about signature of admissions 581 [O 12 r 7]

**Ambassador—See Foreign State**

- exemption from arrest 255 [s 86 (3)]
- suit against 255 [s 86]

**Amendment—**

- answers to interrogatories of 401
- application for amendment of decree and res judicata 79 80
  - execution of 662 [O 21 r 17]
- decree of 396 [s 152]
  - where third parties have acquired rights under erroneous decree 398
- failure to amend pleadings within time specified by Courts 507 [O 6 r 18]
- general powers of Court to amend proceedings in a suit 401 [s 153]
- inherent powers of Court to amend decrees or orders 397
- issues power of Court to amend 590 [O 14 r 5 (1)]
- leave to amend pleadings when given 496 497
  - when refused 497 500
- limitation and amendment of application for execution 663
- memorandum of appeal of 987 [O 41 r 3]
- mistake arising from accidental omission 396 [s 152] 398
- multifariousness amendment of plaint defective for 451
- notice of motion of 401
- opponent's pleadings of 493
- particulars of 497
- plaint of and notice under sec 80 p 251
  - o by adding new reliefs 504
  - of in suit for specific performance and compensation in addition or substitution 504
- pleadings of 496 500 [O 6 r 17]
- proceedings in suit of 401 [s 153]
- res judicata and application for amendment of decree 79
- revision of order granting application for 399
- sale certificate of 770

**Ancestral property—**

- liability of in execution 162 [s 53]
- suit to recover and joinder of parties 409

**Anticipation—**

- attachment of property subject to restraint upon 195

**Appal—289 317 [4s 94 108] 933 1027 [O 41] Appeal**

- abatement of "80 "82 "8" 793 836 [O 22 r 11]
- additional evidence in appeal 1016 1017 [O 41 r 24]
- agreement not to appeal 289
- appellate decrees appeal from 1027 [O 42 r 1]
- assignment of interest before final decree in 804
- award decree based on appeal from 1182 1187
- British India where appellant resides out of and security for cost 995 [O 41 r 10 (1) proviso]
- case making of new in appeal 987
- Court appellate to have same powers as original Court 316 [s 107 (1)]
  - arbitration can refer matters in dispute in appeal to 1166
  - execution stay of by 949 950 [O 41 r 5]
  - inherent power of to consolidate appeals 393
- consolidation of appeal 393

Appeal—*contd*

- cost direction as to in decree in appeal 1026 [O 41 r 3a (3)]
- direction as to appeal from 13\_ 133
- credibility of witness 98a
- cross objections—See Cross objections against appellant 1004 [O 41 r 22]
  - by respondent against co respondent 1007
  - consequence of not filing 1006
  - effect of withdrawal or dismissal of appeal on 100a [O 41 r 22 (4)] who may file 1004 [O 41 r (1)] 1006 1007
- death of either party pending appeal and abatement of appeal 780 781
  - one of several appellant 78
- decree amendment of appellate 399
  - appeal from 258 [s 96]
  - appeal from consent decree 298 [s 96 (3)] 291 292
  - appeal from *ex parte* decree 288 [s 96 (a)] 289
  - appeal from preliminary decree 8 293 [s 97]
    - when not drawn up 294
  - appeal from final where no appeal from preliminary decree 293 [s 97]
  - copies of appellate decree 10 6 [O 41 r w 36 3a]
  - in appeal date and contents of 1024 [O 41 r 3a]
- defendant appeal by against co defendant 291
- dismissal of—See Dismissal of appeal
- evidence additional—See Additional Evidence
  - on record where sufficient Court may determine case 1024 [O 41 r 24]
  - further documentary admission of not a good ground of appeal 582
  - where lower Court has refused to admit 1016 [O 41 r 27 (1) (a)]
- execution of orders of Privy Council appeal from orders as to 1045 [O 45 r 16]
  - stay of by appellate Court 989 990 [O 41 r 5]
- exhibit copies of when appeal preferred 999 [O 41 r 13 (3)]
- ex parte* decree remand in appeal from order refusing to set aside 1011
  - hearing of appeal *ex parte* 1001 [O 41 r 17 ( )]
  - restoring of appeal heard *ex parte* 1004 [O 41 r 21]
- fact new questions of raised for first time in appeal 987
- fixing day of hearing of appeal 999 [O 41 r 12]
- form of appeal 983 [O 41 r 1]
- former appeal meaning of 36
- final decree appeal from where no appeal from preliminary decree 293 [s 97]
  - passing of during pendency of appeal from preliminary decree 294
  - forum of 289 290
- fraud case of other than that alleged in pleadings 483
- general power to pass any proper decree or order 1023 [O 41 r 33]
- grounds which may be taken in appeal 98 [O 41 r 2]
  - hearing of appeal 1020 [O 41 rr 16 29]
- High Court in second appeal may refer issues of fact to lower appellate Court 101a
  - inherent powers of to remand in second appeal 1028
  - powers of in appeal from orders of remand 1013
  - power of to determine issues of fact in second appeal 309 [ 103]
- immovable property stay of sale of pending appeal 993 [O 41 r 6 (a)]
- inherent power of court appeal from order passed under 39a
  - appellate Court to consolidate appeals 393
  - High Court to remand in second appeal 10 8
  - appellate Court to remand 101\_ 1013
  - order made in exercise of 396

**Ambassador—See Foreign State**

- exemption from arrest 250 [s 86 (3)]
- suit against 255 [s 86]

**Amendment—**

- answers to interrogatories of 401
- application for amendment of decree and res judicata 79 80
  - execution of 662 [O 21 r 17]
- decree of 396 [s 100]
  - where third parties have acquired rights under erroneous decree 335
- failure to amend pleadings within time specified by Courts 407 [O 6 r 18]
- general powers of Court to amend proceedings in a suit 401 [s 103]
- inherent powers of Court to amend decrees or orders 397
- issues power of Court to amend 590 [O 14 r 5 (1)]
- leave to amend pleadings when given 496 497
  - when refused 497 500
- limitation and amendment of application for execution 663
- memorandum of appeal of 987 [O 41 r 3]
- mistake arising from accidental omission 396 [s 102] 398
- multifariousness amendment of plaint defective for 401
- notice of motion of 401
- opponent's pleadings of 493
- particulars of 497
- plaint of and notice under sec 80 p 251
  - of by adding new reliefs 504
  - of in suit for specific performance and compensation in addition or substitution 504
- pleadings of 496 500 [O 6 r 17]
- proceedings in suit of 401 [s 103]
- res judicata and application for amendment of decree 79
- revision of order granting application for 399
- sale certificate of 770

**Ancestral property—**

- liability of in execution 182 [s 103]
- suit to recover and joinder of parties 409

**Anticipation—**

- attachment of property subject to restraint upon 100

**Appeal—** 98 317 [Ss 96 108] 933 1027 [O 41] Appeal

- abatement of 780 822 78, 793 836 [O 23 r 11]
- additional evidence in appeal 1016 1017 [O 41 r 27]
- agreement not to appeal 269
- appellate decrees appeal from 1027 [O 43 r 1]
- assignment of interest before final decree in 804
- award decree based on appeal from 1182 1187
- British India where appellant resides out of and security for costs 900 [O 41 r 10 (1) proviso]
- cause making of new in appeal 987
- Court appellate to have same powers as original Court 316 [s 107 (1)]
  - arbitration can refer matters in dispute in appeal to 1166
  - execution stay of by 989 990 [O 41 r 10]
  - inherent power of to consolidate appeals 393
- consolidation of appeals 393

Appeal from Orders—*contd*

- interpleader suits orders made in 942 944 1029 [O 43 r 1 (p)]
- issues referring for trial by lower Court 1015
  - refusing to frame 589
- judgment on failure to file written statement 532 1028 [O 43 r 1 (b)]
  - on refusal to give evidence 600 1028 [O 43 r 1 (h)]
  - on failure of pleader to answer 555 1028 [O 43 r 1 (c)]
- judgment debtor determining question between and representative of decree holder 661
  - disallowing objection by to draft of document for execution of which decree is passed 681 1028 [O 43 r 1 (i)]
  - refusing simultaneous execution against property & person of 668
  - setting aside or refusing to set aside sale of immovable property where has no saleable interest 763
- leave giving or refusing for assignee to be joined as party 806 1029 [O 43 r 1 (l)]
  - granting to withdraw suit with liberty to bring a fresh suit "
  - granting to plaintiff to withdraw suit or abandon part of claim 816
  - granting or refusing to appeal to Privy Council 1034
- leave to sue under cl. 12 of the Charter refusing to grant 1258
  - refusing to set aside order granting 1258
- legal representative determining question as to 196
- limitation dismissing appeal on ground of 10
- mandamus directing issue of to a public body 1258
- memorandum of appeal rejecting 10
  - returning for being presented to proper Court 9
- mortgage debt refusing to extend time for payment of—
  - in foreclosure suit 910 1029 [O 43 r 1 (o)] 1030
  - in redemption suit 928 1029 [O 43 r 1 (o)] 1030
- objection allowing or disallowing to attachment 712 713
- orders from which appeals lie 310 311 [s 104] 1028 1030 [O 43]
- pauper refusing leave to sue a 7
  - refusing leave to appeal as 1031
  - rejecting application for leave to sue as 888
  - refusing to make order for payment of Court fees to Government 894
- payment out of Court allowing or refusing application to record 644
- plaint directing to be taken off the file 864 865
  - order rejecting 517
  - returning for amendment 9
    - to be presented to proper Court 514 1028 [O 43 r 1 (a)] 1030
- plaintiff's appearance dismissing suit for default of 537
  - non appearance rejecting application to restore suit dismissed for 542
    - 1028 [O 43 r 1 (c)]
    - granting application to restore suit dismissed for 542
- pleading order refusing to strike out as scandalous and 495
- Privy Council appeal See Privy Council Appeal
- procedure in appeals from orders 317 [s 108] 1030 [O 43 r 2]
- re admit refusing to an appeal 1002 1029 [O 43 r 1 (l) (t)]
- re admitting an appeal 1002
- receiver directing in a suit to advance moneys to a guardian *ad litem* 980
  - granting application to appoint 979 1029 [O 43 r 1 (l) (s)]
  - rejecting application to appoint 979 1029 [O 43 r 1 (l) (t)]
- refusing leave under cl. 12 of the Charter 1258
- rehear refusing to an appeal 1004 1029 [O 43 r 1 (l) (t)]

Appeal from Orders—*contd*

- appeal refusing to enlarge time for preferring 1258
  - leave to appeal as a pauper 1031
    - to restore an rejected for failure to furnish security for cost. 997
  - re hear appeal refusing to 1029 [O 43 r 1 (i)]
  - rejecting appeal for failure to furnish security for costs 997
- arbitration arising out of agreement to refer to 310 [s 104 (1) (d)]
  - superseding 310 [s 104 (1) (a)] 1193
- arrest declining to order for disobedience of interlocutory injunction 967
  - awarding compensation for wrongful 286
- assets for distribution of under s 73 233
- attachment allowing or disallowing objections to under s 47 p 712
  - awarding compensation for wrongful 286
  - of property of witness directing 197 1028 [O 43 r 1 (g)]
- award filing or refusing to file 310 [s 104 (1) (f)] 1196
  - modifying or correcting 310 [s 104 (1) (c)] 1175
  - order on stated in the form of a special case 310 [s 104 (1) (b)] 1174
  - remitting for reconsideration of arbitrator 1177
  - setting aside or refusing to set aside 1161
- certificate to appeal to I C refusing grant of 1029 [O 43 r 1 (c)] 1030
- claim rejecting application to join with claim for immovable property 406
- Collector orders passed by in execution proceedings transferred to him 276
  - [s 70 (2)] 22"
- commission directing or refusing issue of 838
- compensation awarding for wrongful arrest attachment or injunction 286
- compromise of suit recording or refusing to record 1029 [O 43 r 1 (r)]
- contempt directing or refusing committal for 1258
- costs awarding or refusing 132 133
  - security for dismissing petition praying Court to receive 997
- Court to which appeal lies from orders 316 [s 106]
- decree rejecting application for transfer of for execution 144
- decree holders orders made on questions between 654
  - refusing permission to to purchase at Court sale 735
- default dismissing suit or appeal for 11
- discovery order made on non compliance with order for 1029 [O 43 r 1 (f)]
- dismissal of suit refusing to set aside 801 1029 [O 43 r 1 (l)]
- execution determining questions in 166
  - made in enforcing claim against surety 396
  - refusing to stay pending appeal to Privy Council 1041
  - refusing to transmit for order of Privy Council 1045
  - refusing stay of under O 41 r 5 p 992
- ex parte* decree passed granting application to set aside 553
  - rejecting application to set aside 553 1028 [O 43 r 1 cl (d)]
- failure of party to perform acts for which adjournment granted on 604
- guardian ad litem directing receiver in a suit to advance moneys to 950
- habeas corpus deciding claim to the custody of a minor on a writ of 1 57
- High Court order made by in original criminal jurisdiction 1063 [Charter cl 95]
- immovable property rejecting application to join claim with claim for 406
- injunction awarding compensation for wrongful, 286
  - discharging or setting aside 968 [O 39 r 4] 10 9 [O 43 r 1 (r)]
  - temporary refusing or granting 962 1029 [O 43 r 1 cl (r)]
- inspection allowing or disallowing 773

**Appearance—*contd***

- dismissal of suit for default bars fresh suit 537 [O 9 r 9] 540
- exemption of certain persons from personal appearance 364 [ss 132 133]
- firm appearance of partners where suit brought in firm name 557 [O 30 r 6]
- Government fixing of time for appearance on behalf of 846 [O 27 r 5]
- inherent powers of Court to restore suit dismissed for default 541 542
- meaning of 538 540
- next friend non appearance of at hearing 541
- non appearance of claimant defendants in interpleader suit 942
  - parties 538 544 [O 9 rr 2 12]
- parties to appear on day fixed in summons 532 [O 9 r 1]
- partner where sued in firm name appearance of 557 [O 30 r 6]
- person appearance of party in 539
  - Court may order appearance of party in 460 [O 5 r 2] 555 [O 10 r 4 (1)]
  - consequence of non attendance in 544 [O 9 r 12]
- pleader appearance of party by 459 [O 9 r 1] 539
- procedure where defendant has good cause for previous non appearance 538 [O 9 r 7]
- res judicata* and dismissal of suit for default 70
- restoration of suit when sufficient cause shown for non appearance 537 [O 9 r 9]
- women exemption of from personal appearance 364 [s 132]

**Application—***See* head under which application is made *eg* Amendment Decree *ex parte* Execution of decree sub head (1)

**Arbitration—**

- agreement to refer—*See* sub head Order of reference on Agreement to refer
- appeal from decree passed on award 180
  - orders about arbitration or awards—*See* Appeal from Orders
- appellate Court when can refer matters in dispute in appeal to 1186
- application by parties to suit for order of reference 1164 1165 [Sch II para 1]
- arbitrator appointment of 1167 [Sch II para 2]
  - of new 1170 [Sch II para 5] 1171
- consequence of disobedience to summons to attend before 1172 [Sch II para 7 (9)]
- arbitrator corruption or misconduct of 1177 [Sch II para 15 (1) (a)] 1178
  - death of 1170 [Sch II para 5 (b) (i)]
  - decision of majority of 1169
  - delegation of duty by 1169
  - difference of opinion among 1169 [Sch II para 4]
  - distinction between valuer and 1186 1187
  - empowering to appoint an umpire 1169 [Sch II para. 4]
  - form of order for appointment of new 1179 1200
  - is the sole and final judge of all questions of fact and of law 1183
  - Judge may be made by consent 112
  - leaving British India 1170 [Sch II para 5 (b) (ii)]
  - necessity of presence of at meetings 1173 1174
  - notice for appointment of new 1170 [Sch II para 5]
  - power of Court to appoint new may be limited by agreement 1171
  - powers of 1172 [Sch II para 6]
  - refusing to act 1170 [Sch II para 5 (b) (ii)] 1171
  - revocation of arbitrator's authority 1166 1167
  - sign award need not in presence of each other 1173.



**Appeal from Orders—*could***

- Religious Endowment order to appoint a new member on Committee of 7
- rejecting application to set aside order granting leave under cl 1<sup>o</sup> of Charter 124
- remand order of 313 [s 105 (2)]
- remand of case 1012 1029 [O 43 r 1 (u)] 1030
- resale allowing or disallowing application for recovery of loss on 732
- restitution directing 373 [s 144] 381
- review granting application for 1029 [O 43 r 1 (x)] 1038 1060
  - rejecting application for 1060
- revision orders made in 333
- rules relating to appeals from order 1030 [O 43 r 2]
- sale certificate allowing or refusing amendment of 770
- sale of immovable property setting aside or refusing to set aside—
  - on deposit of decretal amount 748
  - on ground of irregularity or fraud 761
  - where judgment debtor has no saleable interest 63
  - under O 21 r 92 p 765 1029 [O 43 r 1 (y)]
  - when decree holder purchases without leave of Court 737 1029 [O 43 r 1 (y)]
- second appeal—See Second Appeal
- security for costs dismissing petition praying Court to receive 997
  - directing plaintiff to give 834
  - refusing to extend time for furnishing and directing appeal to Privy Council to be struck off 1037
  - refusing to set aside order of dismissal for failure to furnish 835 1029 [O 43 r 1 (n)]
  - refusing to restore appeal rejected for failure to furnish 997
  - rejecting appeal for failure to furnish 997
- set off disposing defendant's claim to 531
- stamp rejecting memorandum of appeal on ground of insufficiency of 10
  - stay of execution refusing under O 41 r 5 p 99<sup>7</sup>
- suit compromise of recording or refusing to record 827 1029 [O 43 r 1 (m)]
  - to restore granting application dismissed for plaintiff's non appearance 84—
  - to restore rejecting application dismissed for plaintiff's non appearance 84 1029 [O 43 r 1 (c)]
  - to withdraw granting leave with liberty to bring a fresh suit<sup>7</sup>
  - granting leave to plaintiff to abandon part of claim or withdraw from 816
- surety orders against 386
- time enlarging or refusing to enlarge under s 148 p 387
- transfer of decree rejecting application for 144
- Vice admiralty jurisdiction orders made in exercise of 1233
- witness directing attachment of property of 597 1029 [O 43 r 1 (g)]

**Appeal under cl 15 of the Charter—**

- meaning of judgment in cl 15 of the Charter 1232 1234
- what decisions are judgments and appealable 1236 1239
- wrong exercise of discretion may be a ground of appeal 1236

**Appellate Court—See Appeal****Appearance—**

- agent by recognised 49 [O 3 r 1]
- mere presence of recognised in Court is not appearance in suit 439
- defendants appearance of one of several for others 434 [O 1 r 1<sup>o</sup>]

Appearance—*contd*

- dismissal of suit for default bars fresh suit 53, [O 9 r 9] 540
- exemption of certain persons from personal appearance 364 [ss 132 12] ch II
- firm appearance of partners where suit brought in firm name 557 [O 3],
- Government fixing of time for appearance on behalf of 846 [O 27 r 5], ion of
- inherent powers of Court to re-tore suit dismissed for default 541 542
- meaning of 538 540
- next friend non appearance of at hearing 541
- non appearance of claimant defendants in interpleader suit 542
- parties to appear on day fixed in summons 532 [O 9 r 1] 1178
- partners where used in firm name appearance of 557 [O 30 r 1]
- person appearance of party in 539
- Court may order appearance of party in 460 [O 5 r 3] 555 [O 10 r (3)]
- consequence of non attendance in 544 [O 9 r 12]
- pleader appearance of party by 459 [O 7 r 1] 539
- procedure where defendant has good cause for previous non appearance 10 9 r 7] 17
- res judicata* and dismissal of suit for default 70
- restoration of suit when sufficient cause shown for non appearance 537 [O p to
- women exemption of from personal appearance 364 [s 132]

**Application**—See head under which application is made *eg* Amendment Decree  
*parte* Execution of decree sub-head (1)

**Arbitration**—

- agreement to refer—See sub-head Order of reference on Agreement to re.
- appeal from decree passed on award 180
- orders about arbitration or awards—See Appeal from Orders
- appellate Court when can refer matters in dispute in appeal to 1160
- application by parties to suit for order of reference 1164 1165 [S h, II para 1]
- arbitrator appointment of 1167 [Sch II para 2]
- of new 1170 [Sch II para 3] 1171
- consequence of disobedience to summons to attend before 1172 [Sch II para 7]
- arbitrator corruption or misconduct of 1177 [Sch II para 15 (1) (a)] 1178
- death of 1170 [Sch II para 5 (b) (i)]
- decision of majority of 1169
- delegation of duty by 1169
- difference of opinion among 1169 [Sch II para 4]
- distinction between valuer and 1166 1187
- empowering to appoint an umpire 1169 [Sch II para 4]
- form of order for appointment of new 1179 1200
- is the sole and final judge of all questions of fact and of law 1183
- Judge may be made by consent 112
- leaving British India 1170 [Sch II para 5 (b) (ii)]
- necessity of presence of at meetings 1173 1174
- notice for appointment of new 1170 [Sch II para 3]
- power of Court to appoint new may be limited by agreement 1171
- powers of 1172 [Sch II para 6]
- refusing to act 1170 [Sch II para 5 (b) (ii)] 1171
- revocation of arbitrator's authority 1166 1167
- sign award need not in presence of each other 1173.

**Appeal from Orders—*contd***

- Religious Endowment order to appoint a new member on Committee of 7
- rejecting application to set aside order granting leave under cl 1<sup>o</sup> of Charter 1<sup>o</sup>
- remand order of 313 [s 105 (2)]
- remand of case 1012 1029 [O 43 r 1 (u)] 1030
- re sale allowing or disallowing application for recovery of losses on 732
- restitution directing 373 [s 144] 381
- review granting application for 1029 [O 43 r 1 (u)] 1038 1060
- rejecting application for 1060
- revision orders made in 300
- rules relating to appeals from orders 1030 [O 43 r 2]
- sale certificate allowing or refusing amendment of 770
- sale of immovable property setting aside or refusing to set aside—
  - on deposit of decretal amount 748
  - on ground of irregularity or fraud 761
  - where judgment debtor has no saleable interest 63
  - under O 21 r 92 p 765 1079 [O 43 r 1 (j)]
  - when decree holder purchases without leave of Court 737 1029 [O 43 r 1 (j)]

**second appeal—*See* Second Appeal**

- security for costs dismissing petition praying Court to receive 997
  - directing plaintiff to give 834
  - refusing to extend time for furnishing and directing appeal to Privy Council to be struck off 1037
  - refusing to set aside order of dismissal for failure to furnish 833 1039 [O 43 r 1 (n)]
  - refusing to restore appeal rejected for failure to furnish 997
  - rejecting appeal for failure to furnish 997
- set off disposing defendant's claim to 511
- stamp rejecting memorandum of appeal on ground of insufficiency of 10
  - stay of execution refusing under O 41 r 5 p 992
- suit compromise of recording or refusing to record 827 1029 [O 43 r 1 (m)]
  - to restore granting application dismissed for plaintiff's non appearance 54
  - to restore rejecting application dismissed for plaintiff's non appearance 54 1028 [O 43 r 1 (c)]
  - to withdraw granting leave with liberty to bring a fresh suit "
  - granting leave to plaintiff to abandon part of claim or withdraw from 810
- surety orders against 386
- time enlarging or refusing to enlarge under s 148 p 387
- transfer of decree rejecting application for 144
- Vice admiralty jurisdiction orders made in exercise of 123
- witness directing attachment of property of 597 1079 [O 43 r 1 (g)]

**Appeal under cl 15 of the Charter—**

- meaning of judgment in cl 1<sup>o</sup> of the Charter 125-1254
- what decisions are judgments and appealable 1256 129
- wrong exercise of discretion may be a ground of appeal 1256

**Appellate Court—*See* Appeal****Appearance—**

- agent by recognised 49 [O 3 r 1]
- mere presence of recognised in Court is not appearance in suit 459
- defendants appearance of one of several for others 434 [O 1 r 12]

Arbitration—*contd*

## award—

fraudulent concealment of matter which ought to have been disclosed 1177 [Sch II para. 15 (1) (b)] 1180

Indian Arbitration Act IX of 1899 application of 260

minor whether agreement to refer to arbitration on behalf of requires sanction of Court 876

order of reference in a suit 1167 1168 [Sch II para (3)]  
 effect of 1168 [Sch. II para 3 (2)] 1168 1169  
 form of application for 1199  
 form of 1199  
 superseding 1110 [Sch II para 5 (2)] 1171 1178  
 [Sch II para 15 (2)]  
 who may apply for 1164 1166  
 future differences to arbitration 1188  
 notice of application to file 1187 [Sch II para 17 (3)]  
 revocation of 1189  
 validity of 1191  
 where no provision for appointment of umpire in 1189  
 on an agreement to refer 1187 1192 [Sch II paras 17 and 18]  
 appeal from order filing or refusing to file agreement to refer 1189  
 staying or refusing to stay suit 1192  
 application to file agreement 1187 [Sch II para 17]  
 appointment of arbitrator 1187 [Sch. II para 17 (4)]  
 stay of suit 1189 1190 [Sch II para 18]

reference to how far governed by Schedule II 260 [s 89]

revocation of arbitrator's authority 1166 1167

revision 1185 1186

second appeal when lies 1180

umpire—*See* Arbitrator

appointment of 1169 [Sch II para 4 (1) (a)]

umpire when to arbitrate 1173 [Sch II para 9]

withdrawal of suit after reference to arbitration 815 816 1167

Arbitrat on w thout intervent on of Court 1192 1198

appeal from order filing or refusing to file award made in 1196

award application to file made on a reference 1192 1193 [Sch II para 20]

decree on 1190 [Sch II para 21 (2)]

filing and enforcement of 1190 [Sch II para 21]

no power to remit or amend the award 1196

notice to show cause why should not be filed 1193 [Sch II para 20 (3)]

period within which application for filing of should be made 1194

refusal to file and *res judicata* 1197

valid constitutes a bar to suit on original demand 1193

withdrawal of application to file 1197

Court to which application should be made 1192 [Sch II para 20] 1193 1194

jurisdiction of Court determined by subject matter of award 1194

public charitable trust award relating to 1194

Arrest and detention—pp 180 190 [as 5 59] *See* Arrest before Judgment

ambassador or envoy of foreign State exempt from 255 [s 86 (3)]

appeal from order for detention 311 [s 104 cl (b)]

arrest other than in execution of decree 360 [s 134]

before judgment 284 [s 94] 950 953 [O 38 rr 1-4] *See* Arrest before Judgment

40

Arbitration—*contd*

- arbitrator statement of special case by 1174 [Sch II para 11]
- summoning of witnesses before 1172 [Sch II para 7]
- where Court acts as 1186
- award—
  - arbitrators need not sign award in presence of each other 1173
  - decree based on award modified by Court 1183
  - provisions relating to apply to awards 674
  - delivery of 1174
  - estoppel from impeaching validity of 1173
  - execution where award indefinite 1178 [Sch II para 14 (b)]
  - of against a firm 701
  - expiration of period fixed by Court where award is made after 1189
  - [Sch II para 10 (1) (c)] 1180
  - extension of time for making 1172 [Sch II para 8] 1173
  - fixing of time for making 1167 [Sch II cl 3 (1)] 1168
  - form of 1200
  - illegal patently 1176 1177
  - invalid award 1183 1184
  - judgment on award 1183 [Sch II para 16]
  - making of award 1168
  - modify or correct award power to 1174 1175 [Sch II para 12]
  - notice of filing of award 1173 [Sch II para 10]
  - part of award upon matter not referred to arbitration 1174 [Sch II para 12 (a)] 117
  - remit power to 1175 1176 [Sch II para 14]
  - revision whether decree passed on an award is subject to 1185 1186
  - whether order setting aside or refusing to set aside an award is subject to 1182
  - res judicata* and refusal of Court to file a private award 1197
  - second appeal when lies on a decree passed on an award 118
  - setting aside award grounds for 1177 1178 [Sch II para 15]
  - signing and filing of award 1173 [Sch II para 10]
  - stay of execution of 674
  - superseding arbitration where award is made after order 1183
  - [Sch II para 10 (1) (c)] 1160
  - time within which application to set aside an award should be made 1183
  - where award has left undetermined any of the matters referred to arbitration 1175 [Sch II para 14 (a)] 1176
- cost of arbitration 1170 [Sch II para 13]
- death of arbitrator or umpire 1170 [Sch II para 5 (b) (i)]
- partly after application but before order of reference 1167
- decree on award against Hindu widow how far binding on reversioners 60
- estoppel from impeaching validity of award 1173
- modified by Court 1183
- evidence of arbitrator where charged with misconduct 1179
- execution when award indefinite 1177 [Sch II para 14 (b)]
- form of application for order of reference 1169
- order of reference 1191
- or for appointment of new arbitrator 1199 1200
- special case stated for Court's opinion 1200

Assets—See Rateable distribution

Assignment—

*lis pendens* doctrine of 803

of decree 654 66 See Transfer of Decree

of interest in suit 602 [O 22 r 10] 803 805

of mortgagee after preliminary decree and before final decree 804.

pending appeal 804

of cross decree and execution 664 [O 21 r 18 (2)]

*pendente lite* 602 [O 22 r 10]

Attachment—

actual seizure of movable property in possession of judgment debtor 689 [O 21 r 43]

adjudication order effect of on attachment 213

adjustment of attached decree when ineffectual 705 [O 21 r 53 (6)] 707

agricultural produce—See Agricultural produce

attachment of 609 [O 21 r 44]

agriculturists houses occupied by 197 198

alienation temporary of attached land 223

allowances being less than salary of a public officer while absent from duty 199

anticipatory attachment 62 703

appeal from order of compensation for wrongful attachment before judgment 286.

assets claims for rateable distribution of are claims enforceable under attachment 206 [s 64 Explan] 210

before judgment—See sub head Attachment before judgment

bonus sanctioned by Railway Company to its servant 105

charge attachment does not create a 212 213

claim investigation of—See sub head Investigation of claims.

Collector application for attachment of land registered in office of 651 [O 21 r 14]

compensation for wrongful 284 285 [s 95]

compulsory deposits in Provident fund 192 [s 60 (1) (4)] 200

current coin or currency notes where property attached is 709 [O 21 r 56].

damages attachment of right to sue for 191 [s 60 (1) (e)]

debt attachment of 692 [O 21 r 46] 693

decree attachment of 704 705 [O 21 r 53]

default in proceeding with execution after 709 [O 21 r 57]

dwelling house seizure of property in 203 [s 62]

easement transfer of pending attachment 208

effect of 212 213

exemption from of stipends and gratuities of certain family pension fund. 198

firm in case of decree against 698 699 [O 21 r 50]

garnishee's debt 694—See Garnishee

gratuities allowed by Government 198

growing crop attachment of 690 [O 21 r 44 (a)]

growing crop which cannot be stored attachment of 691 [O 21 r 45 (5)]

immovable property attachment of 709 [O 21 r 54]

immovable property particulars in application for attachment of 650 [O 21 r 13]

irregularity in attaching property 704

judgment debtor examination of as to his property 688 [O 21 r 41]

jurisdiction Court has no to sell property without attachment 216

jurisdiction where property to be attached is outside—

(1) and it is to be attached in execution of a decree 142 [s 39]

(2) where it is to be attached under other provisions of Code 367 [s 136]

**Arrest and detention—*contd***

- compensation for wrongful before judgment 284 285 [s 95]
  - conjugal rights discretion of Courts in decree for restitution of 679 [O 21 r 33]
  - decree in execution of 185 [s 55]
  - decrees enforceable by detention in prison 675 679 [O 21 rr 30 32]
  - directors of in decree against corporation 678 [O 21 r 32 (2)]
  - door breaking open of the outer for arrest 187
  - execution in of decree 185 186 [s 55]
  - exemption of women from arrest 188 [s 56]
  - exempt from
    - ambassador or envoy of foreign State 255 [s 86 (3)]
    - judicial officer when 365 [s 135 (1)]
    - members of legislative bodies 367
    - parties to suit and their pleaders when 365 [s 135 (2)]
    - public officer when 252 [s 81 (a)]
    - witnesses when, 365 [s 135 (2)]
    - women when 188 [s 56]
  - injunction of person guilty of disobedience to order granting 964 [O 39 r 2 (3)]
  - insolvency of judgment debtor and 187
  - interim protection order and re arrest 190
  - judgment debtor
    - immediate arrest of on decree for payment of money 647 [O 21 r 11 (1)]
    - insolvent procedure when judgment debtor expresses his intention to be declared an 186 [s 55 cl 4]
    - procedure on appearance of in obedience to notice or after arrest 185 186 [s 55] 687 [O 21 r 40]
    - re arrest of 189 [s 58 (2)] 190 688 [O 21 r 40 (4)]
    - release of 189 190 [ss 58 59]
    - when unable to pay Court may disallow application for arrest 687 [O 21 r 40 (1)]
  - jurisdiction where person to be arrested is outside—
    - (1) and arrest is to be made in execution of a decree 142 [s 39]
    - (2) where it is to be made under other provisions of the Code 367 [s 136]
  - notice before arrest 635 [O 21 r 37]
  - pardanashin women when not exempt from arrest 364 [s 132 (2)]
  - period of detention 189 [s 58]
  - public inconvenience to and arrest of certain persons 186 [s 55 (°)]
  - re arrest 189 [s 58 (°)] 190 698 [O 21 r 40 (4)]
  - release not a discharge of debt 189 [s 58 (2)]
  - subsistence allowance 189 [s 57] 686 [O 21 r 39]
  - surety for appearance of judgment debtor under arrest 186 [s 55 (4)]
  - warrant for arrest 686 [O 21 r 38]
  - without warrant illegal 62
  - witness arrest of defaulting 597 [O 16 r 10 (3)]
  - woman and a for money decree 188 [s 56]
- Arrest before Judgment** 284 [s 94] 950 953 [O 38 rr 14]
- appeal from orders relating to B.L. 953 1099 [O 43 r 1 (7)]
  - compensation for wrongful arrest 284 285 [s 95]
  - defendant when may be arrested before judgment 950 951 [O 38 r 1]
  - period of detention in prison 953 [O 38 r 4]
  - security order to furnish for appearance 952 [O 38 r 2]
    - where defendant fails to furnish 953 [O 38 r 4]
  - surety procedure on application by to be discharged 953 [O 38 r 3]
- Assessors—**
- Admiralty and Vice admiralty cases in 370 [s 140]

Attachment—*cont'd*

## Attachment before judgment—254 [s 94 (b)] 953 959 [O 38 rr 12]

agricultural produce not attachable before judgment 959 [O 38 r 12]

appeal from orders relating to 10-8 [O 43 r 1 (2)]

compensation for wrongful attachment 254 285 [s 95]

decree holders does not bar rights of other 958

determination of attachment for decree holder a default inapplicable 710

divorce proceedings no attachment before judgment in 955

effect of on alienation of property 107

investigation of claims to property attached before judgment 956 [O 38 r 8]

jurisdiction Court may attach before judgment property situate outside 955

mode of making 956 [O 38 r 7]

partnership property in suit for partnership accounts whether liable to 954

power of provincial small cause court in 21

property to be attached specification of 954 [O 38 r 5 (2)]

re attachment not necessary after decree 958 [O 38 r 11]

removed when may be 956 [O 38 r 9]

sale of property under person holding decree may apply for 957 [O 38 r 10]

security for production of property when defendant should furnish 953 954 [O 38 r 5]

third parties does not affect rights of 957 [O 38 r 10]

transfer private of property pending 955

verdict order effect of on attachment before judgment 954 97

when ordered 953 954 [O 38 r 5] 955 [ib r 6]

where cause not shown or security not furnished 956 [O 38 r 6]

withdrawal of when ordered 955 [O 38 r 6 (2)]

## Investigation of claims and objections—711 724 [O 21 rr 58 63]

appeal from order made on application of third party objecting to attachment 712 713

burden of proof in suit to establish right to attached property 723

claim when to be allowed 714 [O 21 r 60]

disallowed 716 [O 21 r 61]

evidence in support of claim or objection 713 [O 21 r 59]

mortgage claim continuance of attachment subject to 716 [O 21 r 62]

mortgaged property objection by third party to sale of under a mortgage decree 712

mortgagee in possession objection by 717

objection by third party to attachment of debt 711

sale of mortgaged property under mortgage decree 712

to attachment by third party 711 [O 21 r 58]

to attachment by a party to suit where 153

when allowed 14 [O 21 r 60]

disallowed 16 [O 21 r 61]

order allowing or disallowing claim when conclusive 717 [O 21 r 63]

party judgment debtor necessary to suit by unsuccessful claimant 718

payment by claimant under protest 722

purchaser rights of when property is sold subject to a mortgage 116 717

when notice of mortgage given in proclamation 717

release from attachment effect of order of 15

sale postponement of pending inquiry into claim 711 [O 21 r 58 (2)]

suit declaratory by defeated party 717 [O 21 r 63]



**Attachment—*contd***

- labourer wages of 192[s 60 (1) (h)] 200
- land paying revenue to Government attachment of, 708 [O 21 r 54]
- life policy 695
- liquidator of registered company position of 213
- maintenance right to future 193[s 60 (1) (a)] 201
- mesne profits before determination of amount of 689 [O 21 r 42]
- money decrees and mortgage decrees 706
  - value of property attached in case of 662 [O 21 r 17 proviso]
- mortgage debt attachment of 693 694
- movable property in possession of judgment debtor 689 [O 21 r 43]
- movable property not in judgment debtor's possession 690 [O 21 r 1<sup>st</sup>]
- native army pay and allowances of soldiers and followers of exempt 192[s 60 (1) (j)] 200
- negotiable instruments attachment of 702 [O 21 r 51]
- notice in case of decree passed by another Court 704 [O 21 r 53 (1) (b)]
- objection to on ground that property is not saleable when to be raised 202
- objections to attachment—See sub head Investigation of claims and objections
- Official A signee Attaching creditor has no priority over 213
- partnership property when attachable 697 [O 21 r 49 (1)] 698 [ib 50 (1) (s)]
- pensions private attachment of 199,
  - political attachment of 199
- policy effected by married man for benefit of his wife and children 100
- precept attachment under 149[s 46]
- preliminary decree for possession and rents attachment under 689 [O 21 r 4<sup>th</sup>]
- priority where fund in Court is attached by several decree holders 703
- property attached in execution of decrees of several Courts 203 204[s 63]
  - liable or not liable to attachment 191[s 60]
  - in custody of Court or public officer 704 [O 21 r 52]
  - in custody of receiver and 702 [Case 1]
  - of defaulting witness 697 [O 16 r 10 (3)] 698 [O 16 r 12]
  - of person disobeying order granting injunction 901 [O 39 r 2 (3)]
  - of receiver in enforcement of his duties 982 [O 40 r 4]
- Provident fund compulsory deposits in 192[s 60 (1) (i)] 200
- raising of and subsequent restoration of 211
- removal of 708 709 [O 21 r 55]
- salary of officer of His Majesty's regular forces 201 202
  - private servant 200
  - public officer or railway servant or servant of local authority 192[s 60 (1) cl. (i)] 694 696 [O 21 r 48]
- service right of personal 198
- shares in a corporation 694 [O 21 r 46 (1) (b)] 695
- share of judgment debtor in movables 694 [O 21 r 47]
- Stridhan* ornaments 197
- succession expectancy of 194[s 60 (1) (m)] 200
- title or priority questions of by what Court to be determined 704 [O 21 r 53 proviso]
- transfer of easement pending attachment 208
  - attached property 206[s 64] 207 209
- vesting order effect of on attachment 213
- warrant of 674 [O 21 r 24]
- winding up order effect of on attachment 213

**Auction purchaser—*contd***

- party necessary to application under O 21 r 89 p 748
  - to application under O 21 r 90 p 749
- representative of parties to suit whether is a under s 47 p 157
- re sale defaulting purchaser answerable for loss on 731 [O 21, r 71]
- resistance to delivery of possession to 772 [O 21 r 97] *See Possession*
- restitution against 378
- sale application to set aside where judgment debtor has no saleable interest 762
  - [O 21 r 91]
  - certificate of to 768 [O 21 r 91]
  - in execution of decree when void and when voidable 216 217
  - setting aside compensation to purchaser on 743 [O 21 r 89] 746
- suit by after confirmation of sale and before issue of certificate of sale 215
  - for possession 215
- title of 213 [s 60] 216 *See Sale sub head Purchaser's title*
- vesting of property in 213 [s 60] 214

**Award—(Schedule II)—*See Arbitration***

- Land Acquisition Act appeal from award under 296

**Bankers Books Evidence Act 219****Barrister—*See Counsel***

- admissions by 10
  - to bind client by authority of 15
- arbitration to refer to authority of 10
- compromise authority to 14 10
- High Court Judges one third of to be Barristers 1210 [High Courts Act s 2]
  - judgeship what Barristers eligible for 1210 [High Courts Act s 2]
- omission by to argue a question of law or abandoning same 16
- professional etiquette affecting 1239 1240
- who included in term barrister 1-14 [High Courts Act s 10]
- withdraw suit to authority of 10

**Benami—**

- purchase meaning of 219

**Benamidar—**

- beneficial owner suit by against benamidar 221
- execution application for by 607
  - sales benami purchases at for benefit of judgment debtors 221
- Hindu family joint and benami purchaser 20
- mortgage whether benamidar can maintain suit on 900
- suit by benami purchaser for declaration that he purchased on his own behalf 221
  - by benami purchaser against real owner for possession 221
  - by third person alleging certified purchaser is a benamidar 218 [s 60 (2)] 220
- waiver by benami purchaser of right of possession 22- 2-3

**Bid—**

- liberty to 733 [O 21 r 72]
- restriction on bidding by officer 730 [O 21 r 73]

**Bill of exchange—*See Negotiable Instrument summary suits***

- costs recovery of of noting non acceptance of dishonoured 900 [O 3 r 6]
- definition of 917
- joinder of parties liable on same 416 [O 1 r 6] 417
- summary suit upon 946 [O 37 r 1] *See Summary suits*

**Attachment—*contd*****Investigation of claims and objections—*contd***

- third party where objection to attachment is made by 711 [O 21 r 38]
- objection by to attachment of debt 713
  - to sale under a mortgage decree 710
- remedies open to for releasing property from attachment 711
- time within which suit under O 21 r 63 should be brought 718 719
- title Court not to go into question of 713 714
- transfer private of property by claimant after release from attachment 715
- trust property held upon 714 [O 21 r 60]

**Attendance—**

- corporation officer of power to require personal attendance of 550 [O 29 r 3]
- duty of witness to attend at each hearing 599 [O 16 rr 15 16]
- of person able to answer questions in suit against Government 846 [O 27 r 6]
- witnesses before Commissioner 844 [O 26 r 17 (1)]
  - to give evidence or produce documents power to compel 122 [s. 30 (b)].
- witness when not required to attend in person 600 [O 16 r 19]

**Attorney—**

- admissions by 15
- authority of in suits 14 15
- bill of costs when privileged from inspection 566
- compromise without client's express authority effect of 14 15
- is an officer of Court and amenable to disciplinary jurisdiction 1239
- lien of for costs 529 531
  - and rateable distribution 242
- processes of Chartered High Courts that may be served by attorneys 1063 [O 40 r 1]
- powers of Chartered High Courts *See* Chartered High Courts

**Auction—**

- court sale as a rule to be held by public auction 724 [O 21 r 65]

**Auction purchaser—*See* Possession Sale sub head Purchaser's title**

- amendment of sale certificate 770
- appeal from order allowing or refusing amendment of sale certificate 710
- benami purchase 218 [s. 66] 219
- benami purchases at execution sales for benefit of judgment debtor 220
- benamidar where certificated purchaser is 219
- certificate of sale to 763 [O 21 r 91]
  - variance between proclamation and 770
- compensation to on setting aside sale 743 [O 21 r 59] 746
- default in payment of deposit by at court sale 741 [O 21 r 84]
- delivery of possession to 771 772 [O 21 rr 9, 9C] *See* Possession
  - property in occupation of judgment-debtor 771 [O 21 r 9C]
  - of tenants 712 [O 21 r 96]

- deposit by at court sale 741 [O 21 r 84]

- dispossession by 773 [O 21 r 100]

- execution proceedings questions between auction purchaser decree holder and judgment-debtor 159 164

- limitation as to for application for delivery of possession 771

- mesne profits right of purchaser to 216

- mortgage where property is sold subject to or with notice of 716 717
  - what passes to purchaser on Court sale of immovable property 768 60
  - mortgaged property 770

**Caste—*contd.***

- definition of 23
- expulsion from suit for 23
- suits against a member of for employing usurper for performing ceremonies 27
- relating to religious or caste questions 23 28
- caste property 28
- inspection of accounts of caste property 28

**Cause of action—**

- Charter within the meaning of cl 12 of 1246
- contract in suits on 103 108 1246
- decree not to be reversed in appeal for misjoinder of 297 [s 99]
- definition of 103
- different causes of action arising out of same transaction 442 443
  - separate trials of 448 [O 2 r 6]
- distinct causes of action different suits for 439
- ejection suit cause of action in 409
- in suits other than suits on contracts 109 109
- joinder of causes of action 446 447 [O 2 r 3]
  - under the Charter 1249 [Charter of 14]
- misjoinder of—
  - defendants and causes of action* 449
  - plaintiffs and causes of action* 405 448
- multifarious suits held to be 449 450
  - suits held not to be 450
- objection as to misjoinder of when to be taken 458 [O 2 r 7]
- pauper rejection of application to sue as if no cause of action 886 [O 33 r 5 (d)]
- plaint must contain facts constituting* 506 [O 7 r 1 (e)]
  - rejection of when it does not disclose 514 [O 7 r 11 (a)]
- plaintiff seeking relief in respect of several distinct* 512 [O 7 r 8]
- plaintiff several having separate causes of action* 406 408
- separate trials of different causes of action 448 [O 2 r 6]
- splitting cause of action 435 436 [O 2 r 2]
- successive claims arising under same obligation 436 [O 2 r 2 Explan] 438
- suit no fresh in respect of same when dismissed for non appearance 540
- rules precluding further on same cause of action 80 [s 12]

**Certificate—**

- abandonment of appeal in part after grant of to appeal to Privy Council 324
- ambassador sanctioning suit against 255 [s 86]
- Chiefs or Princes sanctioning suit against 255 [s 86]
- Court granting of by as to fitness to appeal to Privy Council, discretionary 1033
- execution on transfer of decrees for 646 [O 21 r 6 (b)]
- judgment debt of payment of out of Court 635 [O 21 r 2]
- judgment debtor authorising to mortgage &c his attached property 739 [O 21 r 83 (2)]
- leave for to appeal to Privy Council 1033 [O 45 r 3]
- legal representative certificate of sale to 768
- Privy Council—*see* Privy Council
- sale certificate of to bear date on which sale becomes absolute 768 [O 21 r 94]
  - to legal representative 768
  - to purchaser at court sale 768 [O 21 r 94]
- sale certificate amendment of 770
- variance between and proclamation of sale 770

**Breach of trust—**

particulars of, to be stated in pleadings 482 [O 6 r 4] 493

**British India—**

Aden is within 4

administrators etc outside need not be made parties 861 [O 31 r 2]

arbitrator leaving 1170 [Sch II para 5 (1) (b) (iii)]

arrest before judgment of defendant about to leave 951 [O 39 r 1 (b)]

commission to examine witness residing out of 838 [O 26 r 5]

definition of 4

firms suits by and against carrying on business in, 850 [O 30 r 1]

foreign firm when said to carry on business in 852

judgment how enforced in 81 82

Rajkot Civil Station is not within 832

Secunderabad Cantonment of is not within 832

security for costs and residence outside 831 [O 25 r 1 (1)] 832

where appellant resides outside 990 [O 41 r 10 (1) proviso]

Singapore is not within 4

summons service of where defendant resides outside 473 [O 5 r 2c]

tort committed beyond and place of suing 93

trustees outside need not be made parties 861 [O 31 r 2]

umpire leaving 1170 [Sch II para 5 (1) (b) (iii)]

Wadhwan Cantonment of is not within 832

**Burden of proof—**

in suit to establish right to attached property 223

mesne profits and 622

rules as to 600

**Business—**

agent service of summons on by whom defendant carries on 467 [O 5 r 13]

carrying on business through 102

business books verified copies of entries in instead of inspection 53 54

[O 11 r 19]

corporation where deemed to carry on 99 [s 20 Explan II]

Court transfer of business from one to another 391 [s 100]

foreign firm when said to carry on in British India 852

foreigner carrying on through agent 110

non resident carrying on within jurisdiction through an agent 600

jurisdiction from place of business 91 92 [s 16 proviso] 99 [s 20] 1240 1 11

[Charter cl 12]

meaning of carrying on business 101 102

receiver debts contracted by in course of 973 [Case 3]

Secretary of State and carrying on business 217

suit against person carrying on in name other than his own 860 [O 30 r 10]

summons affixing copy of on outer door of defendant's place of 463 [O 5 r 17] 469

transfer of from one Court to another 391 [s 100]

**Case—**

meaning of 344

**Caste—**

accounts of caste property suits relating to 23

caste property suits relating to 28

caste questions what are 23

**Chartered High Courts—*contd***

- criminal jurisdiction as to persons 1263 [Charter cl 13] 1278 [All cl 16] 1286 [Pat cl 16] 1290 [Lah cl 16] 1305 [Rang cl 22]
- extraordinary original 1263 [Charter cl 24] 1278 [All cl 17] 1286 [Pat cl 17] 1295 [Lah cl 17] 1300 [Rang cl 23]
- decree contingent upon decision of High Court 1017 [O 46 r 2]
- despatch from Secretary of State forwarding Charter 1225 1233
- establishment of in several Presidencies in India 1210 [High Courts Act s 1]
  - other High Courts in India 1213 [High Courts Act s 16]
- execution by of decrees transferred by other Courts 64 [O 21 r 9]
  - of decrees of time limit for 169
- extent of jurisdiction of governed by their respective Charters 92
- extraordinary original civil jurisdiction 338 1248 [Charter cl 13] 1277 [All cl 9]
  - 1294 [Pat cl 9] 1294 [Lah cl 9] 1302 [Rang cl 11]
  - criminal jurisdiction 1263 [Charter cl 24] 1278 [All cl 17] 1286 [Pat cl 17] 1295 [Lah cl 17] 1305 [Rang cl 23]
- foreigner non resident jurisdiction over 1246 1247
- Hollar v Dadabhai* discussed 1247 1248
- infants jurisdiction as to 1270 [Charter cl 17] 1277 [All cl 12] 1285 [Pat cl 12] 1295 [Lah cl 12] 1304 [Rang cl 15]
- inherent powers of 392 [s 151]
- Insolvent Court provisions with respect to 1261 [Charter cl 18] 1304 [Rang cl 16]
- issues of fact for trial to Lower Courts High Court may refer in second appeal 1016
- joinder of several causes of action under the Charter 1249 [Charter cl 14] 1303 [Rang cl 12]
- judges clerks and ministerial officers of High Court 1236 [Charter cls 3 4]
- judges of declaration to be made by 1236 [Charter cl 5] 1277 [All cl 3] 1283 [Pat cl 3] 1292 [Lah cl 3] 1301 [Rang cl 4]
  - provision as to appointment etc of 1210 1211 [High Courts Act s 6] 1215 1218 [Government of India Act ss 101 105]
  - where equally divided opinion of senior judge prevails 1268 [Charter cl 36] 1279 [All cl 17] 1298 [Pat cl 28] 1297 [Lah cl 26] 1307 [Rang cl 34]
- judgment meaning of as used in cl 15 of the Charter 1202 1254
- jurisdiction—See different items Civil etc
  - and powers of 1212 [High Courts Act s 9] 1219 [Government of India Act s 107] 1219 1220
  - appellate as to appeals from original suits 1250 [Charter cl 15]
    - from Courts in the Province 1260 [Charter cl 16]
  - exercise of not at usual place of sitting 1260 [Charter cl 31] 1279 [All cl 24] 1290 [Pat cls 35 36] 1299 [Lah cl 33] 1309 [Rang cls 41 43]
- Lahore High Court has no original jurisdiction 87 92
- Land Acquisition Act no appeals to Privy Council from certain award 1271
- land suits for within the meaning of cl 12 of the Charter what are 1241 1245
- law to be administered by the Chartered High Courts 1261 1262 [Charter cls 19 21]
  - 1277 [All cls 13 14] 1285 [Pat cls 13 14] 1290 [Lah cls 13 14] 1304 [Rang cl 17 20]
- leave of Court under cl 12 is a condition precedent to jurisdiction 1245
- Letters Patent High Courts to be established by 1210 [High Courts Act s 1]

**Certifying payment—**

payment of judgment debt out of Court to be certified to Court 630 [O 21 r 2]

**Certiorari—**

writ of 338

**Charge—**

interpleader suits when plaintiff entitled to a charge for costs in 913 [O 30 r 6]

pauper suits of Government for court fees in 891 [O 33 r 10]

suits to realize charge on immovable property 940 [O 34 r 10]

**Charities—**

suits relating to public 625 266 [s 92] See Public Charities

**Charter—See Chartered High Courts****Chartered High Courts—356 507 [ss 116 120] 1063 [O 49]—**

Aden Court of Political Resident at power to remove suits from 1249

Admiralty and Vice admiralty jurisdiction 1260 1266 [Charter cl 37 33]

Advocate General grant of certificate in criminal cases 1263 [Charter cl 21]

Advocates vakeels and attorneys—

powers of in admitting 1238 [Charter cl 9]

to make rules for admission of 138

to remove or suspend 1239

Allahabad High Court has no original jurisdiction 87 92.

appeal under cl 15 1202 154

from Courts in the Province 1260 [Charter cl 16]

Court of original jurisdiction to High Court in its appellate jurisdiction 1200 [Charter cl 15]

from criminal Courts in the Province 1264 [Charter cl 27] 1278 [All-

cl 20] 1286 [Pat cl 20] 1296 [Lah cl 20] 1300 [Rang cl 20]

order refusing leave under cl 12 of the Charter 1247 1259

rejecting application to set aside order granting leave under cl

12 of the Charter 1247 1258

no from High Court exercising original criminal jurisdiction 1263 [Charter cl 20]

to Privy Council—see Privy Council

appearance for suitors 1238 [Charter cl 9]

arrest of defendant guilty of contempt 1240

cause of action in suits on contracts within meaning of cl 12 of the Charter 1304

Charters of 1234 1310

Calcutta Bombay and Madras High Courts 1234 1270

Allahabad High Court 1276 1280

Lahore 1302 1299

Patna 1281 1291

Rangoon 1300 1310

civil jurisdiction of 1240 1262 [Charter cls 11 21]

Code extent of application of to 306 [s 117] 307 [s 110] 1003 [O 49 r 3]

conjugal rights decree for restitution of High Court has no jurisdiction under

cl 30 to grant unless both parties are Christians 1267

constitution of 1240 [High Courts Act 1861]

contempt arrest of defendant guilty of 1240

costs execution of decrees before ascertainment of 300 [s 118]

criminal jurisdiction 1267 1277 [Charter cl 20 30] 1277 1278 [All cl 10 20]

1286 1287 [Pat cls 10 23] 1290, 1296 [Lah cls 10 23]

1304 1306 [Rang cls 10 23]

**Chartered High Courts—*contd***

- revocation of Letters Patent of 1862 [Charter cl 1] 1235
- Rules in Sch. I of the Code how far applicable to [O 49 r 3] 1063
- rules as to transmission of copies of evidence to Privy Council [Charter cl 42] 1273
  - of practice for subordinate Courts to be framed by High Court 1219
  - [Government of India Act s 107]
- power of Chartered High Courts to make as to their original civil procedure 362 363 [s 129] 363 [Charter cl 37]
- rulings of different High Courts when different judge to follow ruling of High Court to which he is subordinate 18
- saving in respect of [O 49 r 2] 1063
- seal of High Courts [Charter cl 6] 1237
- service of certain processes of [O 49 r 1] 1063
- ship jurisdiction in respect of nces saries supplied to 1266
- Small Cause Courts are subordinate to 17 [s 3]
- special provisions in Code relating to 306 357 [ss 116 120]
- suits for land of which a part is within jurisdiction 145
  - within meaning of cl 12 of the Charter 1241 1245
  - partition of moveable and immovable property the latter being situated wholly outside jurisdiction 1245
- triable by in exercise of ordinary jurisdiction 1240 1241
- transferred under Charter cl 13 powers of High Court in dealing with 1240
- superintendence power of 333 1-19 1270
- Supreme Courts provisions applicable to to apply to Chartered High Courts 1212 [High Courts Act s 11]
- stay of suit pending in a subordinate Court 963 964
- testamentary and intestate jurisdiction 1266 1267 [Charter cl 34] 1279 [All cl 20] 1287 [Pat cl 26] 1296 [Lah cl 24] 1306 [Rang cl 32]
- time limit for execution of decrees of 169 170
- transfer of criminal case or appeal 1264 126, [Charter cl 29] 1278 [All cl 22] 1-87 [Pat cl 22] 1296 [Lah cl 22] 1306 [Rang cl 28]
  - of suits from Presidency Small Cause Court 1249
  - of suits or appeals by 117 [s 24] 1213 [High Courts Act s 15] 1248 [Charter cl 13]
  - of suit from Court in which it is filed to another Court where such Courts are under different High Courts 116 [s 23 (3)]
- unauthorised persons not to address 306 [s 119]
- writs etc to issue in name of the Crown 1237 [Charter cl 7]

**Cheque—**

- attachment liable to in execution of decrees 191 [s 60 (1)]

**Chiefs (ruling) and Princes—**

- agents recognised who may act as for 254 [s 85]
- arrest exemption from 250 [s 86 (3)]
- attachment of property of 250 [s 86 (3)]
- consent of G G in Council and suits against 255 [s 86]
- execution of decrees in territories of foreign Prince or State 147 [s 43]
  - passed by Courts of Native States 147 [s 44]
- limitation and time spent for obtaining certificate for filing suit against 207
- Political Agent whether can sue on behalf of a Prince 205
- private capacity suit against in their 207
- provisions of Code as to minors and lunatics do not apply to 882 [O 32 r 16]
- style of Princes and Chiefs as parties to suits 258 [s 87]



Chartered High Courts—*contd*

- lunatics jurisdiction as to 1260 [Charter cl 17] 1277 [All cl 12] 1280 [Pat cl 12] 1290 [Lah cl 12] 1301 [Rang cl 15]
- matrimonial jurisdiction 1267 [Charter cl 35]
- offenders to be punished under the Indian Penal Code 1260 [Charter cl 30]
- officers appointment of 1231 1233 [Charter cl 8]
- opinion of High Court power to refer case for 337 [s 113]
- orders in proceedings other than suits and appeals 1207 1208
- ordinary jurisdiction meaning of 1217
  - original civil jurisdiction local limits of 1210 [Charter cl 11] 1219 1302 [Rang cl 9]
- original civil jurisdiction as to suits 1240 1241 [Charter cl 12] 1300 [Rang cl 10]
  - provisions of Code how far applicable 357 [s 10]
- partition suit for of movable and immovable property the latter being situated wholly outside jurisdiction 1243
- Patna High Court has no original jurisdiction 97 92
- powers of Indian legislature preserved 1274 [Charter cl 44]
- powers of single judges and Division Courts 1268 [Charter cl 36]
- power to extend time for security and deposit in Privy Council appeals 1037
- power of to provide for exercise of jurisdiction by single judges or Division Court 1201 [Government of India Act s 108]
- power to grant leave to appeal to Privy Council *in forma pauperis* 1030
- Presidency Small Causes Court reference to High Court by 1046
  - transfer of suits from to High Court 1219
- Privy Council appeals to 1270 1273 [Charter cls 39 40] 1280 [All cls 30 33] 1289 1290 [Pat cls 31 34] 1290 1298 [Lah cls 29 32] 1308 1309 [Rang cls 37 40]
  - from decree or final orders of 317 [s 109]
  - interlocutory judgment 1270
  - in criminal cases 1272 1273 [Charter cl 41]
  - decisions appealable to under cl 39 of the Charter 1271
  - rules as to transmission of documents to 1273 [Charter cl 42]
- reference of questions as to jurisdiction in Small Causes 1017 1018 [O 46 r 6]—  
see Reference
- referred cases hearing of 1264 [Charter cl 28] 1278 [All cl 21] 1280 [Pat cl 11] 1290 [Lah cl 21] 1300 1301 [Rang cl 27]
- regulation of criminal proceedings 1269 1270 [Charter cl 38] 1279 1280 [All cl 29] 1288 [Pat cl 30] 1297 [Lah cl 28] 1300 [Rang cl 36]
- remand inherent power of High Court to in second appeal 1003
  - power of High Court in appeals from orders of 1013
- requestion for records by Government to be complied with 1273 1274 [Charter cl 43] 1280 [All cl 34] 1291 [Pat cl 40] 1299 [Lah cl 36] 1310 [Rang cl 46]
- reserving points of law for opinion of in criminal trials before High Courts in it
  - original criminal jurisdiction 1263 [Charter cl 25] 1278 [All cl 18] 1280 [Pat cl 18] 1290 [Lah cl 18] 1300 [Rang cl 24]
- restraining a party from proceeding with suit in another Court 963 964
- review by High Court in criminal cases [Charter cl 26] 1263
- revision powers of High Court as to 33 [s 115]
  - true function of High Court in 33
  - whether High Court can call for record of its own motion in, 344

**Collector—*contd***

- execution proceedings in orders by and appeal 226 [s 70 (2)] 227
  - revision 226 [s 70 (2)] 227
- instalments no power to allow payment of debt by 101
- judicially deemed to be acting in execution transferred decrees 227 [s 71]
- jurisdiction of civil Courts barred as to Collector's powers 226 [s 70 (2)]
- Land Acquisition Act Collector acting under s 11 of not a Court 345
- Local Government rules for execution of decrees by Collector to be made by 225 [s 70]
- money realised in execution of decree sent to Collector for execution 226
- mortgage by judgment debtor pending execution by 1203
- notices of suit to Collector under s 80 p 251
- nuisance consent of Collector to suit relating to 283 [s 93]
- objections whether Collector has power to hear to execution of decree 1202
- order made by in execution proceedings and revision 227
- owner when Collector may exercise power of 1204 [Sch III para 7 (2)]
- partition by of estate paying revenue to Government 184 [s 54]
- pauper suit when copy of decree to be sent to 89a [O 33 r 14]
- powers of to compel attendance and production 1203 [Sch III para 13]
- public charities consent of Collector to suit relating to 283 [s 93]
- visitation powers of as to 283
- public sale of land stay of 228 [s 72]
- receiver when Collector may be appointed 983 [O 40 r 5]
- refusal of to sanction suit under sec 93 p 283
- revenue to Government partition by Collector of estate paying 184 [s 54]
- sales in execution how to be conducted by 1207 [Sch III para 10]
- scheme for liquidation of decrees for payment of money 1204 105 [Sch III para 7]
- stay in certain cases of public sale of land 228 [s 72]
- substitution of judgment debtor providing for 1206 [Sch III para 9 (3) (u)]
- suit for setting aside orders made by Collector in execution proceedings 227
- transfer of certain decrees for execution by 224 [s 68]

**Commission—**

- commissioner powers of 814 [O 26 r 16]
- Court may issue commission to another Court 214 [s 76]
- ex parte* when commissioner may proceed 814 [O 26 r 18 (2)]
- expenses of to be paid into Court before issue of 844 [O 26 r 15]
- foreign Courts commissions issued by 215 [s 78]
- letter of request in lieu of 244 [s 77]
- parties appearance of before commissioner 815 [O 26 r 18 (1)]
- pauper applicant when may be ordered to be examined on, 885 [O 33 r 4 (2)]
- power of Court to issue 244 [s 77]
- purposes for which commissions may be issued 244 [s 76]
- witness attendance and examination of before commissioner 844 [O 26 r 17 (1)]
  - issue of process to on application of commissioner 844 [O 26 r 17 (2)]
- To examine witness—835 840 [O 26 rr 18]
- appeal from order directing issue of 833
  - refusing issue of 838
- arbitration commission may be issued pending reference to 836
- cases in which commission may be issued 83
- cross examination of witnesses on commission 839
- documents admissibility of produced before commissioner 840

**Chiefs (ruling) and Princes—*contd***

suits against 255 256 [s 86]

by 253 254 [s 84]

waiver of objection to want of consent by G. G. in Council 256.

**Civil nature—*See* Caste**

suits of a, 22 [s 9]

declaration of a right, to worship is a 28

of burial interference with is a 28

for setting aside election of directors is a 29

**Claims—*See* Attachment sub-head Investigation of claims**

investigation of claims to attached property "11 [O 21 r 58]

investigation of claims to property attached before judgment 956 [O 38 r 8]

sale in execution postponement of pending inquiry into claims "11 [O 21 r 58  
(2)]

splitting of for restitution 375 376

**Client—*See* Pleader**

act of pleader how far binds 14 16

confidential communications between client and legal adviser when privileged 563  
566

death of client or pleader determines pleader's appointment 461 [O 3 r 4 (\*)]

**Club—**

members of whether can be sued collectively through their secretary 420 421

suits against secretary of 421

suits by or against, 420 421

**Code of Civil Procedure—**

application of 1 [s 1]

Chartered High Courts Code applies to 357 s 120] 1063 [O 49 r 3]

Code includes Rules 5 [s 2 (1)]

exhaustive is not 392

inherent powers of Courts, provisions of Code not to affect 392 [s 151]

miscellaneous proceedings procedure in Code for suits to apply to 30 [s 141]

Presidency Small Cause Courts extent of application of to 21 [s 8] 1064 [O 51]

Provincial Small Cause Courts extent of application of to 20 [s. "] 1064 [O 50]

retrospective operation of 3

Revenue Courts application of Code to 19 [s. 5]

**Collector—**

accounts rendering of to Court 1200 [Sch III para 9] 1206

alienation prohibition as to pending execution by 1207 [Sch III para 11]

appeal to High Court from order passed by in execution proceedings -  
assets inquiry as to in execution proceedings 1202 1203 [Sch III para 4].

attachment of land and certified extract from Collector's register 1211 [O 21 r 14]

Bombay Mamlatdar's Courts Act II of 1906 Collector's Court and revision 315

debts inquiry as to in execution proceedings 1203 1204 [Sch III para 4]

decree powers of Collector in executing transferred to him 1201 [Sch III para 1].

procedure for liquidation of money 1201 1202 [Sch. III para. "]

decrees transfer of for execution by 4 [s 69]

decree-holders notice in certain cases to 120 [Sch. III para 3].

dispossession under order of 776

districts where property to be sold is in several 1204 [Sch III para 12]

District Court when may issue notices and enquire instead of, 1203 [Sch III para 5]

**Compromise of suit—*contd***

- appeal from order recording or refusing to record 827 1029 [O 43 r 1 cl (m)]
- client binding on by solicitor or counsel 14 15 827
- compromise of probate proceedings 873 874
  - when court should record 827
  - where fact of is denied 819 820
- decree in terms of 818 819 [O 23 r 3]
  - passed on unlawful compromise 822 826
  - which comprises matters not relating to suit 824 827
- fraud practised upon Court consent decree obtained by 292
- guardian of minor by 573 [O 32 7]
- Hindu widow by how far binding on reversioners 60
- joint Hindu family compromise by adult members of how far binds minor members 67
- minor by guardian or next friend of 573 [O 32 r 7]
- parties by out of Court 818 819 [O 23 r 3] *See* Adjustment
- probate proceedings of out of Court 823 874
- registration whether necessary when compromise affects land not in suit 828
- representative suit and compromise 423
- submission and award as constituting adjustment of suit 820 822

**Compulsory deposits—**

- attachment of 192 [s 60 (1) (i)] 200
- definition of 200

**Concise statement—**13 [O 7 r 9 (1)]**Condition precedent—**

- when to be pleaded 487 [O 6 r 6]

**Conduct of suit—**

- where parties numerous 434 [O 1 r 11]

**Conjugal rights—*See* Restitution of conjugal rights****Consent—**

- Advocate General of to suits relating to public charities 265 [s 92] 268
  - to public nuisance 261 [s 91]
- alien enemy of Governor General in Council to suits by 253 [s 83 (1)]
- ambassadors of Governor General in Council to suits against 255 [s 86]
- Chiefs (ruling) of Governor General in Council to suits against 255 [s 86]
- disability consent to proceedings in suits on behalf of persons under 367 [s 147]
- enlargement of time and consent order 389
- guardian *ad litem* no person to be appointed without his consent 809 [O 32 r 4 (3)]
- judge may be made an arbitrator by 112
- jurisdiction cannot be conferred by 112
- next friend no person to be added as without his consent 426 [O 1 r 10 (3)]
- plaintiff no person to be added as without his consent 426 [O 1 r 10 (3)]
- remand of case by for trial of issues not raised in appeal 1013
- withdrawal of suit by one plaintiff without consent of others 808 [O 23 r 1 (4)]
  - with consent of defendant 815

**Consent decree—**

- appeal from 288 [s 96 (3)] 231 292
- decree by consent of parties on a compromise 818 819 [O 23 r 3]
- estoppel and 74

**Commission—*contd***

- duty of Court receiving commission to examine witnesses, 838 [O 26 r 6]
- evidence admissibility of taken on of a person residing outside British India, 838
- reading of taken on commission 840
- exempted persons from attending Court 836
- order for issue of commission when made 836 [O 26 r 2]
- persons who can be examined on 835-838
- return of commission with deposition of witnesses 839 [O 26 r 7]
- returned Court to direct where commission to be 837 [O 26 r 4 (3)]
- revision order refusing issue of outside British India not subject to 838

**For Local investigation—840-842 [O 26 rr 9 10]**

- commissioner procedure of 841 [O 26 r 10 (1)]
- evidence further after commissioner's report 842
- examination of commissioner by Court 841 [O 26 r 10 (2)]
- inquiry further when Court dissatisfied with proceedings 841 [O 26 r 10 (3)]
- market value of property to ascertain 840 [O 26 r 9]
- mesue profits to ascertain 840 [O 26 r 9]
- report commissioner's to be evidence in suit 841 [O 26 r 10 (-)]
- when issued 840 [O 26 r 9]

**To examine accounts—842 [O 26 rr 11 12]**

- evidence proceedings and report to be 842 [O 26 r 12 (-)]
- instructions Court to give commissioner necessary 842 [O 26 r 12 (1)]
- inquiry when Court may direct further 842 [O 26 r 12 (2)]
- when issued 842 [O 26 r 11]

**To make partition—843-844 [O 26 rr 13 14]**

- commissioner procedure of 843 [O 26 r 14]
- report Court to confirm vary or set aside 843 [O 26 r 14 (2)]
- when set aside Court may issue new commission 843 [O 26 r 14 (3)]
- resistance to commissioner 843
- when issued 843 [O 26 r 13]

**Commissioner—See Commission.**

- delegation of power by Court to to try material issue not allowed 841
- documents admissibility of produced before 840
- ex parte* when may proceed 845 [O 26 r 18 (-)]
- parties appearance of before 845 [O 26 r 18 (1)]
- powers of 844 [O 26 r 16]
- witnesses attendance and examination of before 844 [O 26 r 17 (1)]
- issue of process to on application of 844 [O 26 r 17 (2)]

**Company—See Corporation.****Compensation—**

- appeal from order awarding for wrongful arrest attachment or injunction 284
- arrest or attachment before judgment in case of 284 [a. 93] 284
- award of for wrongful arrest attachment or injunction 284 [a. 93 (1)]
- cost compensatory in respect of vexatious claim or defence 133, 134 [a. 35 (1)]
- counterclaim for in a summary suit 286
- injunction interim in case of 284 285 [a. 93] 284
- undertaking by plaintiff on grant of 287
- suit, award of compensation under s. 93 bars 285 [a. 93 (2)] 286

**Compromise of suit—**

- agreement to take oath under the Oaths Act not an adjustment 822
- must be one adjusting a suit 822

**Compromise of suit—*contd***

- appeal from order recording or refusing to record 827 1029 [O 43 r 1 cl (m)]
- client binding on by solicitor or counsel 14 15 827
- compromise of probate proceedings 873 824
  - when court should record 827
  - where fact of is denied 819 820
- decree in terms of 818 819 [O 23 r 3]
  - passed on unlawful compromise 822 826
  - which comprises matters not relating to suit 824 827
- fraud practised upon Court consent decree obtained by 292
- guardian of minor by 873 [O 3- 7]
- Hindu widow by how far binding on reversioners 60
- joint Hindu family compromise by adult members of how far binds minor members 877
- minor by guardian or next friend of 873 [O 32 r 7]
- partie by out of Court 818 819 [O 23 r 3] See Adjustment
- probate proceedings of out of Court 823 824
- registration whether necessary when compromise affects land not in suit 878
- representative suit and compromise 423
- submission and award as constituting adjustment of suit 820 822

**Compulsory deposits—**

- attachment of 19- [s 60 (1) (A)] 200
- definition of 200

**Concise statement—**13 [O 7 r 9 (1)]**Condition precedent—**

- when to be pleaded 487 [O 6 r 6]

**Conduct of suit—**

- where parties numerous 434 [O 1 r 11]

**Conjugal rights—See Restitution of conjugal rights****Consent—**

- Advocate General of to suits relating to public charities 265 [s 92] 268
  - to public nuisance 261 [s 91]
- alien enemies of Governor General in Council to suits by 253 [s 83 (1)]
- ambassadors of Governor General in Council to suits against 255 [s 86]
- Chiefs (ruling) of Governor General in Council to suits against 255 [s 86]
- disability consent to proceedings in suits on behalf of persons under 387 [s 147]
- enlargement of time and consent order 389
- guardian *ad litem* no person to be appointed without his consent 869 [O 32 r 4 (3)]
- judge may be made an arbitrator by 112
- jurisdiction cannot be conferred by 112
- next friend no person to be added as without his consent 426 [O 1 r 10 (3)]
- plaintiff no person to be added as without his consent 426 [O 1 r 10 (3)]
- remand of case by for trial of is uses not raised in appeal 1013
- withdrawal of suit by one plaintiff without consent of others 808 [O 23 r 1 (4)]
  - with consent of defendant 815

**Consent decree—**

- appeal from 288 [s 96 (3)] 291 292
- decree by consent of parties on a compromise 818 819 [O 23 r 3]
- estoppel, and 74.

**Consent decree—could**

execution of 826 827

Hindu widow, against how far binding on reversioners 67

set aside when a consent decree may be 74

setting aside of procedure for 292 293

**Consolidation of suits—**

inherent power of Court as to 393 985 1034

on appeal to Privy Council 1034 [O 45 r 4]

**Construction—**

of Code 24

of decree by executing Court 142

of deed is a question of law and second appeal will lie 301

**Contempt of Court—**

appeal from order of committal or refusing committal for, 1253

arrest for no exemption from 364 [s 13, (2)]

discovery or inspection non compliance with order for and 575

inherent power of High Court to punish summarily for 394

receiver interference with and 972 978

witness proceedings against 598

**Contract—**

agency of and place of suing 105

breach of and place of suing 104

cause of action in suits on 103 108 1246

denial of in pleadings 490 [O 6 r 8]

discharge of defendant pleading and particulars in pleadings 485

illegal Court ought not to enforce 490

implied, averment of 492 [O 6 r 12]

injunction temporary to restrain breach of 964 [O 39 r 2] 965-967

joinder of parties liable on same contract 416 [O 1 r 6]

joint liability on 417

and several liability on 417

letters contract constituted by and pleadings 492 [O 6 r 12]

performance of defendant pleading and particulars in pleadings 485

place of suing contract as to 33

pre-emption by 627

several liability on 417

specific performance of decree for mode of execution of 676 677 [O 21 r 3<sup>o</sup>]

wagering, defence of must be specifically pleaded 49

**Contribution—**

suit for by one judgment debtor against another in respect of costs 133

**Conveyance—**

execution of by Judge or officer of Court 680 [O 21 r 34 (4)]

**Copy—**

execution application for and copy of decree 649 [O 21 r 11 (3)]

transfer of decree for and copy of decree 646 [O 21 r 6 (a)]

exhibits copies of when appeal preferred 999 [O 41 r 13 (3)]

judgment and decree in appeal copies of furnished to parties 107 [O 41 r 30]

memo of appeal copies of judgment and decree to accompany 993 [O 41 r 1]

**Corporation—**

- attendance personal of officer of power to require 850 [O 29 r 3]
- business where deemed to carry on and place of suing 99 [s 20 Expln II]
- decree against company in liquidation transfer of 661
  - mode of executing 676 [O 21 r 32 (2)]
- examination of officer of as to property of 688 [O 21 r 41]
- foreign corporation 848
- Indian Companies Act procedure of Code applies to certain petitions under 372
- injunction against 96b [O 39 r 5]
- interrogatorie to delivery of 560 [O 11 r 5]
- liquidator of registered and attachment of property of 213
- place of suing 99 [s 20 Expln II]
- pleadings subscription and verification of 848 [O 29 r 1]
- principal officer of corporation who is 849
  - bares in attachment of 69\_ [O 21 r 46]
  - delivery of in execution 738 [O 21 r 79 (3)]
  - sale of in execution 736 [O 21 r 76]
  - transfer of sold in execution 738 [O 21 r 80]
- suits by or against 848 400 [O 29]
- summon service of upon 849 850 [O 29 r 2]
- unregistered or unincorporated society suit by 849
- verification by principal officer of 849

**Co sharer—**

- bid of to have preference in sale of property 737 [O 21 r 77 (3)] 742 [O 21 r 88]
- right of to apply for setting aside sale of immovable property in execution 742

**Costs—**

- action for costs against a person not a party to suit 131
- adjournment costs of 601 [O 17 r 1 (2)]
  - payment condition precedent to 601
- administration suit costs in 131
- affidavit containing hearsay or argumentative matters 612 [O 19 r 3 (2)]
- alternative relief claimed against defendants in the and costs 415
- appeal whether it lies for costs 132 133
- applications in suits 128
- arbitration costs of 117\_ [Sch II para 13]
- arbitration refusal to go to no ground for refusing costs 129
- bankruptcy assignee in suit continued by and costs of defendant 799
- co-defendants and 131
- compensatory in respect of vexatious claim or defence 133 134
- compromise offer of and right of successful plaintiff to 129
- contribution suit for in respect of costs 133
- costs costs in the cause meaning of 1<sup>98</sup>
- decree to give directions as to 615 [O 20 r 6 (2)]
- delegation of discretion of Court to award 131
- direction for in decree in appeal 1026 [O 41 r 35 (3)]
- disallowing costs to a successful plaintiff 1<sup>99</sup>
- discretion of Court costs to be in 127 [s 3\_ (1)] 128 131
- dishonoured bill costs of noting non acceptance of 900 [O 37 r 6]
- documents of proving when notice to admit not given or complied with 576 [O 12 r 2]
- event costs as a rule to follow 127 [s 3\_ (2)] 1\_9
- execution of decree before ascertainment of costs 3\_6 [s 11<sup>9</sup>]



Costs—*contd*

- facts of proving when notice to admit not complied with 577 [O 1<sup>o</sup> r 4]
- Gaming Act defence under and costs 130
- guardian *ad litem* costs incurred by officer of court acting as 869 [O 32 r 4(4)]
- incidental to suit 128
- insolvency costs of suit payable by plaintiff prior to his 798
- interest on 197 [s 35 (3)] 1044
- interpleader suits in 911 912 [O 35 r 3 4] 913 [ib r 6]
- interrogatories of 560 [O 11 r 3]
- issues costs of particular 129 130
- joint defence by two defendants one of whom is successful and question of 13<sup>o</sup> 131
- judgment in favour of one plaintiff against another plaintiff and question of 131
- jurisdiction absence of no bar to exercise by Court of power as to 1.7 [s 35 (1)]
- Letters Patent order as to costs not appealable under cl 15 of 133
- lien of pleader for where set off claimed by defendant 524 [O 8 r 6(2)]
  - solicitor's for costs 529 531
- limitation defendant pleading and question of 130
- mortgage suits costs in 905 [O 34 r 2(a)] 909 915 [ib r 4] 925 [ib r 7]
  - costs subsequent to decree 931 [O 34 r 10]
- next friend liability of for 863
- of notice for admission or production of unnecessary documents 891 [O 1<sup>o</sup> r 9]
- officer of Court incurred by as guardian *ad litem* 869 [O 32 r 4(4)]
- partnership suit costs in 131
- party to suit costs cannot be ordered against person who is not 131
- pauper partly succeeds and partly fails 893
- pauper of application for leave to sue as and of inquiry 896 [O 33 r 16<sup>o</sup>]
  - suit in whether Court may award a successful defendant his 894
- payment made into Court costs where 830 [O 24 r 4]
- penalty whether costs could be awarded as 128
- pleader liability of for costs in suit on behalf of minor 864 [O 3<sup>o</sup> r 2(1)] 865
- plaintiff only partially successful and 130
  - successful disallowing costs to when 129
  - successful against one defendant but not against another 415 416
- postponement of occasioned by plaintiff's default as to summons 535 [O 9 r 6(2)]
- probate court proceedings in costs of 131
- proclamation of sale costs not covered by 743 [O 21 r 89(3)]
- reference to High Court cost of 1047 [O 46 r 4]
- relief against defendants in the alternative and 415
- refund of costs order for on variation or reversal of decree 373 [s 144 (1)]
- representative suit and costs 424
- second appeal whether lies on a matter of costs only 133
- Secretary of State against 133
- security for costs of suit—*See* sub head Security for costs of suit
- security for costs in appeal—*See* sub head Security for costs in appeal
- separate costs question of when defence common to all defendants 130
- set off, and lien of pleader for costs 535 [O 8 r 6(2)]
  - Court may direct costs payable to party to be 615 [O 20 r 6(3)]
- solicitor's lien for 529 531
- subsistence allowances sums disbursed for to be costs in suit 68<sup>o</sup> [O 21 r 39(5)]
- suit withdrawal of payment of costs on, 812
  - separate for costs 132
- summary suit costs in 946 [O 37 r 2(2)]

**Costs—*contd***

- stay of execution costs of application for 99
- taxation review of rule as to 133
- true costs of 131
- unnecessary matter in pleadings affects question of 494
- variation or reversal of decree order for refund of costs on 373 [s 144 (1)]
- withdrawal of suit payment of costs on 812
- witnesses of successful party guilty of exaggeration and costs 130

**Security for costs of suit—531 833 [O 20]**

- appeal from order made by High Court requiring plaintiff to give 834
  - refusing to set aside order of dismissal of suit for failure to give 833 1029 [O 43 r (1) (n)]
- cross claim by defendant residing out of British India and 834
- failure to furnish effect of 834 [O 45 r 2]
- insolvency of plaintiff security for costs to be given on 797 [O 22 r 8]
- instances where security for costs required 834
- minor where plaintiff is a 833
- next friend retiring to give security for costs already incurred 878 [O 32 r 8 (1)]
- pauper where leave is granted to plaintiff to sue as 833
- plaintiff security for costs from 831 [O 20 r 1]
- poverty of plaintiff 833
- res judicata* and dismissal of suit for failure to furnish 833
- setting aside of order of dismissal for failure to furnish 835 [O 20 r 2 (2)<sup>1</sup>]
- suit for payment of money 831 [O 25 r 3] 834
- woman where plaintiff is a 831 832 [O 25 r 1 (3)] 833

**Security for costs in appeal—**

- effect of failure to comply with order for further to Privy Council 1039 [O 45 r 11]
- appellant security for costs from 995 [O 41 r 10]
- at what stage respondent should apply for 996
- consequence of not furnishing 995 [O 41 r 10 (2)]
- further security for costs of appeal to Privy Council 1039 [O 45 r 10]
- insolvent or poor appellant and 996
- pauper appellant whether can be called upon to furnish 996
- Privy Council appeal to on dismissal of appeal for failure to furnish 334
  - security for costs of 1036 1038 [O 45 rr 7 9]
- time extension of for giving 996

**Counsel—*See* Advocate Barrister**

- case for opinion of and brief for privileged from discovery and inspection 566

**Counterclaim—**

- rules as to joinder of claims (O 2 r 4) apply to 456
- security for costs in case of made by defendant residing out of British India 834
- summary suits in for arrest before judgment 286

**Courts—**

- Additional and Assistant Judge's Courts subordinate to District Court 117 [s 24 (3)]
- amend issues to powers of 590 [O 14 r 5]
- appellate powers of 316 [s 107] 1023 [O 41 r 33]
- arbitrator where a judge may act as 1186
- attachment of property in custody of Court 70 [O 21 r 52]
- Chartered High Courts 366 367 [ss 116 120] 1063 [O 49]—*See* Chartered High Courts
- civil Courts to try only suits of a civil nature 22 [s 91]

Courts—*contd*

- Collector's jurisdiction civil Courts barred as to matters within 226
- Competent jurisdiction of and res judicata 63
- Court which passed a decree definition of 137 [s 37]
- English Courts jurisdiction of over British Indian subjects in British India 83
- executing Court bound by but may construe decree 142
- jurisdiction of 140 141
- foreign judgment on a decree of British Indian Court 85
- Prince or State Courts established by Governor General in territories of and execution of decrees 147 [s 43] 148 [s 45]
- grades of outside Presidency towns 87 88
- High Court power to refer case for opinion of 337 [s 113]
- immovable property sale of in execution what Courts can order 739 [O 21, r 82]
- inherent powers of Courts 392 [s 151] 392 396
  - to restore suit dismissed for plaintiff's non appearance 541 542
  - to strike out scandalous matter from pleadings 494
- inspection of property by Court 618 [O 18 r 18]
- issues Court to frame 586 [O 14 r 1 (5)]
  - power of Court to amend or strike out 586 [O 14 r 5]
- jurisdiction Court of concurrent 64
  - exclusive 63
  - of English Courts over British Indian subjects in British India, 83
  - of Courts executing decrees 140 141
- language of Courts subordinate to High Courts 369 [s 137]
- name of Court in which suit brought to be stated in plaint 506 [O 7 r 1 (a)]
- Native State of and execution, 147 [s 44]
  - British Indian Court has no power to restrain party from proceeding with suit in 863
- negotiable instruments Courts empowered to try summary suits on 945 [O 37 r 1]
- opinion of power to state case for 266 [s 90]
- papers from its own records or from other Courts may be sent for 586 586 [O 13 r 10]
- payment into Court 828 831 [O 24]
- plaint duty of Court to examine before issue of summons 515
- Presidency Small Cause Courts 21 [s 8] 1064 [O 51]
- Privy Council application for execution of orders of 1042 1043 [O 45 r 15]
  - powers of Court pending appeal to 1039 1040 [O 45 r 13]
- Provincial Small Cause Courts 20 [s 7] 1064 [O 50]
- public charities Courts competent to try suits relating to 278 280
- receiver what Courts can appoint 971
- reference to High Court 337 [s 113] 1045 1046 [O 46]
- restore suit dismissed for plaintiff's non appearance inherent power of Court to 541 542
- Revenue Courts 19 [s 5]
- review Court to which application for to be made 337 [s 114] 1050 [O 47 r 1]
- sale of immovable property in execution what Courts can order 739 [O 21 r 8-]
- setting aside decree *ex parte* application for pending appeal from decree 546 547
- stay of execution application for to be made to which Court 900
  - of decree when Court may order 673 [O 21 r 26]
- subordination of 17 [s 3]
- tunc power of to enlarge 387 [s 148] 398
- transfer of business of one Court to another 391 [s. 150]
  - suits 115 117 [ss 2- 24]

**Courts—*could***

transferred decrees power of Courts in executing 145 [s. 42]

**Court Fees—**

appeal from order refusing to order payment of in pauper suits 894

cases in which Court will allow party to make up 390 391

Court fees Act s. 149 applies to all documents chargeable with court fees under 391

deficiency of power of Court to allow party to make up 380 [s. 149]

Government right of to apply for payment of in pauper suits 890 [O 33 r 12]

mesne profits decrees as to and 622

pauper suits exemption from payment of in 890 [O 33 r 8]

Crown a prerogative of precedence in respect of court fees under 892

recovery of court fees in 891 [O 33 r 10]

plaint must show value of subject matter of suit for purpose of 106 [O 7 r 1 (4)]

rejection of or return of and 514

res judicata and dismissal of suit for failure to pay additional 70

revision directing plaintiff to make up deficiency 517

valuation of suits 89 91

**Creditor—**

Administration suit when creditors may institute, 624

debtor must find his 106 107

Insolvent Debtors Acts right of secured creditors under 674

judgment debtor definition of 12 [s. 2 (10)]

**Criminal Court—**

adjustment uncertified and criminal proceedings 644 645

decision of and res judicata 66

**Crop—See Agricultural produce**

attachment of 690 [O 21 r 44 (a)]

which does not admit of being stored 691 [O 21 r 44 (5)]

growing crop is movable property 14 [s. 2 (13)]

interim order prohibiting removal of growing crop 691 [O 21 r 45 (4)]

sale of growing crop 730 736 [O 21 r 74 (75)]

**Cross claims—**

execution in case of 667 [O 21 r 19]

mortgage suits in 667 [O 21 r 20]

**Cross decrees—**

assignment in case of 664 [O 21 r 18] 665 666

execution in case of 664 [O 21 r 18]

for payment of two sums of money 666

mortgage suits in 667 [O 21 r 20]

parties must fill same character in both suits 666

setting off cross decrees against each other conditions necessary for 667

**Cross objections—**

consequence of not filing 1005

correspondent when cross objections may be filed against 1007

dismissal of appeal effect of on 1005 [O 41 r 22 (4)] 1006

form of 1004 [O 41 r 22 (2)]

Letters Patent appeal and 1008

limitation dismissal of appeal on ground of bars hearing of 1005

non joinder of party in mortgage suit dismissal of appeal for effect of 1005

second appeal from decree of first appellate Court disallowing cross objections 1005

cross objections may be filed in 1008

**Cross objections—*contd***

- time within which to be filed 1004 [O 41 r 22 (1)] 1008
- withdrawal of appeal effect of on 1005 [O 41 r 22 (4)] 1006
- who may file 1004 [O 41 r 22 (1)] 1006 1007

**Cy pres doctrine—**

- power of Court to apply in settling schemes of public charities 283

**Damages—**

- attachment mere right to sue for damages not liable to 191 [s 60 (1) (c)]
- commission to ascertain 840 [O 26 r 9]
- defendant need not plead to 521 [O 8 r 3]
- deposit by defendant in Court in suit to recover damages 898 [O 24 r 1]
- interest recoverable as in mortgage suits 934
- pleadings and matters affecting 478 521 [O 8 r 3]
- public nuisance no special damages necessary for instituting suit relating to "61 [s 91]
- reversal of decree and order for payment of damages 373 [s 144 (1)]
- variation of decree and order for payment of damages 373 [s 144 (1)]

**Damdapat—**

- meaning and rule of 126 127
- mortgage how far rule of damdupat applies in case of 126 127

**Death—*See* Abatement**

- abatement of suit and death of party 778 [O 22 r 1]
- arbitrator or umpire death of 1170 [Sch II para 5 (1) (b) (i)]
- appeal death of either party pending and abatement 780
- appellants death of one of several and abatement 782 969
- client death of determines pleader's appointment 461 [O 3 r 4 (2)]
- defendant death of after preliminary decree 794
- guardian *ad litem* death of 879 [O 32 r 11]
- hearing death of party after but before judgment 796 [O 22 r 6]
- judge death of before completion of trial of suit 610 [O 18 r 15]
- next friend death of stay of proceedings on 879 [O 32 r 10 (1)]
- pauper applicant death of and abatement 780
  - pending hearing of application 885
- public charities death of party in suit relating to 282
- reference order of death of party after application but before 1167
- stay of proceedings on death of next friend 879 [O 32 r 10 (1)]

**Debt—**

- attachment application by alleged debtor for removal of 713
  - mode of of debt 692 [O 21 r 46]
  - of debt after same is paid by cheque 694
  - of debt no bar to judgment debtor suing for it 693
  - liability of debt to 191 [s 60 (1)] 196 197
  - whether debt enforceable by foreign Courts only is liable to 19
- definition of 196
- delivery of in execution "38 [O 21 r 79 (3)]
- deposit by defendant in Court in suit to recover debt 898 [O 24 r 1]
- discharge of on passing of foreclosure decree 911 [O 34 r 3 (3)] 913 914
  - final decree in redemption suit 909 [O 34 r 8 (3)]
- exact amount of need not be stated for purposes of attachment 603
- garnishee debt and procedure for attachment of 694
- instances of attachable debts 197
- receiver debts contracted by in course of business [Case 3] 973

## Debtor—

- must find his creditor 106
- place of suing 106

Decree—See Preliminary decree Final decree Decree *ex parte*

accounts in suits for 6-9 [O 20 r 16]

order directing accounts whether a decree 8

act of State is not a decree 318

adjudication which is appealable as an order is not a decree 10

adjustment of 635 [O 21 r 2]

administration suit decree in 6-3 [O 20 r 13]

agreement not to execute 153

alienation from trustee decree for possession against 2 7 278

amendment of decree inherent power of Court as to 397

amendment of decree application for and res judicata 79 80

amendment of decree 397 [s 152] 397 398

appeal—See Appeal

appeal from original decree 288 [s 96]

assignment of by decree holder 6 4 [O 21 r 16] See Transfer of Decree..

award decree against Hindu widow based on and reversioner 60

decree based on 1182 [Sch II para 16] 1183 1193 [ib para 21]

benamidar how far decree against binds real owner 59

certified copies of furnishing 630 [O 20 r 20] 1027 [O 41 r 36]

Collector transfer of certain decrees for execution by 213 [s 63]

compromise decree in terms of 818 819 [O 23 r 3]

conflicting decree and res judicata 80

conjugal rights decree for restitution of and res judicata 43

consent decree 288 [s 96 (3)] 291 292 816-828 [O 23 r 3]

and e toppel 74

procedure for setting aside 292

construction of by executing Court 78 147

contents and date of original decree 615 [O 20 rr 6 7]

appellate decree 1026 [O 41 r 30]

Court which passed a decree meaning of 137 [s 37]

Courts by which decrees may be executed 139 140 [s 38]

cross-decrees execution in case of 664 [O 21 r 18]

decisions under certain acts when not decrees 7

decree to agree with judgment 615 [O 20 r 6 (1)]

default decree against plaintiff by bars fresh suit 537 538 [O 9 r 9]

definition of decree 5 [s 2 (2)]

drawn up decree must be before an appeal from it can be entertained 289 294..

executed what decrees may be 130 136

executor who has not proved and decrees against 181 182

execution of—See Execution of Decree

execution application for —See Execution of Decree Sub head (1)

in case of cross decree 664 [O 21 r 18]

in case of declaratory decree 101

pending reference to High Court not allowed 1047

[O 46 r 2]

property attached in execution of decrees of several Courts 203 204 [s 63]

only decree capable of execution is decree of Court of last instance 130

questions relating to 107 15 [s 47]

transfer of decree for execution 142 [s 39] 143

Decree—*could*

final for foreclosure 911 [O 34 r 3] and 915 919 [ib 5] redemption 92 93  
[ib r 8]

decree passing of during pendency of appeal from preliminary decree 904

finality of decree in redemption suit 73

firm decree in suit against 858

foreign Court execution of decree of passed without jurisdiction by 80 83.

fraud suit to set aside decree obtained by or sale in execution of decree obtained  
by and place of suing 100

Government decree in suit for partition of estate paying revenue to 184 [s. 14].

heir decree against a wrong person as and execution 151

High Court decree passed by on second appeal and execution 135

Hindu widow decree against how far binding on reversioners 60 (1)

immovable property for recovery of 116 [O 20 r 9]

inherent power of Court to amend 397

injunction decree for and res judicata, 43

instalment decree may direct payment by 616 [O 20 r 11]

interest rate of when decree is for the payment of money 123 1-4 [s. 34]

where decree awards mere profits but silent about 6-1

irregularity decree not to be interfered with in appeal for mere 29 [s. 60]

joint decree and application for execution 631 [O 21 r 15]

when cannot be executed by one of several decree-holders 65...

judge procedure where has vacated office before issuing decree 615 [O 20 r 1]

judgment decree on 123 [s. 33]

decree to agree with 115 [O 20 r 6 (1)]

jurisdiction decree of foreign Court passed without 80 83

decree passed without 115

Karnataka of 1881 how far decree against Hindu members of 1881 59

land decree for possession of 116

legal representative decree against 150 [s. 3-]

application for execution of decree against 178

liability of and satisfaction of decree 178

orders of administration when necessary before passing decree 30- 309

limitation decree to be executed must not have been barred by 130

maintenance for no bar to subsequent suit for maintenance at enhanced rate 42

mere profit 137

mere profit decree for and possession 115 [O 20 r 12]

silent as to 119

minor for or against when involved 150

procedure to set aside decree against 11 165 153.

mode of paying money under decree 634 [O 21 r 1]

monetary personal decree against for balance due after sale 92- [O 21 r 1] 93.

movable property decree for delivery of 116 [O 20 r 10]

mutual accidental and amendment of decree 378

order of dismissal for default is not a decree [s. 2 (\*) (b)]

order rejecting plaint is a decree [s. 2 (\*)] 9

under s. 47 (execution proceedings) is a decree 5 [s. 2 (\*)]

under 144 (for restitution) is a decree 3 1

partition decree in suit for 629 [O 20 r 15].

of estate paying revenue to Government 11 [s. 4].

Decree—*contd*

- partnership in suit for dissolution of 627 [O 20 r 15]
  - pauper refusal of leave to sue as how far a decree 7
  - payment of dower conditional on 43
    - out of Court of money payable under 635 [O 21 r 2]
    - to decree holder directing 634
  - possession of land decree for 616
  - postponement of payment of amount of 616 [O 20 r 11 (1)]
  - pre-emption suit decree in 625 [O 20 r 14]
  - preliminary decree appeal from 293 [s 97]
    - when not drawn up 294
    - definition of 5 [s 2 (2) Explan]
  - probate when necessary before passing of decree 507-509
  - receiver after decree 9-8
  - redemption suit finality of decree in 73
  - reference to High Court decree not to be executed pending 1047 [O 46 r 2]
  - relief decree for larger than what is claimed when given 510
    - providing for events after institution of suit 512
  - Religious Endowments Act whether order under is a decree 7
  - representative suit decree in 424
  - res judicata and decree for restitution of conjugal rights 43
    - and application for amendment of decree 79-80
  - restitution of uncertified payment on reversal of decree 643
  - Revenue Court *decis on of* when operates as a decree 66
  - reversal of before confirmation of auction sale 218
    - after confirmation of auction sale 217
  - sale in execution of effect of reversal of decree upon 218
  - satisfied decree when said to be fully 177
  - second appeal amendment of decree passed in 399
    - from appellate decree 299-300 [s 100]
  - set off decree in suit where is allowed 620-630 [O 20 r 19]
  - setting aside consent decree procedure for 292
    - of decree in suit which is either over valued or under valued 89-90.
    - by accidental and amendment of 398
  - stay of execution of 63 [O 21 r 26] 989-990 [O 41 r 5]
    - pending appeal to Privy Council 1040 [O 45 r 13 (2) (c)].
    - proceedings pending reference to High Court 1047 [O 40 r 2]
  - suit decree against plaintiff for default bars fresh 70
    - to set aside decree obtained by fraud and place of suing 109
  - summons when decree may be passed without is use of 464
  - surety for the performance of a decree 382 [s 145 (a)]
  - transfer of decree for execution 142 [s 39] See Transfer of Decree
    - for execution by Collector 224 [s 68] See Collector
    - against a company in liquidation 661
  - transferee of decree application for execution by 654 [O 21 r 16]
    - pending attachment 662
    - execution 661
  - trustee how far decree against binds his successor 59
  - withdrawal of suit granting of leave for is not a decree 816
- Decree *ex parte*—535 [O 9 r 6]
- appeal from 288 [s 96 (2)]
  - Court to which application to set aside to be made when appeal filed 546-547.
  - fraud setting aside decree *ex parte* obtained by 547-548



**Decree ex parte—*contd***

- legal representative of defendant right to apply to set aside 548
- minor defendant *ex parte* decree against 549
- notice to opposite party no decree to be set aside without 541 [O 9 r 14]
- property taken in execution of set aside 142
- remand in appeal from an order refusing to set aside an *ex parte* decree 1011
- remedies open to defendant against whom *ex parte* decree passed 544 545
- res judicata* how far 42
- satisfaction of under protest no bar to application to set aside 543
- second appeal from appellate decree passed *ex parte* 300 [s 100 (2)]
- set aside may be when 544 [O 9 r 13] 548
  - against all defendants when 544 [O 9 r 13 proviso] 549 553
- setting aside of *ex parte* decree obtained by fraud 547 548
  - of *ex parte* decree after appeal 547
    - effect of 543
  - sufficient cause for setting aside *ex parte* decree 548
- surety liability of and 383
- terms on which *ex parte* decree may be set aside 549
- time within which application should be made to set aside 545 554
- when passed 535 [O 9 r 6]

**Decree holder—**

- adjustment suit by decree holder upon an uncertified 639
- appeal as to question between judgment debtor and representative of 661
- assignment of decree by and execution 654 [O 21 r 16]
- bid or buy property not to without leave of Court 733 [O 21 r 72]
- definition of 5 [s 2 (3)]
- dispossession by 775 [O 21 r 100]
- execution application for by 647 [O 21 r 10]
  - joint decree holder 641 [O 21 r 15] 64
  - in case of assignment of decree by 644 [O 21 r 16]
- joint decree holder application for execution by 651 [O 21 r 14] 65
- joint mortgage decree property purchased by one of several holders of at execution sale with use of joint funds 22
- notice to before final order for stay of execution is made 691
  - by Collector in certain cases 1202 [Sch III para 3]
  - why payment or adjustment should not be certified 635 [O 21 r 2 (1)]
- party necessary to application to set aside sale of immovable property in execution 743 [O 21 r 89] 749 [O 21 r 90]
- payment out of Court to 635 [O 21 r 2]
  - one of several decree holders 643
- priority where fund in Court is attached by several decree holders 703
- purchase by decree holder at court sale 733 [O 21 r 72]
- rateable distribution among decree holders 29 230 [s 73]
- representative of decree holder who is for purposes of execution 146-148
- sale on ground of irregularity or fraud may apply to set aside 740
- stay of execution pending suit by judgment debtor against 674 [O 21 r 79]
- suit by against party obstructing execution of decree 743
  - upon an uncertified adjustment 679

**Defamation—**

- exact words alleged to be libellous must be set out in action for 491
- interrogatories in suits for 77
- particulars of to be stated in pleadings 484

**Default—**

- dismissal of application under O 21 r 100 for 776
- of suit for 536 537 [O 9 r 8 9]
- of appeal for appellant's default 997 [O 41 r 11 (2)] 1001 [O 41 r 17]
- of pauper application for default 896
- of suit for default not a decree 5 [s 2 (2) (b)] 11
- of suit where neither party appears 533 [O 9 r 3]
- execution default in proceeding with after attachment 709 [O 21 r 57]
- dismissal of application for for default 341
- inherent power of Court to restore suit dismissed for default 394
- purchase money default in payment of in time 42 [O 21 r 86]
- re admission of appeal dismissed for default 1002 [O 41 r 19]
- receiver losses occasioned by default of 973 [Case 4] 982 [O 40 r 3 (d)]
- release on default of deposit by purchaser 741 [O 21 r 84]
- res judicata and dismissal of suit for default of plaintiff's appearance 70
- restoration of appeal dismissed for default inherent power 100
- second appeal from order dismissing appeal for 306
- willful default particulars of to be stated in pleadings 482 [O 6 r 4]

**Defect or error—**

- amend general power of Court to defect in proceedings 401 [s 153]
- appeal defect in an order may be a ground of objection in 313 [s 100 (1)]
- defect in a proceeding not always a ground for reversing decree in 297 [s 99]
- instances of defect error or irregularity not affecting merits 299
- judgments decrees or orders errors in arising from accidental slips 306 [s 152]
- remand in case of error omission or irregularity 1010 1011
- second appeal defect in procedure when a ground of 300 [s 100 (1) (c)]
- withdrawal of suit leave for because of formal defect 807 [O 23 r 1 (2) (a)]

**Defence—**

- alternative and inconsistent defences 481
- distinct grounds of to be stated separately 531 [O 8 r 7]
- facts to be specially pleaded in 520 [O 8 r 2]
- firm in suits brought against in firm name 857 858
- Government defence of suit against public officer undertaken by 847 [O 27 r 8]
- new ground of how raised 531 [O 8 r 8]
- particulars of in pleadings 484 485

**Defendant—**

- acquiescence in suit by defendant residing outside jurisdiction 99 [s 20 (b)] 103
- addition of parties as defendants and limitation 46 [O 1 r 10] 428 432 433
- adjourned hearing procedure at when defendant assigns good cause for previous non appearance 536 [O 9 r 7]
- admissions between co defendants 577
- affidavit of documents by several defendants or co defendant 569
- appeal by a defendant against co defendants 291
- appearance by one defendant for others 434 [O 1 r 12]
- arrest before judgment 950 951 [O 38 r 1]
- causes of action joinder of and of defendant 446 [O 2 r 3]
- co defendants res judicata between 55 56
- costs as between 131
- commission to examine 838
- common interest defendant may be sued on behalf of all having 418 [O 1 r 8]

Defendant—*contd*

- conspiracy who may be joined as defendants in suits for causing wrong by 433
- contract joinder of defendants liable on same 416 [O 1 r 6]
- costs of defendant in suit continued by plaintiff's assignee in bankruptcy 798
- damages defendant need not plead to 521 [O 8 r 3]
- day of appearance of how fixed in summons 466 [O 5 r 6]
- death of defendant—*See* Death
- defend on behalf of all when one defendant may 418 [O 1 r 8] 42<sup>o</sup>
- deposit in court by defendant in a suit for money or for damages 8<sup>o</sup>8 [O 4 r 1]
- defences may be alternative and inconsistent 481
- documents relied on by and order in summons to produce 466 [O 5 r 7]
- ejectment suit who may be joined as defendants in 402 403
- foreigner non resident where defendant is a 110
- hearing procedure where defendant only appears at 536 [O 9 r 8]
- improper addition of 431
- insolvency of result of 798 803
- interrogatories when a defendant may administer to a co defendant 509
- issue where one of several defendants not at with plaintiff 592 [O 15 r 2]
- issues where defendant born after settlement of 430
- joinder of defendants 410 411 [O 1 r 7] 416 [O 1 r 6]
- joint defendants Court may give judgment against one or more of 416 [O 1 r 4 (b)]
- jurisdiction leave of Court to sue where all defendants not within 99 [a. 90 (b)] 100
- legal representative of *see* legal representative
- liability of plaintiff must disclose 509 [O 7 r 5]
- limitation where persons added or substituted as defendants 4<sup>o</sup>8 432
- marriage of female defendant no abatement of suit by 797 [O 22 r 7]
- misdescription of its effect 433
- negotiable instrument joinder of defendant liable on same 416 [O 1 r 6]
- newly added defendant service of summons and plaint on 426 [O 1 r 10 (4)]
- non appearance of and *ex parte* decree 530 [O 9 r 6]
- non attendance of one of several defendants 544 [O 9 r 11] 544 [O 9 r 1<sup>o</sup>]
- non joinder of objection as to when to be taken 434 [O 1 r 13]
- Official Assignee joinder of on insolvency of defendant 803
- pauper defendant 884
- personal appearance of when can be ordered 46 [O 6 rr 3 4]
- place of suing and residence of defendant 98 99 [s. 20] 100
- plaint defendant's name description and residence to be put in 406 [O 7 r 1 (c)]
- pleader defendant may appear by 464 [O 1 r (1) (2)]
- procedure where are several sets of defendants and their interests similar 606
- reliefs claimed defendant need not be interested in all 416 [O 1 r 5]
- res judicata* as between co defendants 45 55
  - and *pro forma* defendant 56
- right to begin when defendant has 600 [O 18 r 1]
  - when preliminary issue raised by that suit does not lie 600
- security for production of property defendant giving 953 904 [O 38 r 5]
  - for appearance 204 [s. 91 (a)] 900 901 [O 38 r 1] 900 [O 38 r 1]
- service of summons to be on defendant in person or his agent 46<sup>o</sup> [O 1 r 1<sup>o</sup>]
- set off when may be claimed by 5<sup>o</sup>0
- ship suit may be instituted against as a defendant 414
- suit defendant in fresh after abatement and withdrawal 814
- summary suit defendant cannot defend without prior leave 916 [O 3 r 2 ( )]

**Defendant—*contd***

summons not issued if claim admitted by when plaint presented 464 [O 5 r 1]  
 unnecessary parties added as defendants 452  
 withdrawing suit without leave of Court but with consent of defendant 815  
 written statement when to be filed 590 [O 8 r 1]

**Definition of—**

|                                 |                                      |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Judgment debtor 12 [s 2 (10)]   | judgment 12 [s 2 (9)]                |
| bill of exchange 947            | judgment debtor 12 [s 2 (10)]        |
| cause of action 104             | legal representative 12 [s 2 (11)]   |
| charge 940                      | mesne profits 13 [s 2 (13)]          |
| Code 5 [s. 2 (1)]               | movable property 14 [s 2 (13)]       |
| compulsory deposit 200          | negotiable instrument 947            |
| Court which passed a decree 137 | order 14 [s 2 (14)]                  |
| [s 37]                          | pauper 892 [O 33 r 1 Explan]         |
| decree 5 [s. - (-)]             | pleader 14 [s 2 (15)]                |
| decree holder 5 [s 2 (3)]       | prescribe 16 [s 2 (16)]              |
| district 11 [s 2 (4)]           | promissory note 948                  |
| foreign Court 12 [s 2 (5)]      | public nuisance 261                  |
| foreign judgment 12 [s 2 (6)]   | public officer 16 [s 2 (17)]         |
| Government pleader 14 [s 2 (7)] | Rules 17 [s 2 (18)]                  |
| immovable property 93           | share in a corporation 17 [s 2 (19)] |
| judge 12 [s 2 (8)]              | signed 17 [s 2 (20)]                 |

**Delegation—**

of authority to execute 672  
 of duty by arbitrator 1169 1170  
 power by Court to commissioner to try material issue not allowed 841  
 power by receiver 980

**Demeanour—**

of witness remarks on 609 [O 18 r 12]

**Departure—**

in pleadings 488 [O 6 r 7]

**Deposit—**

Court deposit in by defendant in suit for money or for damages 828 [O 24 r 1]  
 court sale at by purchaser 741 [O 21 r 84]  
 money or movables of in Court 969 970 [O 39 r 10]  
 Privy Council on appeal to 1036 [O 45 r 7]  
     order for further deposit on appeal to 1039 [O 45 r 10]  
 summary suit order for deposit of bill hundis or note in 950 [O 37 r 5]

**Despatch accompanying Charter of 1852—1225 1233****Detention—See Arrest and Detention**

of subject matter of suit 968 [O 39 r 7]

**Disability persons under—**

consent to orders on behalf of 387 [s 147]

**Discharge—**

decree questions relating to discharge of and execution proceedings 149 150  
     [s 47] 152 154  
 foreclosure decree discharge of debt on passing of 911 [O 31 r 3 (3)] 913 914  
 injunction discharge of order for 968 [O 39 r 4]  
 redemption suit discharge of debt on passing of final decree in 99 [O 34 r 8 (3)]  
     930 [O 37 r 84]

**Documents—*contd***

- provisions as to documents apply to material objects produced 586 [O 13 r 11]
- public official document and objection to produce for inspection 566
  - record receiving copies of entries in 584 [O 13 r 5 (2)]
- receiver power of to execute document 970 [O 40 r 1 (d)]
- recording of documents admitted in evidence 584 [O 13 r 7 (1)]
- registration of documents by judge or officer of Court 680 [O 21 r 34 (6)]
- rejection of irrelevant or inadmissible documents 582 [O 13 r 3]
- relied on by defendant and order in summons to produce 466 [O 5 r 7]
  - plaintiff but not in his possession 518 519 [O 7 r 15]
  - in plaint 518 520
- return of admitted documents 585 [O 13 r 9]
  - rejected documents 584 [O 13 r 7 (2)]
  - power of Courts to order return of documents 122 [s 30 (a)]
- sealing up parts of documents 569
- summons to attend and to produce 593 [O 16 r 1]
  - to produce 596 [O 16 r 6]
- waiver of privilege 570
- witness apprehended cannot produce procedure where 599 [O 16 r 18]

**Door—**

- arrest breaking open of outer door for 185 [s 65 2nd proviso]
- breaking open of for delivery of possession to decree holder 681 [O 21 r 30 (3)]
- movable property breaking open of outer door for seizure of 203 [s 62 (2)]
- proclamation affixing copy of on outer door of house of witness 597 [O 16 r 10 (2)]
- summons affixing copy of on door of defendant's house 468 [O 5 r 17] 469

**Dwell—*See* Reside**

- meaning of dwells incl 12 of the Charter 100 101

**Dwelling House—**

- arrest entry by serving officer into dwelling house for 185 186 [s 65]
- property entry by serving officer into dwelling house for seizing 203 [s. 6-]

**Easement—**

- transfer of easement is a transfer of interest in immovable property 207

**Enactments—**

- amended by the Code 1209

**Equity—**

- acts in personam 95
- judgment debtor and 170

**Error—*See* Defect or error****Estoppel—**

- consent decree and 74
- statute against 54

**Evidence—**

- additional in appeal 1016 1020 [O 41 rr 27 29]
- adjourned hearing failure to produce evidence at 603 [O 17, r 3]
- admissibility of of a foreign witness taken on commission 533
  - questions of to be decided as they arise 581
- admitted without objection in Court of first instance 609

**Evidence—*contd***

- appeal not a good ground for mere admission of further documentary evidence 582
- appealable cases how taken in 607 [O 18 r 5]
- attachment evidence in support of claim or objection made to 783 [O 21 r 59]
- Chartered High Court saving of rules for taking of evidence by 1063 [O 49 r 2]
- commission admissibility of evidence taken on of foreign witness 833
  - on 835 840 [O 26 rr 1 8] See Commission
- de bene esse* 610 [O 18 r 16]
- demeanour of witnesses remarks on 609 [O 18 r 12]
- document when a party may compel his opponent to exhibit 570
- documentary evidence production of 581 582 [O 13 rr 1 2]
- English when evidence may be taken down in 609 [O 18 r 9]
- hearing production of evidence at 605 606 [O 18 r 2]
  - failure to produce evidence at adjourned 603 [O 17 r 3]
  - failure to produce evidence at first 593 [O 15 r 4]
- interpreted when to be 608 [O 18 r 6]
- interrogate party not entitled to about evidence of other side 557
- interrogatories answers to may be used as evidence 575 576 [O 11 r 22]
- issues production of evidence where there are several 606 [O 18 r 3]
- judge power to deal with evidence taken before another 610 [O 18 r 15]
  - when unable to make memorandum of to record reasons 609 610 [O 18 r 14]
- judgment when given upon evidence recorded by other judge or person 612
- lower Court to return evidence to appellate Court with findings 1014 [O 41 r 25]
- memorandum of evidence in unappealable cases 609 [O 18 r 13]
- memorandum when evidence not taken down by judge 608 [O 18 r 8]
- particular question and answer may be taken down 609 [O 18 r 10]
- pleading to state facts and not evidence 476 [O 6 r 2] 480
- production of documentary evidence 581 582 [O 13 rr 1 2]
- questions objected to and allowed by Court 609 [O 18 r 11]
  - not objected to in first Court cannot be rejected by appellate Court 609
- refusal of party to suit to give evidence when required by Court 600 [O 18 r 20]
- review on discovery of new and important evidence 1050 [O 47 r 1] 1051
- summons to give evidence 593 [O 16 r 1]

**Evidence Act—**

- document notice to produce 570

**Examination—See Evidence Witness**

- appeal from order pronouncing judgment against party under O 10 r 4 (2) p 555
- commission examination by 835 840 [O 26 rr 1 8] See Commission
- corporation examination of officer of as to its property 688 [O 21 r 41]
- de bene esse* 610 [O 18 r 16]
- executing officer examination of as to his inability to execute process 673 [O 21 r 25 (2)]
- issues examination of parties in order to frame 586 [O 14 r 1 (5)]
  - of witness before framing 590 [O 14 r 4]
- judgment-debtor examination of as to his property 688 [O 21 r 41]
- parties examination of by Court at first hearing 554 555 [O 10]
- pauper examination of applicant for leave to sue as 885 [O 33 r 4]
- proclamation for sale for settling 75 [O 21 r 68 (4)]
- serving officer examination of touching service of summons 470 [O 5 r 19]
  - examination of when witness fails to attend 597 [O 16 r 10 (1)]

**Examination—*contd.***

witnesses examination of 606 609 [O 18 rr 4 12] 610 611 [ib, rr 16 1.]  
before commissioner 844 [O 26 r 17 (1)]

**Execution of decree—*See* Arrest Attachment Sale Execution proceedings**

ambassadors against 200 [s 86 (3)]

appeal to Privy Council no bar to 1039 [O 45 r 13 (1)]

from orders in execution 166

application for execution—*See* sub-head (1) below

arrest in execution.—*See* Arrest and Detention

attachment of property in execution.—*See* Attachment

benami purchases at execution sales 218 [s 68]

British Indian Court when may refuse execution of decree of Native State 8<sup>o</sup>

Chiefs or princes execution against 250 [s 86 (3)]

claims investigation of—*See* Attachment sub-head Investigation of Claims.

Collector execution by 224 [s 68]—*See* Collector

consent decrees execution of 826 827

co partners execution in suits between 859 [O 30 r 9]

costs execution of decree before ascertainment of 356 [s 118]

Courts by which decrees may be executed 139 140 [s 35]

executing decrees—*See* sub-head (2) below

Court to which application for stay of execution should be made 990

when it ceases to have jurisdiction to execute its decree 137 [s 3<sup>o</sup> (b)].

decrees what may be executed 135 136 /

exercise of powers in appeal from orders made in 994 [O 41 r 8].

firm execution of decree against 698 699 [O 21, r 50]

foreign judgment when enforceable by proceedings in execution, 81 147 [s 44]

limit of time for execution—*See* sub-head (3) below

mode of execution.—*See* sub-head (4) below

mortgaged property of judgment debtor liable to be seized in 689

Native State decree of and execution of 147

limitation for 148

Native State when a British Indian Court may refuse execution of decree of 82

orders execution of 130 [s 36] 137

partner execution of decree against 697 [O 21 r 49]

and insolvency of firm 701

Privy Council in appeal to 1039 [O 45 r 13 (1)]

possession delivery of—*See* Possession.

proceedings in execution provisions of O 23 do not apply to 8<sup>o</sup>8

procedure in execution—*See* sub-head (5) below

property attached in execution of decrees of several Courts 203 204 [s 63]

liable to attachment and sale 191 193 [s 60]

provisions of O 9 whether apply to proceedings in 542

public officer execution of decree against 252 [s 8<sup>o</sup>]

purchaser at Court sale and his inquiry into correctness of decree or order of sale 216  
21<sup>o</sup>

questions relating to execution—*See* sub-head (6) below

reference to High Court no execution of decree pending 1017 [O 46 r 2].

resistance to execution 213 [s 74]

restitution of property security for 693 [O 41 r 6].

sale in execution application for order for 720 [O 21 r 66 (3)] *See* Sale

when void and when voidable 216 217

**Execution of decree—*contd***

- sale of immovable property in and purchaser's title 213 [s 65]
  - Secretary of State execution of decree against 252 [s 82]
  - simultaneous execution against person and property of judgment debtor 179
  - stay of when may be granted 990 *See* Stay
    - in summary suit 900 [O 3, r 4]
    - on appeal 989 990 [O 41 r 5]
    - pending appeal to Privy Council 1040 [O 45 r 13 (2) (c)]
  - successive purchasers at sale in execution of money decrees 214 215
  - suit to set aside execution—sale obtained by fraud and place of suing 109
  - surety for restitution of property taken in execution 382 [s 145 (b)]
  - transfer of decree for execution.—*See* Transfer of decree for Execution
  - transferee of decree —*See* sub-head (7) below
  - uncommunicated order staying execution effect of 992
  - vesting of property sold in execution in purchaser 213 [s 60]
- (1) **Application for execution**
- amendment of 662 [O 21 r 17]
  - assignment who may apply for execution of decree transferred by 655-657
  - benamidar application for execution by 607
  - Collector's register certified extract from when to be produced 651 [O 21 r 14]
  - contents of application for execution 648 649 [O 21 r 11 (2)]
  - cross-claims.—*See* Cross claims
  - cross-decrees.—*See* Cross decrees
  - decree-holder application by for execution 647 [O 21 r 10]
  - delegation of authority to execute process 672
  - dismissal of application for execution for default 371
  - fresh presented after expiration of twelve years 170 171
  - immediate execution oral application for of money decree 178 647 648 [O 21 r 11 (1)]
  - joint decree-holder application by 601 [O 21 r 15]
  - legal representative of party to the decree against 668 [O 21 r 22 (1) (b)]
  - limitation and amendment of application for execution 663
    - and application by transferee for substituting his name 659
    - and issue of notice to show cause against execution 671
    - successive applications for execution of decrees of
      - Chartered High Courts 119 170
      - Courts other than Chartered High Courts 168 169
  - mode of execution to be specified in application 648 [O 21 r 11 (2) (b)] 650
  - mortgage suits cross decrees and cross claims in 667 [O 21 r 20]
  - movable property not in judgment debtor's possession, as to 600 [O 21 r 12]
  - notice to transferor of decree and judgment debtor 608
    - legal representative of a party to the decree 668 [O 21 r 22] 669
    - when decree more than a year old 668 [O 21 r 22] 669
  - particulars in application for attachment of immovable property 600 [O 21 r 13]
  - payment out of Court to one of several decree holders 603
  - precept issue of for attachment 149 [s 46]
  - privilege from arrest none when order made for immediate arrest 360 [s 135 (3)]
  - procedure on receiving application for execution, 662 [O 21 r 17]
    - regarding suits does not apply to applications for execution 371
  - process for execution 672 [O 21 r 24]
  - rejection of application for execution 662 [O 21 r 17 (1)]
  - reliefs decree awarding two distinct and application for execution, 371.
  - res judicata and application for execution, 77 79



**Execution of decree—*contd*****(1) Application for execution—*contd***

- share of judgment-debtor in property to be specified in 651 [O 21 r 13 (b)].
- simultaneous execution against person and property 668 [O 21, r 21].
- successive applications for execution, 163 170
- transfer of interest in a joint money decree to one of several judgment-debtors 659
- transferee of decree application by 654 [O 21 r 16] 655 657
  - to hold subject to equities of judgment debtor 15 [s. 49]
- value of property attached, under a money decree 662 [O 21 r 17 *proviso*].
- verification of 650
- withdrawal of 372 809

**(2) Courts executing decrees (their powers and functions—**

- Courts by which decrees may be executed 139 [s 38]
- decree executing Court cannot go behind 141 142
  - may construe 142
- discretion to issue notice under O 21 r 37 p 685
  - whether executing Court has to refuse or suspend attachment of judgment debtor's property 685 686
- documents to be sent to Court to which decrees transferred 646 [O 21 r 6]
- execution by Court to which decree is sent for execution 647 [O 21, r 8].
- foreign judgment passed without jurisdiction, 147
- High Court execution by of decree sent by other Courts 647 [O 21 r 9]
- jurisdiction of Courts executing decrees 140 141
  - when lands situate in more than one 645 [O 21 r 3]
  - of Court passing decree executing Court cannot inquire as to, 646.
- obstructing execution of decree 145 [s 42]
- procedure where Court desires execution by another Court, 646 [O 21 r 8]
- questions as to execution to be determined by executing Court 149 150 [s. 41]
- salary of public officer or railway servant and jurisdiction 695 696 [O 21 r 45]
- transfer for execution mode of 645 [O 21 r 6]
  - to Presidency Small Cause Courts of decrees for execution 645 [O 21 r 4].
- transferred decree powers of Court executing 145 [s 42]

**(3) Limit of time for execution—167 175 [s 48]**

- Chartered High Courts of decrees of 169 170
- Courts other than Chartered High Courts of decrees of 168 169
- fraud where execution of decree is prevented by 167 [s. 48 (2) (a)]
  - what amounts to within meaning of s 48 p 174
- fresh application for execution presented after expiration of twelve years 173.
  - what amounts to to execute the same decree 170 171
- injunction execution of decree granting and limitation 167 [s 48 (1)] 173.
- mesne profits ascertained in execution and limitation* 173
- minority and time limit for execution of decree 174 175
- successive applications for execution of decrees 168 170

**(4) Mode of execution—**

- building or enclosure for delivery of possession of 681 [O 21 r 35 (3)]
- corporation against 676 [O 21 r 32 (2)]
- documents for execution of 690 [O 21 r 34]
- immovable property for delivery of 681 [O 21 r 35]
  - for joint possession of 681 [O 21 r 35 (-)]
- injunction for 676 [O 21 r 32]
- joint possession of immovable property for 681 [O 21 r 35 (a)]

**Execution of decree—*could*****(4) Mode of execution—*could***

- money for payment of 675 [O 21 r 30]
- negotiable instrument for endorsement of 680 [O 21 r 34]
- partner against 679 [O 21 r 49]
- partnership firm against 698 699 [O 21 r 50]
- possession actual and formal delivery of 682 684
- restitution of conjugal rights for 676 [O 21 r 32] 679 [ib r 33]
- specific movable property for 675 [O 21 r 31]
- specific performance for 676 677 [O 21 r 32]

**(5) Procedure in Execution—**

- ancestral property enforcement of decree against 182 [s 53]
- Collector effecting partition Court's control over 184 185
- Government for partition of an undivided estate paying revenue to 184 [s 54]
- Hindu father where money decree has been passed against and—
  - (1) father dies after attachment of ancestral property 183
  - (2) father dies before issue of execution 183
- legal representative enforcement of decree obtained against 180 [s 52]
- partition of an undivided estate paying revenue to Government 184 [s 54]
- powers of Court to enforce execution 179 [s 51]

**(6) Questions relating to execution—15<sup>th</sup> 16<sup>th</sup> [ 47]**

- agreement not to execute decree 153 [Case 7]
- discharge of decree questions relating to 149 [s 47 (1)] 152 155
- execution of decree questions relating to 149 [s 47 (1)] 152 155
- lessee of property under attachment 157 [Case 3]
- maladministration of debtor's estate 154 [Case 2]
- mortgagee of property under attachment 157 [Case 3]
- notice to judgment debtor before issue of execution 631 668 [O 21 r 22] 685 [O 21 r 37]
- objection that property attached is not liable to attachment 158
- parties to the suit meaning of 150 [s 47 Expln.] 155 156
- payment of money notice of payment into Court 635
- under a decree modes of 634 [O 21 r 1]
- purchaser at a Court sale whether representative of parties 157
- of equity of redemption at Court or private sale 157 [Cases 4 5]
- of property regarding which injunction granted 156 [Case 6]
- under attachment 157 [Case 3]
- questions as to validity of decree 154 [Case 1]
- between auction purchaser and a party or his representative 160 164.
- decree holder and judgment debtor 159 160
- questions held not to relate to execution of decree 154
- representative of party inquiry as to who is 150 [s 47 (3)] 164
- restitution of property when decree amended or sale set aside 152 153 [Cases 2 3]
- satisfaction of decree question relating to 150 [s 47 (1)] 152 155
- uncertified payment or adjustment 153 [Case 6]

**(7) Transferees and legal representatives—**

- accounts power to compel legal representative to produce 156 [s 50 (2)]
- deaths successive of judgment debtor and his legal representative 178
- execution against legal representative of deceased judgment debtor 176 [s 50] 177
- transferee of decree to hold subject to equities of judgment debtor 175 [s 49]

**Arrest of judgment debtor—See Arrest and detention**

**Execution of decree—*contd*****(1) Application for execution—*contd***

- share of judgment debtor in property to be specified in 651 [O 21 r 13 (b)].
- simultaneous execution against person and property 668 [O 21 r 21].
- successive applications for execution 168 170
- transfer of interest in a joint money decree to one of several judgment-debtors 659
- transferee of decree application by 654 [O 21 r 16] 655 657
  - to hold subject to equities of judgment debtor 1.5 [a 49]
- value of property attached under a money decree 662 [O 21 r 17 proviso].
- verification of 650
- withdrawal of 372 809

**(2) Courts executing decrees their powers and functions—**

- Courts by which decrees may be executed 139 [s 38]
- decree executing Court cannot go behind 141 142
  - may construe 142
- discretion to issue notice under O 21 r 37 p 685
  - whether executing Court has to refuse or suspend attachment of judgment debtor's property 685 686
- documents to be sent to Court to which decree transferred 646 [O 21 r 6].
- execution by Court to which decree is sent for execution 647 [O 21, r 8]
- foreign judgment passed without jurisdiction, 147
- High Court execution by of decree sent by other Courts 647 [O 21 r 9]
- jurisdiction of Courts executing decrees 140 141
  - when lands situate in more than one 645 [O 21 r 3]
  - of Court passing decree executing Court cannot inquire as to 646
- obstructing execution of decree, 145 [s 42]
- procedure where Court desires execution by another Court, 646 [O 21 r 6].
- questions as to execution to be determined by executing Court 149 150 [s 4]
- salary of public officer or railway servant and jurisdiction 695 696 [O 21 r 43]
- transfer for execution mode of 645 [O 21 r 5]
  - to Presidency Small Cause Courts of decrees for execution 645 [O 21 r 4].
- transferred decree powers of Court executing 145 [s 42]

**(3) Limit of time for execution—167 173 [s 48]**

- Chartered High Courts of decrees of 169 170
- Courts other than Chartered High Courts of decrees of 168 169
- fraud where execution of decree is prevented by 167 [s 48 (°) (a)]
  - what amounts to within meaning of s. 48 p 174
- fresh application for execution presented after expiration of twelve years, 173
  - what amounts to to execute the same decree 170 1.1
- Injunction execution of decree granting and limitation 167 [s 48 (1)] 173.
- mesne profits ascertained in execution and limitation 1.3
- minority and time limit for execution of decree 174 1.5
- successive applications for execution of decrees 168 170

**(4) Mode of execution—**

- building or enclosure for delivery of possession of 681 [O 21 r 35 (3)]
- corporation against 676 [O 21 r 32 (2)]
- documents for execution of 680 [O 21 r 34]
- immovable property for delivery of 681 [O 21 r 35]
  - for joint possession of 681 [O 21 r 35 (°)]
- Injunction for 676 [O 21 r 3°]
- joint possession of immovable property for 681 [O 21 r 35 (2)].

**Exemption—*contd***

- from arrest of Princes Chiefs and ambassadors 25 [s 86 (3)]
  - of public officer except in execution of decree 27, [s 81 (a)]
  - of women in execution of money decrees 183 [s 56] 364 [s. 132 (2)].
- summary suit defendant in whether privilege from arrest extends to 366

**Exhibits—**

- appeal furnishing copies of in 999 [O 41 r 13 (3)]
- endorsement on 583 [O 13 r 4]
- return of 585 [O 13 r 9]

**Ex parte—*See Decree ex parte.***

- appeal hearing of 1001 [O 41 r 1" (2)]
  - re-hearing of appeal disposed of *ex parte* 1004 [O 41 r 21]
- commissioner when may proceed *ex parte* 840 [O 26 r 18 (?)]
- suit hearing of 535 [O 9 r 6]

**Expenses—**

- witnesses of 594 [O 16 r 2]

**Expert witnesses—**

- fee payable to 594 [O 16 r 2 (2)]

**Extraordinary jurisdiction—*See* Chartered High Courts****Facts—**

- appeal new questions of fact raised for the first time in 987
- arbitrator is the sole and final judge of all questions of fact and law 1182
- burden of proof and right to begin 606 [O 18 r 3]
- concurrent findings of in appeals to Privy Council 332 333
- facta probanda* and *facta probantia* distinction between 480
- illegality showing must be specially pleaded in defence 520 [O 8 r 2]
- inconsistent allegations of to be raised only by way of amendment 488 [O 6 r 7]
- issues questions of fact may by agreement be stated in form of 591 [O 14 r 6]
- issues of fact what are 586 [O 14 r 1 (4)]
- not denied to be taken as admitted 522 [O 8 r 5]
- notice to admit facts 577 [O 12 rr 4 5]
- not yet material to a case and pleadings 473 480
- omitting to plead a material fact 478
- pleadings to state material facts only 476 [O 6 r 2] 478
- presumed by law need not be alleged in pleadings 492 [O 6 r 13]
- Privy Council concurrent findings of fact in appeals to 332 333
- res judicata* and issues of fact 52a
- second appeal when lies on ground of erroneous finding of fact 303
- specially pleaded what facts to be 520 [O 8 r 2]

**Female—**

- decree against wife when may be executed against husband 97 [O 22 r " (2)]
- marriage of female party suit not to abate by 797 [O 22 r 7]

**Final decree—**

- administration suit in 623 [O 20 r 13]
- agent in suits between principal and 678 [O 20 r 16]
- appeal from where no appeal preferred from preliminary decree 293 [s. 97]
- definition of 5 [s - (?) Expln.]
- foreclosure suit in 911 [O 34 r 3]
- mesne profits in respect of 618 [O 20 r 12 (?)]
- partnership suit in, 627 [O 20 r 15].

**Execution of decree—*contd***Attachment of property—*See* AttachmentDelivery of possession and resistance thereto—*See* PossessionExecution by Collector—*See* CollectorInvestigation of Claims—*See* AttachmentSale in execution—*See* SaleStay of execution—*See* StayTransfer of decree for execution to another Court—*See* Transfer of decree for execution.**Execution proceedings—**

abatement rules as to how far apply to 806 [O 22 r 12]

ancestral property and liability of in 182 [s 53]

compromise of in case of minors 875

*ex parte* order in execution and res judicata 79

interlocutory orders in 166 167

legal representative execution against 176 [s 50] 180 [s 52]

minor and compromise of execution proceedings 875

appointment of guardian ad litem in 869

order in when appealable 10

whether a decree 10

receiver in 179

res judicata and 77 79

striking off effect of 211 212 709 [O 21 r 57]

suit execution proceeding not a 10

transfer of 117 [s 24]

unlawful agreement when decree passed on 822 823

withdrawal of 117 [s 24] 120

rules as to and compromise of suits do not apply to 830 [O 23 r 4]

**Execution purchaser—*See* Auction purchaser****Executor and administrator—**

administration suit by 674

beneficiaries representation of in suits as to property vested in trustees etc 862  
[O 31 r 1]

when may be added as parties 861

decree against who has not intermeddled or proved 181 182

joinder of claims in suit by or against 456 [O 2 r 5]

of executors etc in suits concerning property vested in them 881  
[O 31 r 2]

letters of administration before suit 507 509

married executrix husband of need not be joined as party 862 [O 31 r 3]

probate or letters of administration before decree 507 509

receiver appointment of when executor is in possession 975

**Exemption—**

appearance pardonashin women exempt from personal 364 [s 13-]

persons of rank exempt from personal 364 [s 133]

public officer exempt from personal 252 [s 81 (b)]

commission to examine exempted persons, 835 [O 26 r 1] 364 [s 133 (3)]

from arrest 36 [s 135 (3)]

of judicial officer parties pleaders and witnesses, 365 [s 13-]

of members of legislative bodies 367 [s 13 A]

**Foreign Court—See Foreign judgment**

- agreement to submit to jurisdiction of 84
- attachment whether debt enforceable by a foreign Court only liable to 197
- Ceylon Courts are 12
- decree of passed without jurisdiction 83 147
- definition of 12 [s 2 (5)]
- execution in British India of decrees of Courts of Native States 147 [s 44]
- execution of decrees of Native States when British Indian Courts may refuse 82
- jurisdiction when decree of foreign Court is passed without 83 147
- High Court of Justice in England is a 12
- Mauritius Court 12
- Native States Courts of 12
- pendency of suit in no bar to suit in British Indian Court 31 [s 10 Explan.]
- persons carrying on business in foreign country through agents 84
- presumption as to jurisdiction of 86 87 [s 14]
- Privy Council is not a 12
- submission to jurisdiction of 83 84

**Foreign firm—**

- foreign judgment against 85
- suit by or against 852

**Foreign judgment—See Foreign Court**

- British India how enforced in 81
  - when no bar to suit in 80 81 [s 13]
- British Indian Courts on a decree of 85
- definition of 12 [s 2 (6)]
- execution enforcement of foreign judgment by proceedings in 81 147 [s 44]
- foreign firm against a 85
- jurisdiction suit on judgment of foreign Court passed without 82 83
  - execution of decree of foreign Court passed without 147
- limitation period of for 86
- merits of the case where foreign judgment not given on, 80 [s 13 (b)]
- res judicata how far operates as 81 85

**Foreign State—See Chiefs (ruling) and Princes**

- consent of Governor General in Council in suit against ambassador of 255 [s 86]
- execution of decree against ambassador of 255 [s 86 (3)]
- execution in British India of decrees of Courts—
  - (1) established by Governor General in Council in territories of 147 [s. 43]
  - (2) of Native States 147 [s. 44].
- service of summons in through Political Agent 473 474 [O 5 r 26].
- suit against 255 256 [s 86]
  - by 253 [s 84] 254
- transfer of decrees of Courts in British India for execution to Courts in 148 [s. 45].

**Foreign summons—**

- service of 122 [s 29]

**Foreigner—See Aliens**

- absent or non resident suit against and jurisdiction under the Code 110
- evidence admissibility of of a foreign witness taken on commission 838.
- jurisdiction over non resident foreigners under cl. 12 of the Charter 1216 1247
- non resident carrying on business in name other than his own 860

**Forms in general—**

- miscellaneous forms 1157 1163 [App H] See below
- of appeals, reference and review 1152 1156 [App G] See below

**Final decree—*contd***

redemption in suit for 928 929 [O 34 r 8]

rent in respect of 618 [O 20 r 12 (2)]

sale in suit for 918 919 [O 34 r 5]

**Fine—**

witness imposing of fine on defaulting 598 [O 16 r 12].

**Firm—850 860 [O 30] See Partners.**

agriculturist within meaning of Dikkan Agriculturist Relief Act 80

British India no suit allowed in firm name if firm outside 800 [O 30 r 1].

decree against firm to be in firm name 858

ex parte against effect of upon partner 803

definition of 851

dissolution of when suit may be brought after in firm name 852.

execution of decree against firm 698 699 [O 21 r 50]

foreign firm suit by or against 802

foreigner non resident suit against 860

insolvency of and execution of decree against partner 701

names and addresses of partners in statement of 852

non resident foreigner suit against 860

partners may sue or be sued in firm name 850 [O 30 r 1]

persons entitled to appear in a suit against firm 857

proceedings to continue in firm name 857 [O 30 r 6]

service of summons where partners sued in firm name 853 854 [O 30 r 3].

signature and verification of pleadings 850 [O 30 r 1 (?)]

suit against person carrying on business in name other than his own and  
[O 30 r 10]

manager or owner of 851

between a firm and one or more of its partners 859 [O 30 r 9].

two firms having one or more partners in common 809 [O 30 r 9]

by on promissory note passed to member 802

by or against 850-860 [O 30]

a foreign firm 857

written statement in suit brought against a firm in firm name 807 808

**Foreclosure—**

appeal effect of on time fixed for payment in decree in foreclosure suit 913.

beneficiaries whether necessary parties to suit for brought by trustees 900

charge no foreclosure in suits to enforce a 910 [O 31 r 15]

decree for whether two can be passed in respect of one mortgage 913.

discharge of debt on 911 [O 31 r 3 (3)] 913 914

final decree in foreclosure suit 911 [O 31 r 3]

mortgagee right of mesne to foreclose 912 [O 31 r 11].

parties to suit for 896 [O 31 r 1] 898 899

place of suing in suits for in cases governed by the Code 91 [s. 16 (c)].

preliminary decree in 900 906 [O 31 r 2]

receiver of mortgaged property in suit for 976

res judicata and suits for 82.

sale power to decree in foreclosure suit 915 [O 31 r 4 (2)], 914

suits for in cases governed by cl 12 of the Chapter 1242.

time enlarging of for payment in foreclosure suit 911 [O 31 r 3 (1) proviso], 913

what is a proper suit for 904

**Forms of Decrees—1103 1129 [Appendix D]**

- Decree against mortgagor personally [O 34 r 6] 1117
  - for injunction against building higher than old level 1120
  - private nuisance 1120
  - restraining use of private road 1120
  - for rectification of instrument 1124
  - for recovery of land and mesne profits 1129
  - in original suit [O 20 rr 6 7] 1103
  - to set aside a transfer in fraud of creditors 1124 [O 44 r 8] 1115
- Final decree for foreclosure 1106 1107 [O 34 r 3]
  - sale 1109 1110 [O 34 r 5] 1110 1116 [O 34 r 8]
  - in an administration suit by a legatee 1127
  - next of kin 1128
  - in a suit for dissolution of partnership and partnership accounts 1129
- Preliminary decrees for foreclosure [O 34 r 2] 1104 1106
  - for foreclosure or sale 1117 1120 [O 34 rr 2 4]
  - for sale [O 34 r 4] 1107 1109 1113 1124
  - for redemption [O 34 r 7] 1110 1115
  - for redemption of prior mortgage and foreclosure or sale on subsequent mortgage 1120 1122 [O 34 rr 2 4 7]
  - in an administration suit 1120 1126
    - by legatee where executor is held personally responsible 1127
  - in a suit for dissolution of partnership and partnership accounts 1128 1129

Simple money decree [s 34] 1103

**Forms of Written Statements—[Appendix A] pp 1030 1089****General defences—**

- |  |                           |
|--|---------------------------|
| Denial 1085  | Minority 1085             |
| Estoppel 1085  | Payment into Court 1085   |
| Ground of defence subsequent to institution of suit 1085 | Performance remitted 1080 |
| Insolvency 1095  | Protest 1030              |
| Jurisdiction 1085  | Rescission 1030           |
| Limitation 1095  | <i>Res judicata</i> 1095  |

**Defences in suits on or for—**

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| Administration by pecuniary legatee 1089 | Infringement of trade mark 1097                |
| Bonds 1086                               | Injuries caused by negligent driving 1096 1097 |
| Debt 1086                                | Nuisances 1087                                 |
| Detention of goods 1087                  | Probate of will 1089                           |
| Foreclosure 1089                         | Redemption 1088                                |
| Guarantees 1088                          | Specific performance 1088                      |
| Goods sold and delivered 1086            | Trade mark 1087                                |
| Grant of Probate 1089                    | Wrongs 1087                                    |
| Infringement of copyright 1097           |  |

**Forms of Process—[Appendix B] pp 1090 1098**

- Affidavit of process server [O 5 r 18] 1094 1090
- Notice to defendant [O 9 r 6] 1090
- Notice to person proposed to be added as co plaintiff 1090
- Order for transmission of summons for service to another Court [O 5 r 21] 1093
- Order for transmission of summons to be served on a prisoner [O 5 r 24] 1093



**Forms in general—*contd***

decrees 1103 1129 [App D] *See below*  
 description of parties 106<sub>3</sub>  
 discovery inspection and admissions 1099 1102 [App C] *See below*  
 particulars 1089  
 plaints 1066 1084 *See below*  
 pleadin \* 106<sub>3</sub> 1089 [App A]  
 proceedings in execution 1130 1146 [App F] *See below*  
 proceedings in arbitration 1199 1200  
 process 1090 1098 [App B] *See below*  
 supplemental proceedings 1147 1151 [App F] *See below*  
 title of suits 1065  
 written statements 1085 1089 *See below*  
 use of in Appendices to Schedule I of the Code 1062 [O 48 r 3].

**Forms of Plaints—1066 1084 [Appendix A].**

Administration suits 1080 108<sup>7</sup>  
 Against surety for payment of rent 1069  
 Against a builder for defective workman hip 1071  
 Breach of contract 1070 10<sup>71</sup>  
 By tenant against landlord with special damage 107<sup>7</sup>  
 Carrying on a noxious manufacture 1073 1074  
 Deficiency upon a re sale (goods sold at auction) 1067  
 Diverting a water course 10<sup>74</sup> 10<sub>10</sub>  
 Execution of trusts 1082  
 Foreclosure or sale 1082 1083  
 Fraudulent acts 1073 1077  
 Goods sold and delivered 1066<sub>3</sub>  
 Goods made at defendant's request and not accepted 106<sup>7</sup>  
 Injunction 10<sup>78</sup> 10<sub>79</sub>  
 Injuries caused by negligence 10<sub>75</sub> 1076  
 Interpleader 1080  
 Malicious prosecution 1076<sub>3</sub>  
 Money lent 1066  
 Money overpaid 1066  
 Movables wrongfully detained 1077  
 Not delivering goods sold 10<sub>70</sub>  
 Obstructing right of way or water 1074 107<sub>5</sub>  
 On an award 1068 1069  
 On a foreign judgment 1069  
 On a bond for the fidelity of a clerk 10<sup>71</sup>  
 On an agreement of indemnity 107  
 Partnership 1081  
 Polluting the water under the plaintiff's land 10 3  
 Public nuisance 10 9  
 Redemption 1083  
 Rescission of a contract on the ground of mistake 107<sup>7</sup> 10 8<sub>3</sub>  
 Restoration of movable property threatened with destruction and injunction, 10<sup>79</sup>  
 Services or materials at a reasonable rate 10<sup>77</sup> 1063  
 Specific performance (No 1) 1093  
 Use and occupation 1068  
 Wrongful dismissal 10<sup>70</sup>

## Forms of Decrees—1103 1129 [Appendix D]

Decree against mortgagor personally [O 34 r 6] 1117

for injunction against building higher than old level 1120

private nuisance 115

restraint of private road 1120

for rectification of instrument 1124

for recovery of land and mesne profits 1129

in original suit [O 20 rr 6 7] 1103

to set aside a transfer in fraud of creditors 1124 [O 44 r 8] 1110

Final decrees for foreclosure 1106 1107 [O 34 r 3]

sale 1109 1110 [O 34, r 5] 1115 1116 [O 34 r 8]

in an administration suit by a legatee 1127

next of kin 1128

in a suit for dissolution of partnership and partnership accounts 1129

Preliminary decrees for foreclosure [O 34 r 2] 1104 1106

for foreclosure or sale 1117 1120 [O 34 rr 2 4]

for sale [O 34 r 4] 1104 1109 1113 1114

for redemption [O 34 r 7] 1110 1115

for redemption of prior mortgage and foreclosure or sale on subsequent mortgage 1120 1122 [O 34 rr 2 4 7]

in an administration suit 1120 1126

by legatee where executor is held

personally responsible 1127

in a suit for dissolution of partnership and partnership accounts,

1128 1129

Simple money decrees [a. 31] 1103

## Forms of Written Statements—[Appendix A] pp 1030 1039

## General defences—

Denial 1080

Estoppel 1085

Ground of defence subsequent to institution of suit 1085

Insolvency 1085

Jurisdiction 1085

Limitation 1085

Minority 1085

Payment into Court 1085

Performance remitted 1080

Protest 1080

Rescission 1080

Res judicata 1085

## Defences in suits on or for—

Administration by pecuniary legatee 1089

Bonds 1086

Debt 1086

Detention of goods 1087

Foreclosure 1088

Guarantees 1088

Goods sold and delivered 1086

Grant of Probate 1089

Infringement of copyright 1087

Infringement of trade mark 1087

Injuries caused by negligent driving 1086 1087

Nuisances 1087

Probate of will 1089

Redemption 1088

Specific performance 1088

Trade mark 1087

Wrongs 1087

## Forms of Process—[Appendix B] pp 1090 1098

Affidavit of process server [O 5 r 18] 1094 1090

Notice to defendant [O 9 r 6] 1090

Notice to person proposed to be added as co plaintiff 1092

Order for transmission of summons for service to another Court [O 5 r 21] 1093

Order for transmission of summons to be served on a prisoner [O 5 r 24] 1093

**Forms of Process—*contd***

Order for transmission of summons to public servant or soldier [O 5 rr 27 '93]  
1093

Proclamation requiring attendance of witness [O 18 r 10] 1096.

Summons for disposal of suit [O 5 rr 1 5] 1090

Summons for settlement of issues [O 5 rr 1 5] 1090

Summons in summary suit on negotiable instrument [O 37 r 2] 1091

Summons to appear in person [O 5 r 3] 1091

Summons to legal representative of a deceased defendant [O 22 r 4] 109"  
witness [O 18 rr 1 5] 1095 1096.

To accompany return of summons to another Court [O 5 r 23] 1093

Warrant of arrest of witness [O 16 r 10] 1097

Warrant of attachment of property of witness [O 16 r 10] 1097

Warrant of committal [O 16 r 16] [O 16 r 18] 1098

**Forms of Discovery Inspection and Admission [Appendix C]**

Admission of fact pursuant to notice [O 12 r 5] 1101

Affidavit as to documents [O 11 r 13] 1100

Answer to interrogatories [O 11 r 9] 1099

Interrogatories [O 11 r 4] 1099

Notice to admit documents [O 12 r 3] 1101

Notice to admit facts [O 12 r 5] 1101

Notice to inspect documents [O 11 r 17] 1100 1101

Notice to produce documents [O 11 r 16] 1100

Notice to produce (general form) [O 12 r 8] 1102

Order for affidavit as to documents [O 11 r 12] 1099

Order for delivery of interrogatories [O 11 r 1] 1099

Order to procure documents for inspection [O 11 r 14] 1100

**Forms relating to execution—[Appendix E] pp 1130 1146**

Application for execution of decree [O 21 r 11] 1132 1133

Attachment in execution [O 21 r 46] 1137

Attachment in execution—Prohibitory orders 1137

Certificate of non satisfaction of decree [O 21 r 6] 1130

Certificate of execution of decree transferred to another Court [O 21 r 6] 1131

Certificate authorizing judgment-debtor to mortgage etc property [O 21 r 83]  
1144

Certificate of sale of land [O 21 r 94] 1145

Notice as to why payment or adjustment should not be recorded [O 21 r 2] 1130

Notice to show cause why execution should not issue [O 21 r 16] 1133.

Notice to state objections to draft of document [O 21 r 34] 1134.

Notice to show cause why warrant of arrest should not issue [O 21, r 37] 1135.

Notice of attachment of decree to the Court which passed it [O 21 r 53] 1139

Notice of attachment of decree to the holder of decree [O 21 r 53] 1139

Notice to attachment creditor [O 21 r 58] 1139 1140

Notice of the day fixed for settling a sale proclamation [O 21 r 60] 1140

Notice to person in possession of property sold in execution [O 21 r 70] 1143

Notice to show cause why sale should not be set aside [O 21 rr 90 91 92] 1144.

Order sending decree for execution to another Court [O 21 r 6] 1130

Order for the release of a person imprisoned in execution of decree [ss. 54 55] 1134.

Order to attach salary of public officer or servant of railway company or local  
authority [O 21 r 49] 1137

Order of attachment of negotiable instrument [O 21 r 31] 1134

Order for payment to the plaintiff etc. of money etc. in the hands of a third party  
[O 21 r 56] 1139

**Forms relating to Execution—contd**

- Order on the nazir for causing service of proclamation of sale [O 21 r 66] 1140
- Order for delivery to certified purchaser of land in execution [O 21 r 95] 1145
- Precept for attachment [s 46] 1130
- Proclamation of sale [O 21 r 66] 1140 1141
- Prohibitory order against payment of debts [O 21 r 79] 1143
- Summons to answer charge of obstructing execution of decrees [O 21 r 97] 1145
- Warrant of attachment of movable property under a money decree [O 21 r 30] 1133
- Warrant for seizure of specific property adjudged by decree [O 21 r 31] 1134
- Warrant to the bailiff to give possession of land etc [O 21 r 35] 1134
- Warrant of arrest in execution [O 21 r 38] 1138
- Warrant of committal of judgment debtor to jail [O 21 r 40] 1135 1136
- Warrant of sale of property in execution of a decree for money [O 21 r 66] 1140
- Warrant of committal [O 21 r 98] 1146

**Forms of supplemental Proceedings—[Appendix F] pp 1147 1151**

- Appointment of a Receiver [O 40 r 1] 1151
- Attachment before judgment with order to call for security for fulfilment of decree [O 38 r 5] 1149
- Attachment before judgment on proof of failure to furnish security [O 38 r 6] 1149
- Bond to be given by Receiver [O 40 r 3] 1151
- Order for committal [O 38 r 4] 1148
- Security for appearance of a defendant arrested before judgment [O 38 r 2] 1147
- Security for the production of property [O 38 r 5] 1149
- Summons to defendant to appear on surety's application for discharge [O 38 r 3] 1149
- Temporary injunctions [O 39 r 1] 1149
- Warrant of arrest before judgment [O 38 r 1] 1147

**Forms of Appeal Reference and Review—[Appendix G] pp 1150 1156**

- Application to appeal *in forma pauperis* [O 44 r 1] 1155
- Decree in appeal [O 41 r 35] 1155
- Intimation to lower court of admission of appeal [O 41 r 13] 1153
- Memorandum of appeal [O 41 r 1] 1152
  - of cross objection [O 41 r 22] 1154
- Notice to respondent of day fixed for hearing of the appeal [O 41 r 14] 1154
- Notice to a party to a suit joined by the Court [O 41 r 20] 1154
- Notice of appeal *in forma pauperis* 1155
- Notice to show cause as to grant of certificate of appeal to the King in Council [O 45 r 3] 1156
- Notice to respondent of admission of appeal to King in Council [O 45 r 8] 1156
- Notice to show cause why a review should not be granted [O 47 r 4] 1156
- Security bond to be given during the pendency of appeal [O 41 r 6] 1152 1153
- Security bond to be given on order to stay execution of decree [O 41 r 5] 1152
- Security for costs of appeal [O 41 r 10] 1153

**Forms Miscellaneous—[Appendix H] pp 1157 1163**

- Agreement of parties as to issues to be tried [O 14 r 6] 1157
- Commission to examine absent witness [O 20 r 4 18] 1159
  - for a local investigation or to examine accounts [O 26 r 9 11] 1160
  - to make a partition [O 26 r 13] 1160
- Letter of request [O 26 r 5] 1159
- List of documents produced by plaintiff or defendant [O 13 r 1] 1155

**Forms Miscellaneous—*contd***

- Notice of application for transfer of suit to another court for trial [a. 24] 1157
- Notice of payment into Court [O 24 r 2] 1157
- Notice to show cause (General form) 1158
- Notice to parties as to examination of witness leaving the jurisdiction [O 18 r 16], 1158
- Notice to minor defendant and guardian [O 32 r 3] 1160 1161
- Notice to opposite party of day fixed for evidence of pauperism [O 33 r 6] 1161
- Notice to surety of his liability under a decree [a. 145] 1161
- Register of civil suits [O 4 r 2] 1162
- Register of appeals [O 41 r 9] 1163

**Frame of suit—435 459 [O 3] See Suits sub head (2)****Fraud—**

- amendment of pleading by adding plea of fraud 504
- appellate Court can only entertain case of fraud specifically alleged in pleadings 483
- decree holder fraud by in not certifying adjustment to Court 641 642
- defence fraud must be specifically pleaded in 500 [O 8 r 2]
- discovery in suits by principal against agent for accounts charging agent with 486
- execution of decree when prevented by fraud and limitation 187 [s. 48 (a) (a)], 184
- proceeding sale in set aside on ground of decree obtained by 160
- foreign judgment obtained by fraud, 81 [a. 13 (c)]
- inherent power of Court to set aside orders obtained by fraud upon Court 393
- judgment obtained by and *res judicata* 69
- limitation in case of application to set aside sale on ground of 60
- minor where decree against is obtained by fraud 61 863
- particulars of to be stated in pleadings 483 [O 6 r 4] 483
- pauper fraudulent disposal of property by and applying to sue in *forma pauperis* 880 [O 33 r 5 (c)]
- place of swing in suit to set aside decree obtained by 109
- sale in execution of decree obtained by 109
- pleading cannot be amended by substituting fraud of another kind 502
- rejection of plaint when particulars of fraud not stated in plaint 453
- res judicata* and judgment obtained by 69
- sale fraud in publishing or conducting 749 [O 21 r 90] 755 756
- setting aside decree *ex parte* obtained by 547 40
- suit against certified purchaser for obtaining certificate of sale by 218 [a. 68 (1)],

**Garnishee—**

- company in liquidation and garnishee order 693
- debt to be attached must be actually due from to judgment-debtor 692
- procedure where garnishee denies debt 694 713
- residing outside jurisdiction and debt also payable outside jurisdiction 694
- set-off garnishee's right of 694

**Government—See Secretary of State Public officer Local Government**

- appearance fixing of day and extension of time for 816 [O 27 r 5]
- attendance of person able to answer questions in suits against 838 [O 26 r 6]
- execution of decree against 822 [a. 82]
- High Court to comply with requisition from for records etc 123 [Charter cl. 43]
- notice before institution of suit against 217 [a. 80]
- pauper suits court fees in and 691 [O 33 r 10],

**Government —*contd***

- pauper suits Government has no lien upon decree for court-fees in 892
- right of to apply for payment of Court fees in 893 [O 33 r 12]
- persons authorised to act for 845 [O 27 r 2]
- place of suing where cause of action arises and carrying on business 247
- process agent for Government to receive 846 [O 27 r 4]
- public officer where Government undertakes defence of suit against 847 [O 27 r 8]
- rateable distribution of assets and rights of 230 [s 73 sub r 3]
- recognized agents of 845 [O 2 r 2]
- security not to be required from under O 41 rr 3 6 p 994 [O 41 r 7]
- signature and verification of plaint and pleading 845 [O 27 r 1]
- suit by or against to be instituted by or against Secretary of State 246 [s 79] 845
- time extension of to enable public officer to make reference to 846 [O 27 r 7]
- title of suits by or against 846 [O 27 r 3]

**Government of India Act 1915**—pp 1215 1224—*See* High Court Act

**Government Pleader—**

- definition of 12 [s 2 (c)]
- dispaupering of plaintiff on application by 890 [O 33 r 9]
- notice to of day for hearing of application for leave to sue as pauper 888 [O 33 r 6]
- suit against Government and 846 [O 27 r 4]

**Government revenue—**

- decree in suit for partition of immovable property paying 629 [O 20 r 18 (1)],
- dispossessing holder for default in payment of 969 [O 39 r 9]

**Governor General in Council—**

- consent of suits against Princes Puling Chiefs and Ambassadors 255 [s 86]
- by alien enemies 253 [s 83 (1)]
- legislative powers of 1274 [Charter cl 44]
- Privy Council no appeal lies to from order of deposing a Maharajah 318
- transfer of suits and appeals from one High Court to another by 121 [s 25]

**Gratuities to Government pensioners—**

- exempt from attachment 192 [s 60 (1) (g)] 198

**Grounds of objection in appeal—**

- memorandum of appeal to be stated in 983 [O 41 r 1 (2)]
- where not stated in 985 [O 41 r 2]

**Guardian ad litem—*See* Minor Next friend**

- abandonment of issue by whether amounts to a compromise 876
- adjustment of decree by without Court's sanction 643
- adverse interest of 869
- affidavit in support of application for appointment of 865 [O 32 r 3 (3)],
- appointment of 865 [O 32 r (3)]
- consent no person to be appointed guardian without his 869 [O 32 r 4 (3)] 87
- costs incurred by officer of Court as 869 [O 32 r 4 (4)]
- death of 879 [O 32 r 11]
- execution proceedings and appointment of 869
- fraud of decree against minor by 868
- leave of Court for compromise of suit by 873 [O 32 r 7]
- to receive money or movable on behalf of minor 872 [O 32 r 6].
- married woman as 869
- minor defendant where not represented by 866 872 [O 32 r 4]
- title of suit against minor 862

**Guardian ad litem—*contd***

- notice of application for appointment of to whom to be given 865 866
- [O 32 r 3 (4)]
- object of having 862
- officer of Courts as 869 [O 32 r 4 (4)] 871
- probate proceedings and appointment of 868
- removal of 879 [O 32 r 11]
- representation of minor by 872 [O 32 r 5]
- retirement of 879 [O 32 r 11]
- security when guardian *ad litem* required to give 872 [O 32 r 6 (\*)]
- service of summons in suits against minors 868
- who may be appointed 869 [O 32 r 4]

**Guardianship—**

- procedure provided in Code in regard to suits to apply to proceedings in 370

**Hearing—See Evidence Issues**

- adjourn hearing when Court may 601 [O 17 r 1]
- adjourned hearing procedure where parties fail to appear at 601 [O 17 r 2] 607
- appeal hearing of 1000 1020 [O 41 rr 16 29]
- disposal of special case and 942 [O 36 r 5]
- suit at first hearing 592 593 [O 15]
- evidence failure to produce at adjourned 603 [O 17 r 3] 604
- at first 593 [O 15 r 4]
- interpleader suits procedure at first hearing in 942 [O 36 r 4]
- pauper applicant death of pending hearing of application, 885
- procedure at hearing of application for leave to sue as 883 [O 33 r 7]
- restoration of appeal heard *ex parte* 1004 [O 41 r 21]
- subordinate Court High Court may stay further hearing of suit pending in, 936 964
- suit hearing of 603 611 [O 18]
- to be continued from day to day 601 [O 17 r 1]

**Heir—**

- decree against a wrong person as heir effect of 181
- execution against a Hindu or Mahomedan heir 181
- joinder of claims in suits by or against heirs 456 [O 2 r 5]
- suit by to recover debt due to the deceased and letters of administration 507-509

**High Court—See Chartered High Courts.****High Courts Act—**

- existing provisions applicable to Supreme Courts to apply to High Courts 1212 [s. 11]
- High Courts constitution and establishment of 1210 [ss 1 2]
- interpretation of terms used in the Act 1214 [s. 19]
- Judges of High Court—See Chartered High Courts Judges of
- jurisdiction and powers of High Courts 1212 [s. 9]
- exercise of by single judges or Division Courts provision for 1213 [s. 13]
- Letters Patent High Courts to be established by 1210 [s. 1]
- order made by a judge in excess of jurisdiction delegated to him 12
- provision as to pending proceedings in abolished Courts 1213 [s. 12]
- subordinate Courts High Court to superintend and frame rules for 1213 [s. 15]
- superintendence power of by High Court 1219 1220
- Supreme Courts and Sudder Courts abolition of 1212 [s. 8]
- transfer of suit or appeal by High Court from one Court to another 1213 [s. 15]

**Hindu Law—**

- ancestral property liability of for debts of father 182 [s 53]
- attachment of stridhan ornaments 197
- benami purchase at court sale 219
- compromise made by Hindu widow how far binding on reversioners 60
  - of suit made by adult male member how far binding on minor 877
- consent decree against Hindu widow how far binding on reversioners 60 61
- decree against Hindu widow how far binding on reversioners 60
  - against Hindu widow on an award when binding on reversioners 60
- execution and Hindu heir 181
- Hindu widow can join claims for ornaments and share in husband's estate 458
- Hindus not governed by Hindu Wills Act and representation before suit 508
- legal representative of Hindu widow suing for husband's property 784.
  - reversioner contesting alleged adoption 784
- letters of administration, when necessary before Hindu heir can sue 508
- manager of joint Hindu family and receipt of property on behalf of minor 872 873
  - how far is an agent for purposes of jurisdiction 102
- mortgage of joint Hindu family property and parties to suit 903 905
- property in hands of Hindu son liable for father's debts 182 [s 53]
- right of Hindu widow to reside in her husband's house cannot be attached 195
- stridhan ornaments and attachment 197
- succession certificate when necessary in suits by Hindu heirs 508
- suit against manager of joint Hindu family and *res judicata* 59

**Hindu Wills Act.**

- to whom applies 508

**Hundis—See Bill of exchange Negotiable instrument****Husband—**

- execution against of decree passed against wife 797 [O 22 r 7 (2)]
- injunction against person preventing wife from returning to her husband 678
- of married executrix etc need not join in suit by or against her, 862 [O 31 r 3]

**Illustrations—**

- in an Act not to control plain meaning of the section 3

**Immovable Property—**

- attachment liable to 191 [s 60 (1)]
  - of 708 [O 21 r 64]
- commission to make partition of 842 [O 26 r 13]
- counterclaim and suit for recovery of 456
- definition of 93
- delivery of possession in execution See Possession
- dispossession of by purchaser in execution 770 [O 21 r 100]
  - by order of Collector 706
- distribution of assets on sale of immovable property 229 [s 73 (1)]
- easement transfer of is a transfer of interest in 207
- equity of redemption is for purposes of attachment 708
- execution of decree for delivery of building or enclosure 681 [O 21 r 35]
  - of in possession of tenant 684 685 [O 21 r 36].
  - where lands lie in more than one jurisdiction 645 [O 21 r 3]
- joinder of claim for recovery both of movable and 405
- jurisdiction possession of immovable property in foreign country and, 84
  - execution of decree where lands lie in more than one 645 [O 21 r 3]



**Immovable Property—*contd***

- jurisdiction in suits relating to immovable property 91 92 [s 16]
  - situate in different suit for immovable property 96 [s 17]
- particulars to be specified in application for attachment of 650 [O 21, r 13]
- partition of decree in suit for 628 [O 20 r 18]
  - estate or separate possession of a share suit for 184 [s 54]
- plaint in suit for recovery of 507 [O 7 r 3]
- possession delivery of in execution *See* Possession
- pre-emption right of can only be exercised in respect of 625
- recovery of decree for 616 [O 20 r 9]
- restitution of sold in execution pending appeal to Privy Council 1044
- sale of in execution 739 772 [O 21 rr 82 96] *See* Sale
  - and purchaser's title 213 [s 65]
- service of summons on agent in charge in suits for 467 [O 5 r 14]
- Small Causes Court cannot attach immovable property 597 [O 16 r 10 proviso]
- stay of sale of pending appeal 993 [O 41 r 6 (2)]
- suits for immovable property and jurisdiction 91 92 [s 16]
  - land within the meaning of cl 12 of the Charter 1241 1245
  - partition of estate or for separate possession of a share 184 [s 54]
    - property partly outside jurisdiction of Chartered High Court 1245
  - recovery of what are within meaning of 455 [O 2 r 4]
  - relating to several properties one within jurisdiction of Chartered High Court 1245
  - relating to immovable property situated in different jurisdictions 96 [s 17]

**Impounding—**

- documents of 585 [O 13 r 8]
- movable property of pending appeal to Privy Council 1039 [O 45 r 13 (2) (a)]

**Imprisonment—*See* Arrest and Detention****Infant—*See* Minor****Information—**

- Advocate General power of to exhibit 246 [s 79 (2)] 247

**Inherent powers—**

- appeal from orders passed under 396
- instances relating to exercise of 392 396
- of Courts 392 [s 151]
- of Chartered High Courts to stay proceedings in another Court 962 963
- to amend decrees and orders 396 [s 152] 397

**Injunction—**

- compensation where undertaking given by plaintiff's counsel 287
  - where injunction wrongfully obtained 284 285 [s 90]
- corporation against how may be enforced 676 [O 21 r 32 (2)] 983 [O 39 r 6]
- decree for and *res judicata* 43
- disobedience of decree for 677 [O 21 r 32 (5)]
- execution of decree granting 167 [s 48 (1)] 173
- land does not run with 157 [Case 6]
- legal representative injunction in suits for light and air binding on 179
- limitation and execution of decree granting 167 [s 48 (1)]
- mortgagor injunction restraining from receiving income of mortgaged property 921 922
- notice whether necessary where suit against public officer is one for 250 251
- perpetual regulated by ss 55 57 of Specific Relief Act 900 901

**Injunction—*contd***

- public nuisance in suits respecting 261 [s 91]
- special provisions for enforcing decree for 61 [O 21 r 32 (5)]
- temporary—*See* sub head Temporary injunction
- wife prevented by third party from returning to her husband and injunction 676
- wilful failure to obey what amounts to 678
- Temporary injunctions—**284 [s 94] 959 968 [O 39 rr 15]
  - appeal from order discharging varying or setting aside an injunction 968
    - granting or refusing 962
  - appellate Court power of to grant 960
  - contract to restrain party from committing breach of 964 965 [O 39 r 2]
  - corporation injunction to binding on its officers 968 [O 39 r 2]
  - disobedience of order granting injunction 964 [O 39 r 2 (3)]
  - duration and effect of 960
  - granted when 959 [O 39 r 1] 960
  - injury to restrain party from committing 964 [O 39 r 2]
  - jail whether Court can commit a party to of its own motion for disobeying 967
  - mandatory injunction 967
  - Native State British Indian Court cannot restrain party from proceeding with suit in 963
  - notice to opposite party before granting injunctions 967 [O 39 r 3]
  - order for may be discharged varied or set aside 968 [O 39 r 4]
  - principles governing temporary injunctions 960 960 960
  - probate proceedings whether injunction can be granted in 964
  - property in danger of being wrongfully sold in execution 959 [O 39 r 1 (a)] 961
  - receiver distinction between temporary injunction and appointment of 975
  - restraining party from proceeding with suit in another Court 962 963
  - revision of order made by lower appellate Court on application for 962
  - subordinate Court power of Chartered High Courts to stay suits pending in 963 964

**Insolvency—**

- adjudication order effect of attachment after 217
- annulment of during pendency of suit substitution of insolvent 804
- Administration suits how far provisions of Insolvency Acts applicable in 624
- appeal to Privy Council right of under Provincial Insolvency Act 318
- appellant insolvent and security for costs of appeal 906
- arrest of judgment-debtor and 187
- attachment after judgment effect of order of adjudication on 213
  - before judgment effect of vesting order on 957
- charging order in favour of partner under O 21 r 49 p 693
- Charter provisions in with respect to Insolvency Courts 1261 [Charter cl 18]
- costs of insolvent party to suit 798
  - successful defendant in suit continued by Official Assignee 799
- creditors rights of secured under Insolvency Acts 624
- defendant insolvency of pending suit 798 803
- firm insolvency of and execution against partner 701
- judgment entered up under s 86 of Insolvent Debtors Act is a money-decree 240
- Official Assignee joinder of on insolvency of defendant pending suit 803
  - substitution of insolvent in place of on annulment of adjudication, 804
- plaintiff insolvency of and security for costs 797 [O 21 r 8]
- rateable distribution order for and insolvency of judgment debtor 242
- receiver in of mortgagor or mortgagee necessary party to suits on mortgage 899

**Insolvency —*contd***

rights created by s 73 not affected by subsequent insolvency 242  
 security for costs of appeal and insolvent appellant 996  
     on insolvency of plaintiff 797 [O 22 r 8]  
*set-off in insolvency proceedings* 529  
 vesting order effect of on attachment after judgment 213  
     before judgment 957

**Inspection—**

appeal from order for 573  
 banker's books and other books of account inspection of 572 [O 1 r 17]  
 business books giving copies of entries in instead of inspection 573 574 [O 11 r 19]  
 confidential communications when protected from 565 566  
 copies right of inspecting party to take 570  
 Court by of documents for which privilege claimed 567 568  
 documents of not referred to in pleadings and affidavits 573 [O 11 r 18 (2)]  
     referred to in pleadings and affidavits 570 [O 11 r 15]  
     power of Court to order inspection of 122 [s 30 (a)]  
     public official documents when protected from 566  
     which an adversary is entitled to inspect 564 565  
 inspection by whom may be taken 572  
 issue determination of to decide upon right to inspection 575  
 non compliance with order for 575 [O 11 r 21]  
 notice to produce documents for 570 571 [O 11, r 15] 572 [O 11 r 16]  
 order for of documents 572 573 [O 11 r 18]  
     of property which is subject matter of suit 968 [O 39 r 7]  
 photographs right of inspecting parties to take 570  
 place and time appointing for inspection 572 [O 11 r 17]  
 privilege 565 566  
     and power of Court to inspect documents for which claimed 567 568  
 property inspection of by Court 611 [O 18 r 18]  
 property which is subject matter of suit inspection of, 968 [O 39 r 7], 969

**Insurance—**

policy of for benefit of wife and children, when attachable 196

**Instalments—**

decree or subsequent order may direct payment by 616 [O 20 r 11]  
 execution of decree payable by 617 618  
 interest rate of when decree made payable by 617  
 limitation period of for application for payment by instalments 617

**Interest—**

assignment of interest in pending suit 802 [O 22 r 10] 803  
 awarded by Court when 123 124 [s 34]  
 bill of exchange when no rate of interest is specified in 125  
 costs on 127 [s 35 (3)]  
     where not allowed by Privy Council 1044  
*damdupal* rule of 126 127  
 deposit in Court interest not allowed to plaintiff after notice of 830 [O 24, r 3]  
 devolution of in representative suit 802 803  
 foreclosure suit interest in 909 952 [O 34 r 11] 934  
 instalments rate of interest when decree made payable by 617  
 Interest Act 32 of 1839 interest payable under 125  
 jurisdiction amount of interest how far affects 141

**Interest—contd**

- keeping down interest on incumbrances of property, 1206 [Sch III para 9 (3) (c) (i)]
- limitation and interest recoverable by way of damages in mortgage suits 934
- mercantile usage interest payable under 124
- mesne profits interest as forming part of 621
- mortgage interest in suits for enforcement of 933 935
  - when suit for interest due on a bars subsequent suit for principal 441
- mortgage deed no express provision in for payment of interest after due date 934
- penalty when rate of interest agreed on is in the nature of 124
- Privy Council whether interest affects the amount in dispute on appeal to 324 326
- proclamation of sale liability for interest not covered by 743 [O 21 r 89 (3)]
- promissory note when no rate is specified in 125
- rate of interest in mortgage suits 932 [O 34 r 11] 933
- refused when deemed to have been 124 [s 34 (2)]
- restitution interest payable by way of 343 [s 144 (1)]
- reversal of decree order for payment of interest on 373 [s 144 (1)]
- suit interest prior to date of 124
- summary suit no interest allowed in unless specified in note or bill 948 949
- variation of decree order for payment of interest on 373 [s 144 (1)]

**Interlocutory orders—**

- appeal from of High Courts to Privy Council 1272 [Charter cl 40]
  - of other Courts 310 [s 104] 1078 1079 [O 43 r 1]
- building or land order authorizing persons to enter into 968 [O 30 r 7 (1) (b)]
- execution proceedings in 166 167
- immediate delivery of possession of certain lands order for 969 [O 30 r 9]
  - payment of money or delivery of movables order for 969 970 [O 39 r 10]
- res judicata and 77
- revision when subject to 339 343
- sale interim of movable property subject to speedy decay 968 [O 39 r 6]
  - of securities where state of market requires such sale 968
- stay of suit under sec 10 and 33
- subject matter of suit order for detention preservation or inspection of 968 [O 39 r 7 (1)]
- trustee order against for deposit of moneys etc in Court 969 970 [O 39 r 10]

**Interpleader—258 [s 88] [O 35]**

- admissions of parties Court may adjudicate title on 942 [O 35 r 4 (2)]
- agents may not institute interpleader suit 942 [O 35 r 5]
- appeal from orders under O 35 rr 3 4 and 6 pp 941 942 943
- charge for plaintiff's costs 943 [O 35 r 6]
- claimant other than plaintiff joinder of as plaintiff 942 [O 35 r 4 (3) (b)]
- costs in interpleader suits 941 942 [O 35 rr 3 4] 943 [ib r 6]
- deposit of money or thing in dispute in Court 941 [O 35 r 2]
- hearing procedure at first 942 [O 35 r 4]
- nature of 259 259
- non appearance of claimant defendants in interpleader suit 942
- plaint in interpleader suit 941 [O 35 r 1] p 1080 [Form No 40]
- railway company interpleader suit by 943
- stay of suit brought against plaintiff (stakeholder) 941 [O 35 r 3]

**Interpleader—*contd***

suit interpleader when may or may not be instituted 208 [s, 88]  
 tenants may not institute interpleader suits 942 [O 35 r 5]  
 what is an interpleader suit 258 209

**Interpretation—**

Act of the 2 4  
 illustrations not to control plain meaning of sections 3  
 law effect of new interpretation of on sale 770  
 marginal notes to sections not to be referred to for construing sections, 3  
 retrospective alterations in procedure are 3  
 rules in Sch 1 as controlling sections 4  
 statement of Objects and Reasons not to be referred to in interpreting the Code 2

**Interrogatories—555 564 [O 11, rr 1 11]**

admissions from opponent to obtain 556  
 affidavits in regard to 563 563 [O 11 rr 8 10]  
 agent or servant of party interrogated answers as to matters done by 567 563  
 allowed what interrogatories may or may not be 556 557  
 amendment of answers to 401  
 answers when not sufficient 563 [O 11 r 11]  
 bona fide not exhibited 560 [O 11 r 6]  
 company refusing to register person as transferee of shares and as to reasons for refusal 558  
 confidential communications between party and his legal advisers 507  
 consequence of failure to answers 575 [O 11 r 21]  
 corporation where party to be interrogated is 560 [O 11 r 5]  
 costs of 560 [O 11 r 3]  
 cross examination distinguished from 509  
 defendant may administer interrogatories to co defendant 509  
 discovery by 505 506 [O 11 r 1]  
 ejectment suit and interrogatories 557  
 evidence party not to interrogate about adversary's 557  
     using answers to interrogatories in evidence at trial 575 [O 11 r 22]  
 fishing 561  
 form of 560 [O 11 r 4]  
     of affidavit in answer 563 [O 11 r 9]  
 irrelevant 556 [O 11 r 1 proviso]  
 issues framing of from answers to 589 [O 14 r 3 (b)]  
 leave of Court can be delivered only by 555 508 [O 11 r 1] 559 [O 11 r 1]  
 lunatic or minor where opposite party is 559 576 [O 11 r 23]  
 names of persons relating to 508  
 not material at the stage they are delivered 560 [O 11 r 6]  
 objection to answer 559  
 order to answer or answer further 563 [O 11 r 11]  
 pleadings distinguished from 509  
 power of Court to order delivery and answering of 122 [s 30 (d)]  
 privilege where party claims 563 564  
 public interests interrogatories involving disclosures injurious to 557  
 scandalous or irrelevant 560 [O 11 r 6]  
 set of interrogatories only one allowed 556 [O 11 r 1 proviso]  
 striking out prolix unnecessary or scandalous interrogatories 562 [O 11 r 7]  
 submitting of interrogatories to Court before delivery 559 [O 11 r 2]

**Interrogatories—*contd***

time for delivery of 558

within which application lies for striking out 562 [O 11 r 7]

wagering in cases where defence of is set up 569

witness cannot be administered to 559

**Investigation (local)—**

commission for 840 841 [O 26 rr 9 10] *See Commission*

**Investigations of claims and objections in execution—*See Attachment and sub heads*****Irregularity—**

appeal and irregularity affecting jurisdiction or merits 297 [s 99]

irregularity in orders may be made a ground of objection in 13 [s 105 (1)]

attaching property irregularity in 49 [O 21 r 90] 754

immovable property in publishing and conducting sale of 49 [O 1 r 90] *See*

Material Irregularity in conducting Sale

instances of error defect or irregularity not affecting merits 298

movable property irregularity in sale of not to vitiate sale 737 [O 21 r 78]

remand irregularity may be a ground for 1010

revision irregularity may be a ground for if material 338 [s 115 (c)] 347

sale-certificate effect of on irregularities 771

of movable property irregularity in not to vitiate sale 737 [O 21 r 78]

second appeal irregularity may be a ground for 300 [s 100 (1) (c)]

set aside sale of immovable property on ground of who may apply to 750

Suits Valuation Art VII of 1887 s 11 and irregularity affecting jurisdiction 299

time within which application lies to set aside sale on ground of 780

**Issues—586-592 [O 14]—**

abandon power of pleader to 16

additional power of Court to frame 590 [O 14 r 5 (1)]

agreement to state questions of law or fact in form of 591 [O 14 r 6]

amend power of Court to 590 [O 14 r 5 (1)]

appeal from order referring issues for trial to lower Court 1015

refusing to frame an issue 599

burden of proof 606 [O 18 r 3]

Court to frame issue 590 [O 14 r 1 (a)]

decision on each issue when Court to state 614 [O 21 r 5]

defence where defendant at first hearing of suit makes no 587 [O 14 r 1 (6)].

delegation of power by Court to commissioner to try material issues not allowed 841

documents examination of before framing issues 590 [O 14 r 4]

evidence where case disclosed in is different from that disclosed in plaint 589

examination of documents parties or witnesses before framing issues 590 [O 14 r 4]

586 [O 14 r 1 (3)]

fact what is an issue of 586 [O 14 r 1 (4)]

framing of by appellate Court 1014 [O 41 r 2a]

guardian *ad litem* or next friend abandonment of issue by effect of 876

High Court power of to refer issues of fact for trial to lower appellate Court 1016.

inspection determination of issue to decide upon right to 575

judgment Court may pronounce at once when 59 [O 15 rr 1 2].

on questions stated by agreement in form of issues 591 [O 14 r 7].

jurisdiction, objection to to be taken at or before settlement of issues 110 [s. 21].

law what is an issue of 586 [O 14 r 1 (4)]

when may Court try issues of first 589 [O 14 r 2].

Issues—*contd.*

- material allegations in plaint effect of no denial or issue as to 583
  - not denied in written statement 588
- materials from which issues may be framed 589 [O 14 r 3]
- minority preliminary issue as to 864
- new issue raised before High Courts 1015
- object of framing issues 587
- objection to place of suing must be taken at or before settlement of 110 [s 21]
- objections to findings on issues referred to lower Court 1015 [O 41 r 26]
- pleadings issues not to be inconsistent with 588
- preliminary issue raised that suit or appeal does not lie 605
- procedure where parties are at issue 592 [O 15 r 3]
- remand of case by consent for trial on issues not raised in appeal 1013
- resetting of by appellate Court 1014 [O 41 r 24]
- res judicata and issue of fact law or mixed law and fact 52A
  - findings on issues and 71 72
- second appeal power of High Court to determine issues of fact in 309 [s 103]
- strike out issues power of Court to 590 [O 14 r 5 (2)]
- summons may be for settlement of 460 [O 5 r o]
- wrong issue where lower Court has framed a 538

Jail—*See* Arrest and Detention Imprisonment

service on defendant in 473 [O 5 r 24]

Joinder—*See* Plaintiffs Defendants Causes of Action Misjoinder Non joinder

## (1) of plaintiffs—

- ancestral property in suit to recover 409
- appeal misjoinder of plaintiffs and 297 [s 99]
- election when plaintiffs may be put to 410 [O 1 r 2]
- joinder of plaintiffs 404 [O 1 r 1]
  - and causes of action 446 [O 2 r 3]
  - having different interests in one suit 408 409
- judgment for one or more of the plaintiffs 416 [O 1 r 4 (a)]
- misjoinder—*See* Misjoinder
- non joinder—*See* Non joinder
- numerous plaintiffs having same interest 418 [O 1 r 8]
- procedure in case of misjoinder of plaintiffs and causes of action 448.
- relief right to exists (severally jointly or in alternative) 409 410
  - in two or more persons severally 409
- separate trials power to order where joinder improper 410 [O 1 r 2]
- who may be joined as plaintiffs 404 [O 1 r 1]

## (2) of defendants—

- appeal misjoinder of defendants and 297 [s 99]
- bills of exchange parties to 417
- company and its directors in case of a false and fraudulent prospectus 412 413
- contract parties liable on same 416 [O 1 r 6]
- ejectment suit when land claimed in possession of several defendants 414
- joinder of defendants 410 411 [O 1 r 3]
- joint wrong doers 414
- judgment against one or more of the defendants 418 [O 1 r 4 (b)]
- misjoinder—*See* Misjoinder
- multifarious suits held to be 449-451
  - not to be 452

**Joinder—contd****(2) of defendants—contd**

- negotiable instrument parties liable on same 416 [O 1 r 6]
- non joinder—*See* Non joinder
- numerous defendants having same interest 418 [O 1 r 8]
- plaintiff when in doubt from whom redress is to be sought 418 [O 1 r 7]
- relief claimed every defendant need not be interested in the whole 416 [O 1 r 5]
- when claimed in the alternative 415
- who may be joined as defendants 410 411 [O 1 r 3]

**(3) of causes of action—446 453 [O 2 r 3]**

- administrator or executor joinder of causes of action by or against 456 [O 2 r 5]
- appeal misjoinder of causes of action and 297 [s 99]
- Charter joinder of causes of action under 1249 [Charter cl 14]
- heir joinder of causes of action by or against 456 [O 2 r 5]
- immovable property in suits for recovery of 454 [O 2 r 4] 455
- joinder of causes of action 446 [O 2 r 3]
- misjoinder—*See* Misjoinder
- separate trials of causes of action 458 [O 2 r 6]

**(4) of respondents—1003 O 41 r 20]****(5) of trustees, executors and administrators—**

- husband of married executrix etc not to be joined as a party 862 [O 31 r 3]
- when to be joined as parties 861 [O 31 r 2]

**Joint—**

- attachment of share in joint property application for 651 [O 21 r 13 (b)]
- bid of co sharer at sale of share in joint property 742 [O 21 r 88]
- contract liability on a joint 417
  - on a joint and several 417
- execution application for by joint decree holder 651 [O 21 r 15]
  - liability in of ancestral property 182 [s 53]
- joint decree what is 652
- mortgage suits on and joint Hindu family 903 905
- promisors joint 416 [O 1 r 6]
- separate debt cannot be set-off against joint and several debt 525
- wrong-doers joint 414

**Judge—**

- amendment of memorandum of appeal to be signed by 887 [O 41 r 3 (3)]
- appeal not allowed from award made by a judge as arbitrator 1186
- arbitrator judge acting as has no power to alter an award once made 1186
  - judge may be made by consent 112
- arrest exemption of judge from 365 [s. 13a]
- decision where appeal is heard by two or more judges 29a [s 93]
- definition of 12 [s 2 (8)]
- dissenting from judgment of Court 1026 [O 41 r 34]
  - need not sign decree 1096 [O 41 r 35 proviso]
- evidence power of judge to deal with taken before another judge 610 [O 18 r 15]
  - when unable to make memorandum of to record reasons 609 [O 18 r 14]
- execution of document by on failure of judgment debtor to do so 680 [O 21 r 34].
- High Court Judges—*See* Chartered High Court Judges of
- judge not to act in matter in which he has an interest 12
- judgment written by predecessor power of to pronounce 613 [O 20 r 2]



Judgment-debtor—*contd*

transfer *pendente lite* by judgment-debtor 777 [O 21 r 10<sup>o</sup>].

transferee of decree to hold subject to equity of judgment-debtor 175 [s 49].

Jurisdiction—*See* Jurisdiction of Chartered High Courts

acquiescence of defendant residing outside, 99 [a. 20 (b)] 103

agreement to submit to foreign jurisdiction 84.

appeal irregularity not affecting jurisdiction 297 [s 99].

arbitrator where a judge has no jurisdiction, but acts as 112

arrest before judgment of defendant leaving or removing property—

(1) who has left or is about to leave jurisdiction, from 900 [O 38 r 1 (a)].

under provisions not relating to execution of person residing outside 367 [s 180]

attachment before judgment of property outside jurisdiction 950 [O 38 r 6]

not in execution, of property outside jurisdiction 367 [a. 136].

business carrying on in foreign country through an agent and, 84.

cause of action, and jurisdiction 99 [s 20 (c)] 103

joinders of causes of action and jurisdiction, 447 [O 2 r 3 (2)].

several against same defendant and 453

Central Provinces jurisdiction of Courts 89

Chartered High Court—*See* Chartered High Courts

Collector's action in executing decree for partition of estates and jurisdiction of Court to control, 184

matters within and bar of jurisdiction of civil Courts 220 [a. 70 (2)]

commission to examine witnesses—

(1) about to leave jurisdiction 837 [O 26 r 4 (1) (b)].

(2) residing beyond jurisdiction, 837 [O 26 r 4 (1) (a)].

(3) residing within jurisdiction 835 [O 26 r 1] 836 [ib r 3].

compensation for wrongful arrest etc and 235 [s 95 *proviso*].

Competent Court of and *res judicata* 63

not and *res judicata* 69

concurrent jurisdiction and *res judicata* 64-63

consent of parties and 112

continuance of of Court executing transferred decree 146

contract breach of and place of suing 104.

corporation where deemed to carry on business 99 [a. 20 *Explan. II*].

costs want of jurisdiction no bar to power of Court to award 127 [s 35 (1)]

decree of foreign Court passed without 82 83

passed without 112

decision wrong as to and revision 353

dismissal of suit for want of, and *res judicata* 70

District Courts jurisdiction of 88

England, jurisdiction of Courts of over British Indian subjects in British India 83

error not affecting and appeal 297 [a. 99].

examination of witness about to leave 610 [O 18 r 16 (1)].

executing Court cannot inquire as to jurisdiction of Court passing decree 646

jurisdiction of 140

powers of 141 142

execution of decree in case of foreign judgment passed without 147

when lands situated in more than one 640 [O 21 r 3].

exercise of, by Court not vested in it and revision 346

failure to exercise jurisdiction vested in Court, and revision, 337 [a. 115 (b)] 346.

Jurisdiction—*contd*

- foreign country carrying on business in through an agent and 84
  - possession of immovable property in and 84
- foreign Court extent of jurisdiction of 83
- foreign judgment and presumption as to 86 87 [s 14]
  - passed without jurisdiction 80 [s 13 (a)] 147
- foreigners non resident and 110
  - carrying on business within through an agent 860
  - jurisdiction over under cl 12 of the Charter 1246 1247
- garnishee residing outside and debt also payable outside 694
- High Court jurisdiction and powers of 1212 [High Courts Act s 9]
- Hindu family how far manager of joint is an agent for the purposes of 102
- inherent jurisdiction 392 [s 151].
  - power of Court to decide questions of 393
- irregular exercise of and revision 338 [s 115 (c)] 347
- irregularity affecting jurisdiction of Court and Suits Valuation Act 299
- Jhansi, of civil Courts of 89
- jurisdiction of Courts executing decrees 140 141
- land, suits for under cl 12 of the Charter 1241 1245
- leave of Court to sue under s 20 of the Code 102
  - under cl 12 of the Charter 1245 1246
- local limits of uncertainty as to 97
- material irregularity in exercise of and revision 338 [s 115 (c)].
- meaning of 111 345
- Munsif's Court no jurisdiction to decide on title 66
- Munsif jurisdiction of 89
- Native States jurisdiction to entertain suits against subjects of 110
- objection as to jurisdiction when to be taken 114.
- original and appellate jurisdiction of Courts explained, 88
- Oudh of civil Courts of 89
- over valuation and under valuation of suits and 89 90
- place of suing objection as to 110 [s 21].
- pecuniary jurisdiction limits of 19 [s 6]
  - principles regulating 89
- plaint to contain facts showing Court has jurisdiction 506 [O 7 r 1 (f)]
- Presidency Small Causes Courts of 88
- Probate Courts no jurisdiction to decide on title 65
- protest against jurisdiction of foreign Court 84
- Provincial Small Cause Courts of 89
- relief *in personam* and 91 92 [s 16 proviso]
- relinquishment of part of claim to bring suit within 43, [O 2 r 2 (1)].
- residence more than one and jurisdiction 101
  - resides meaning of 100
- res judicata and 63 69
- restitution of conjugal rights suit for and 108
- review granted without jurisdiction 106.2
- revision 337 338 [s 115 (a)]
  - as to non exercise or wrong exercise of jurisdiction 345 346.
- second appeal objection as to jurisdiction taken for the first time in 306
- service of summons where defendant resides outside jurisdiction 471 [O 5 r 21].
- submission to jurisdiction of foreign Court 83 84
- subordinate Judges of 88 89

Jurisdiction—*contd*

- suits against corporations and 99 [s 20 Exp II] 109 110
  - Princes and Chiefs and 255 [s 86] 257
  - Secretary of State and 246
- for determination of any other right to or interest in immovable property 91 [s 16 (d)] 93 94
- for compensation for wrong to person or movables 98 [s 19]
  - immovable property situate in different jurisdictions 96 [s 17]
  - partition of property situated in different jurisdictions 96
  - restitution of conjugal rights 108
  - wrong to land 91 [s 16 (e)]
- immovable property relating to 91 92 [s 16] 96 [s 17] 97 [s 18]
  - in personam* 90
- to set aside decree obtained by fraud and place of suing 109
  - sale in execution of decree obtained by fraud and place of suing 109
  - where local limits of jurisdiction of Courts are uncertain 97 [s 18]
- temporary residence of defendant and cause of action 99 [s 20 Exp I] 101
- transfer of suits and 118
- uncertainty of local limits as to 97
- under valuation of claim and objection as to jurisdiction 111
- valuation for determining jurisdiction of appellate Court 239
  - of suits and jurisdiction 89
  - where subject matter of suit does not admit of valuation 90
- waiver of plea as to jurisdiction 112
- Justice equity and good conscience—
  - where no specific provision in the Code Courts to act according to 3
- Laches—
  - revision and 355
- Land—*See* Immovable property
  - attachment liable to in execution of decree 191 [s 60 (1)]
  - suits for under cl 12 of the Charter 1241 1245
- Land Acquisition Act—
  - appeal to P C from award of High Court on appeal from District Court under 1971
  - Collector acting under s 11 of not a Court for purposes of revision 345
- Land revenue—
  - neglect to pay and delivery of possession to party who pays 967 [O 39 r 9]
- Landlord—
  - interpleader suit by tenant against 945 [O 35 r 5]
  - saving of rights of 18 [s 4 (2)]
    - special provisions for recovery of rent of agricultural land 18 [s 4 (2)]
- Language—
  - English recording evidence in 369 [s 133]
  - subordinate Courts of 369 [s 137]
- Law—
  - alteration of and *res judicata* 52a 52b
    - and review 1002
  - appeal from decree in pauper suits when decree contrary to law 1030 [O 44 r 1]
  - arbitrator and questions of law 1183

Law—*cont'd*

Chartered High Court law to be administered by—

in the exercise of ordinary original civil jurisdiction 1761 [Charter cl. 19]  
 extraordinary original civil jurisdiction 1267 [Charter cl. 20]  
 appellate jurisdiction 1761 [Charter cl. 21]

court the effect of new interpretation of law on 770

issue of and *res judicata* 524 528

what is 470

when may be tried first 559 [O 14 r 2]

issues questions of law may by agreement be stated in form of 591 [O 14 r 6]

pauper appeal Court may admit when decree contrary to law 1030 [O 44 r 1]

pleadings to state fact and not law 47

presumption of and pleadings 49 [O 6 r 13]

Privy Council appeal to and question of law 323 [s. 110]

reference to High Court on question of law 1045 [O 46 r 1]

rejection of plaint where suit barred by any law 515 [O 7 r 11 (2)]

*res judicata* alteration of law and, 524 528

issue of law and 524

review alteration of law and 1027

revision erroneous decision of law whether ground for interference in 347

second appeal questions of law and 299 [s. 100 (1) (a)]

usage having the force of law and 299 [s. 100 303 304]

special or local saving of 18 [s. 4 (1)]

transfer of decree by operation of law what is 600

## Leave of Court—

appeal to Privy Council leave to prefer 317 [s. 109] [O 45 r 3]

urge grounds not taken in leave to 985 [O 41 r 2]

Charter to institute suit under cl. 12 of the 145 1246

does not cover amendments unless formal 146

must be obtained before institution of suit 1245

compromise by next friend or guardian leave for 83 [O 3 r 7]

concise statement to amend, so as to make it correspond with plaint 513 [O 7 r 9 (3)]

decree holder leave to to bid at sale 733 [O 21 r 72]

directors for imprisonment of 616 [O 21 r 32 (2)]

disability persons under in cases of consent on behalf of 337 [s. 147]

documents not produced when plaint filed to adduce in evidence 519 [O 7 r 18]

execution leave to: in suits between co-partners 859 [O 30 r 9]

against person not served as partner 699 [O 21 r 50-  
 (?) 700]

guardian or next friend for compromise by 873 [O 3 r 7]

husband, to execute against decree obtained against wife 79 [O 22 r 7 (2)]

interrogatories to deliver 555 [O 11 r 1] 559 [O 11 r 2]

joining claims for recovery of immovable property with other claims and 454

jurisdiction to sue where all defendants do not reside within 99 [s. 20 (6)]

minor to receive money on behalf of 82 [O 32 r 6]

to compromise suits by or against 83 [O 3 r 7]

where elects to proceed with suit in his own name 890 [O 32 r 12 (2)]

numerous parties having same interest leave to sue or be sued 415 [O 1 r 8]

partner to execute decree against who has not been served and has not appeared  
 699 [O 21 r 50 (2)] 700

pauper to appeal 1030 [O 44 r 1]

to sue as 884 [O 33 r 2]

**Leave of Court—*contd***

persons to whom leave under O 1 r 8 can be granted 42<sup>a</sup>

pleader for discharge of 461 [O 3 r 4 (2)].

pleadings to amend 496 [O 6 r 17]

may be granted at any stage of the proceedings 503

to present subsequent to written statement 531 [O 8 r 9].

Privy Council appeal from order granting or refusing leave to appeal to 1034

application for leave to appeal to 1032 [O 45 r 2]

to appeal to 317 [s 109] [O 45 r 3]

whether order granting leave to appeal to is open to review 334

receiver to institute suit against 972 [Case 2]

recovery of land to join claims with suit for 454 [O 2 r 4].

remedies to omit one of several 436 [O 2 r 2 (3)]

review whether order granting leave to appeal to Privy Council is open to 334.

sale to adjourn when held in precincts of Court house 730 [O 21 r 69 (1) proviso].

summary suit to appear and defend in 946 [O 37 r 2 (?)] [O 37 r 3]

time for obtaining under O 2 r 2 p 444

under O 1 r 8 p 422

under O 2 r 4 p 454

under s 20 p 102

under cl 12 of the Charter 1245

transfer pending suit to continue suit in case of 802 [O 22 r 10].

withdrawing suit with liberty to bring fresh suit for 807 [O 23 r 1 (2)].

**Legal maxims—**

equity acts in *personam* 9.

**Legal representative—*See* Abatement**

abatement power of Court to add legal representative as a party after 793

accounts power of Court executing decree to compel legal representative to produce 178 [s 50 (-)]

appellant legal representative of when to be brought on record 782, 63

certificate of sale to 768

deaths successive of judgment debtor and his 178

debts of the deceased when legal representative *personally* liable for 180, 181

decree against person *alleged* to be a legal representative 793

wrong person as 181

defendant legal representative of when to be brought on record 788 [O 2<sup>a</sup> r 4 (1)].

definition of 12 [s 2 (11)] 13, 177

determination of question as to who is 79. [O 22 r 5]

enforcement of decree passed against 180 [s -].

previous proceedings in and 178

execution when decree passed against deceased 176 [s 50].

when decree passed against legal representative 180 [s 52]

*ex parte* decree application by legal representative to set aside 548

extent of liability of in execution 176 [s 50 (?)]

heir decree against a wrong person as 181

Hindu son property in the hands of liable for father's debts 18<sup>a</sup> [s. 53]

reversioner or widow continuation of suit on death of 784

injunction against execution of decree for 179

intermeddler with estate of deceased is a 12, 13

joint decree holder legal representative of and execution 601 [O 21 r 15].

notice where execution is applied against 668 [O 21 r 2-].

**Legal representative—*contd***

- objection by that property attached is his own 158
- partner of deceased need not be joined in suit by or against firms 855 [O 30 r 4].
- party power of Court to add legal representative as after abatement 793
- parties whether all should be made when there are two or more 784.
- pauper suit by legal representative of a deceased 884
- plaint in suit by 507 [O 7 r 4]
- plaintiff legal representative of when to be brought on record 781 [O 22 r 3 (1)]
- res judicata* and determination of question as to 796

**Legislature—**

- members of legislative bodies exempted from arrest under civil process 367
- proceedings of in passing an Act not to be referred to in construing Act 2

**Letter—**

- substitution of for summons 40 [O 3 r 30]

**Letters of Administration—**

- dismissal of suit for failure to produce and *res judicata* 70
- when necessary 503

**Letter of Request—**

- for examination of witness residing outside *British India* 944 [s 77] 838 [O 26 r 5].

**Letters Patent—**

- Allahabad High Court of 1276 180
- appeal under cl 15 of 268 312
  - Income Tax Act reference under and cl 36 of 297
  - cl 15 of from orders passed in revision 300
- Calcutta Bombay and Madras High Courts of 1234 1270
- Lahore High Court of 1292 1900
- Patna High Court of 1291 1291
- provisions of former inconsistent with present to be void 1270 [Charter cl 45].
- Rangoon High Court of 1300 1310
- revision orders in and appeal under cl 15 of 300
- revocation of Letters Patent of 1862 p 1230 [Charter cl 1]

**Liability—**

- ancestral property of and execution proceedings 182 [s 53]
- joint and several on contracts 416 [O 1 r 6] 417
- of joint tortfeasors 414
- of legal representative extent of 176

**Lien—**

- Attorney's 520 531
  - and receivable distribution 242
- Government and first charge for court fees in pauper suits 89.
- interpleader suit lien of plaintiff in 943 [O 30 r 6]
- pleader lien of for costs and set-off 504 [O 8 r 6 (2)].
- receiver lien of 979

## Limitation—

- addition of parties and 426 [O 1 r 10 (5)] 428 432
  - party interested as respondent and 1003
- Advocate-General as against in suits relating to public charities 283
- amendment of application for execution 663
- appeal from decision rejecting memorandum of appeal on ground of 987
  - to Privy Council application for leave to be made within what time 311
- appeals and limitation 983
- assignment pending suit effect of adding or substituting a party on 806
- award made on a reference without intervention of court application to file 1194
- award application to set aside 1182
- certificate for suing Ruling Chief time spent in obtaining and 257
- Collector property in the management of under s 72 and 228
- compensation for wrongful arrest attachment or injunction suit for 756
- costs plea of limitation and question of 130
- cross-objections dismissal of appeal on ground of limitation no bar to hearing of, 1006
- delivery of possession application or suit for and 771
- dismissal of appeal on ground of whether a bar to hearing of cross objections 1006
- execution amendment of application for and 603
  - issue of notice to show cause against and 671
- execution of decree and 136 137 144
  - of Court of native state and 148
  - granting injunction and 167 [s 48 (1)] 173
  - limit of time for 167 170 [s 48]
- foreign judgment time within which suit to be filed in British India on 81
- legal representative of deceased defendant application to bring on record 788
  - plaintiff application to be made a party 782
- memorandum of appeal when plea of limitation not taken in 980
- mesne profits and limitation 67
- minor and appeal after period of 879
- mortgagor period of limitation for obtaining personal decree against 94
- Native State decree when barred by 148
- newly added defendant when suit deemed to be instituted against 426 [O 1 r 10 (5)]
- notice issue of to show cause against execution and 671
- pauper period of limitation for leave to appeal as 103
- pauper limitation as to application for leave to sue as 989
- plaint must show grounds of exemption from law of 509 [O 7 r 6]
- restitution claims for and 381
- return of purchase money application for and limitation 768
- review of judgment for making application for 1061
- sale certificate application for and limitation 71
- set aside abatement of suit application to 800
  - ex parte decree application to 543 544
  - order of dismissal for not furnishing security for costs application to 833
  - sale of immovable property for fraud of irregularity under O 2 rr 90 or 91 application to 760
  - sale in execution of decree and 167
  - sale on deposit under O 21 r 89 application to 748
- set off of claim barred by limitation 527
- specially pleaded in defence limitation must be 50 [O 8 r 2]
- substitution of parties under O 1 r 10 (1) and 426

**Limitation—*contd***

- suit for possession of property sold to decree holder in execution and 162
- to establish right to present possession 777
- to set aside sale of immovable property on ground of irregularity or fraud 760
- under O 21 r 63 to establish right to attached property 718 719
- summary suit and period of limitation for 947
- symbolical possession and limitation 683
- trustee *de son tort* of public charity accounts against and 283
- uncertified adjustment of decree not to operate as a fresh starting point for 642
- withdrawal of suit with permission to bring a fresh suit and 818 [O 23 r 2]

**Lis pendens—**

- a signment by either party pending suit 802 [O 22 r 10]
- judgment debtor and execution 477 [O 21 r 102]
- doctrine of 805

**Local Government—**

- charities suits relating to and officers appointed by 293 [s 93]
- personal appearance power of Government to exempt persons from 364 [s 133 (1)]
- persons authorized to act for in judicial proceedings 845 [O 27 r 2]
- recording of evidence in English power of to direct 369 [s 138]
- remission by of postage and registration fee 343 [s 143]
- rules as to sales of interests in land which cannot be valued 224 [s 67]
- transfer of decrees for execution by Collector 225 [s 70]
- subordinate Courts power of Government to declare language of 369 [s 137 (2)]

**Local Law—**

- lunatics in suits by or against 882 [O 32 r 16]
- minors in suits by or against 882 [O 32 r 16]
- saving of 18 [s 4 (1)]

**Lunatic—**

- Chartered High Courts Jurisdiction of as to 160 [Charter cl 17]
- compromise of suit by next friend or guardian of 873 [O 32 r 7]
- consent of next friend or guardian on behalf of 387 [s 147]
- decree against 891
- documents affidavit of and 569 546 [O 11 r 23]
- interrogatories affidavit in answer to and 569 546 [O 11 r 23]
- Princes and Chiefs provisions of Code as to lunatics not to apply to 882 [O 32 r 16]
- saving of local law relating to suits by or against 882 [O 32 r 16]
- suits by or against procedure in 891 [O 32 r 16]

**Magistrate—**

- exemption of from arrest under civil process 365 [s 135 (1)]
- receiver appointed by 974 [Case 7]
- receiver appointed by a civil Court Magistrate cannot interfere with 973 974 [Case 7]

**Mahomedan Law—**

- execution Mahomedan heir and 181
- mortgage suit and Mahomedan co heirs 903
- pre-emption under 627
- receiver where a Mahomedan executor is in possession 975



**Maintenance—**

judgment debtor's family of in certain cases 1906 [Sch III para 9 (3) (a)],  
 receiver appointment of under a decree for maintenance 977  
*res judicata* decree for maintenance and 47  
 right to future maintenance not attachable 193 [s 60 (1) (a)] 201  
 transference of decree awarding maintenance whether entitled to execution 67

**Malice—**

how pleaded in suits for libel etc 491

**Manager—**

notice to as to in what capacity he is served 86 [O 30 r 5],  
 not to appear though served unless he is a partner 86 [O 30 r 7],  
 of business and service of summons 467 [O 5 r 17]  
     corporations and sale of shares in execution 734 [O 21 r 70 (3)]  
     joint Hindu family and suits on mortgage 903 904  
         *as a n t* and *res judicata* 59 60  
 partnership business and service of summons on firm 853 [O 30 r 3 (1)]

**Marginal notes—**

not to be referred to for the purpose of construing section 3

**Market value—**

commission to a certain of property 840 [O 26 r 9]

**Marriage—**

of female party and abatement 797 [O 22 r 7]

**Married executrix administratrix or trustee—**

husband of not a necessary party to suit by or against her 862 [O 31 r 3]

**Master of ship—**

is agent of owner or charterer for service of summons 467 [O 5 r 13 (1)]

**Material irregularity in conducting sale—**

irregularity in publishing or conducting sale 749 [O 21 r 90],  
 irregularity in attaching property 754  
 movable property of not to vitiate sale 737 [O 21 r 78]  
 omissions which are material 752 753  
 proclamation mis statement of value of property in 754  
 sale before expiration of period prescribed by O 21 r 63 p 730  
 sale certificate cured by 771

**Matter—**

affecting damages and pleadings 478 479  
 argumentative in affidavits and co. 12 [O 19 r 3 (1)],  
 directly and substantially in issue actually and *res judicata* 37-41  
     constructively and *res judicata* 44-5

**Memorandum of appeal—See Appeal**

contents and accompaniments of 993 [O 41 r 1 (1)]  
 cross-objections to be in the form of 1004 [O 41 r 1 (2)],  
 defective vakalatnama 953  
 grounds of objections not set forth in 954 [O 41 r 2]  
 irregularity in orders may be made a ground of objection in 313 [s 10 (1)]  
 rejection or return of whether appealable 997  
     procedure on 518

**Mesne profits—**

- appeal and 6... 623
- attachment before determination of 689 [O 21 r 42]
- attachment of right to sue for mesne profits 198
- burden of proof as to 6...
- claim for may be joined with suit for recovery of land 454 [O 2 r 4]
- commission to ascertain 840 [O 26 r 9]
- court sale right of purchaser as to mesne profits 216
- decree for possession and 618 [O 20 r 12]
  - payment of is a decree for payment of money 239
- definition of 13 [s 2 (12)] 620
- execution mesne profits subsequent to date of suit and jurisdiction in 141 [Rule 4]
- inquiry into whether question in execution 618 619
- interest on mesne profits how calculated 621
- limitation and 143 622
- plaint statement of approximate amount in 50" [O 7 r 2]
- Privy Council how for mesne profits affect amount in dispute on appeal to 324 325
- purchaser *pendente lite* how far liable for 620
- reversal of decree order for payment of mesne profits on 33 [s 144 (1)]
- restitution of on reversal or variation of decree 375 [Case 3]
- Small Cause Court how far suit for mesne profits cognizable by 307 308
- suit for possession whether bars subsequent suit for 441

**Military men—847 848 [O 28].**

- authority to sue or defend, how given 847 [O 28 r 1 (2)]
- commanding officer meaning of 848 [O 28 r 1 Explan]
- officers or soldiers who cannot obtain leave and authority 847 [O 28 r 1 (1)]
- service on person authorized to sue or defend 848 [O 28 r 3]
  - on soldiers 474 [O 5 r 28]
- stipends and gratuities allowed by Government to attachment of 192 [s 60 (g)] 198
- suits by or against 847 848 [O 28]

**Minor—862 882 [O 32] See Guardian *ad litem* Next friend**

- adjustment of decree by guardian without Court's sanction 643
- adult sued as 863
- affidavit of documents by next friend or guardian 567 568 [O 11 r 23]
- agreement by next friend not to appeal how far binding on minor 289
- attachment minor partner and 698 [O 21 r 50 (1)] 701
- bond joint by minor and adult 877
- Chartered High Courts jurisdiction of as to [Chartered cl 17]
- compromise by next friend or guardian 83 [O 32 r 7] 874 875
  - of execution proceedings 875
  - of suit by adult male members of a joint Hindu family 877
- under authority of Court of Wards 877
  - misapprehension of material fact 875
  - when deemed to be beneficial to minor 874
- consent of next friend given on behalf of 337 [s 14"]
- co plaintiff 880 [O 32 r 13]
- decree for minor in suit instituted by him without a next friend effect of 862
- definition of 862
- election by minor plaintiff on attaining majority 880 [O 32 r 12]
- estopped from pleading minority when 863.
- execution of decree time limit for and minority 174 175
- fraud of next friend or guardian *ad litem* decree against minor obtained by 863.

**Minor—*contd***

- fresh suit institution of when suit dismissed for non appearance 540
- guardian *ad litem*—See *Guardian ad litem*
- interrogatories affidavit in answer to by next friend or guardian of 509
- leave of Court for compromise of suit by or against minor 873 [O 32 r 7] 814
  - to receive property under a decree on behalf of 872 [O 3 r 6]
- limitation appeal after expiry of period of 879
- major suit against treating him as 863
  - suing as minor 863
- married women as guardian *ad litem* 869
- minority question of in dispute 864
- next friend—See *next friend*.
- notice of application for appointment of guardian *ad litem* 860 [O 3 r 3 (1)]
  - to have plaint taken off the file where suit instituted without next friend 864 [O 32 r 2 (2)]
  - to next friend when minor elects to proceed with suit in his own name 880 [O 32 r 12 (5)]
- objection to authority of next friend 863
- officer of Court as guardian *ad litem* 869 [O 3 r 4 (4)]
- order made in suit in which a minor is concerned when discharged 812 [O 3 r 10 (2)]
- partner and attachment 698 [O 21 r 50 (1)] 701
- pauper 884
- pleader liability of for costs in suit without next friend 864 [O 3 r 2 (1)] 860
- plaint to state fact of minority 806 [O 7 r (d)]
- Princes and Chiefs provisions relating to minority do not apply to 880 [O 3 r 16]
- probate proceedings and minority of party interested 868
- property receipt of on behalf of minor under a decree 872 [O 32 r 6]
- representation of by next friend or guardian for suit 872 [O 3 r 5]
- repudiation of suit by minor co plaintiff on attaining majority 880 [O 3 r 13]
- res judicata* decree against minor and 61
- saving of local law relating to suits by or against 892 [O 32 r 16]
- service of summons on guardian *ad litem* 868
- stay of proceedings on retirement removal or death of next friend 810 [O 3 r 10]
- suit against or on behalf of an alleged minor who is not in fact a minor 863
  - by next friend to recover portion of a claim bars fresh suit by minor 446
  - unreasonable or improper 881 [O 32 r 14]
  - when instituted without next friend procedure 864 [O 3 r 2]
- title of suit by or against 862
  - when minor elects to proceed with suit on majority 880 [O 32 r 12 (3)]
- withdrawal of suit by next friend, effect of 877

**Miscellaneous proceedings—**

- application of Code to 370 [s 141]
- procedure in regard to suits applies to certain proceeding 373

**Misjoinder—See Joinder**

- non joinder included in for purposes of appeal 298

**of parties—**

- appeal no ground for reversing decree in 297 [s 99] 433
- dismissal of suit for misjoinder of parties and *res judicata* 70
- effect of 426
- objection as to when to be raised 434 [O 1 r 13]
- relief ancillary and 413
- suit not to be defeated by reason of 420 [O 1, r 9]

**Misjoinder—contd**

of plaintiffs—404 [O 1 r 1]

and cause of action 403 44b

what is 404

of defendants—410 411 [O 1 r 3] 404

and causes of action 403 419

multifariousness 449 450

what is 404 411

of causes of action—

appeal no ground for reversing decree in 493 [s 99] 408

in suits by or against executors administrators or heirs 406 [O 2 r 5]

for recovery of immovable property 454 [O 2 r 4]

misjoinder of causes of action 403

of defendants and cause of action 403 449 451

of plaintiffs and cause of action 403 448

multifariousness 403 451 452

objection as to when to be raised 458 [O 2 r 7] 406

procedure in cases of and plaintiffs 448 449

and defendants 451 452

separate trials of causes of action 408 [O 2 r 6]

**Misrepresentation—**

particulars of must be stated in pleadings 482 [O 6 r 4] 483

**Mistake—See Defect or error**

in calculating the amount to be deposited under O 21 r 89 p 746

in instituting suit in name of wrong plaintiff 45 [O 1 r 10 (1)]

in judgments decrees and orders and amendment 396 [s 152]

of law and *res judicata* 62a

review mistake apparent on face of record and 1000 [O 47 r 1 (1)]

**Money—**

assets rateable distribution of and decree for payment of 229 [s 73]

attachment liable to 101 [s 60 (1)]

of decree for payment of money 704 [O 21 r 53]

cross-claims in suits for payment of and execution 667 [O 21 r 19]

cross decrees in suits for payment of and execution 664 [O 21 r 18]

execution and cross decrees in suit for payment of 664 [O 21 r 18]

immediate in case of money decree 647 [O 21 r 11 (1)]

instalments decree for payment of money by 616 [O 20 r 11] 617

interest decree for payment of money and 123 124 [s 34]

minor receipt of money by next friend or guardian under a decree 842 [O 32 r 6]

mode of executing decrees for payment of 673 [O 21 r 30]

paying money under a decree 634 [O 21 r 1]

money payable under a decree what is 634

raised by judgment debtor on his property 739 [O 21 r 83 (2) proviso]

notice issue of before arrest in execution of money decree 633 [O 21 r 37]

payment out of Court of money payable under decree 633 [O 21 r 2]

plaint in suits for recovery of money 507 [O 7 r 2]

Privy Council money payable under order of how calculated 1041 [O 43 r 15 (3)]

realization of an attached money decree 706

scheme for liquidation of decree for payment of money 1041 [Sch III para 7]

security for costs in suit for money by female plaintiff 831 831 [O 21 r 1 (3)]

set off in suit for recovery of 223

**Money—*contd***

- surety for payment of money under order of Court 382 [s 145 (c)] 383
- transfer of money-decree and execution 654 [O 21 r 16]
  - to one of several judgment debtors and execution 659 660
- transferee of money decree from mortgagee rights of 940
- value of property to be attached in case of money decree 662 [O 21 r 17 proviso]

**Mortgage—**

- account against mortgagor 908
- accretion to mortgage property whether to be determined in execution proceedings 163
- appeal effect of on time fixed for payment 913
  - from order refusing to extend time for payment in foreclosure suit 910
  - redemption suit 928
  - suit for sale 918
- assignment of mortgagee's interest after preliminary but before final decree 804 [Case 3]
- attachment continuance of subject to mortgage 716 [O 21 r 62]
  - equity of redemption to be attached like immovable property 718
  - mortgagee not in possession and 717
  - of mortgage debt 693
  - of mortgage decree 704 [O 21 r 53] 700
- benamidar and suit on mortgage 900
- chattels mortgage of 911
- charge provisions respecting sale and redemption apply to 940 [O 34 r 15]
- costs against puisne mortgagee 925
  - of mortgagee subsequent to decree 931 [O 34 r 10]
- cross claims and cross decrees in suits on mortgage 667 [O 21 r 26]
- damdupat rule of and interest claimed under a mortgage 126 127
  - where mortgagee in possession 127
- Deccan Agriculturist Relief Act and splitting of remedies by mortgagor 446
- decree preliminary for foreclosure 905 [O 34 r 2] sale 910 [O 34 r 4] redemption 925 [O 34 r 7]
  - final for foreclosure 911 [O 34 r 3] sale 918 [O 34 r 5], redemption 928 [O 34 r 8]
    - for balance due on mortgage 922 [O 34 r 6]
    - where nothing found due to mortgagee 931 [O 34 r 9]
    - effect of decree in foreclosure suit 911 [O 34 r 3]
- equity of redemption to be attached like immovable property 708
  - persons interested in as parties to suit 897
- estoppel of mortgagor as to receipt of consideration 909
- foreclosure decree discharge of liabilities on passing of 911 [O 34 r 3 (1)]
  - extending time for payment 906 [O 34 r 2 (-)]
  - final 911 [O 34 r 3]
  - preliminary 900 [O 34 r 2]
    - when may be paid in suit for redemption 929 [O 34 r 8 (3)]
- Hindu family property mortgage of and parties 903
- injunction restraining mortgagor from receiving income of mortgage property 911
- intangible property mortgage of 911
- interest in suit on mortgage 932 [O 34 r 11].

**Mortgage—*con d***

- interest subsequent to date fixed for payment 932 [O 34 r 11 (b)]
- limitation for application for personal decree 923
- Mahomedan co heir and suits relating to 903
- mortgagee in *pari et non* account against 910
- mortgage security persons interested in as parties to suit 896 [O 34 r 1] 897
- movables mortgage of 911
- non joinder of parties in suits on mortgage 900
- objection by third party to sale of mortgaged property under mortgage decree 712
- parties to suits on mortgage 896 [O 34 r 1]
  - joint Hindu family 903
  - Mahomedan co heirs 903
  - Official Assignee 893
  - prior mortgagee 896 [O 34 r 1 Expln]
  - puisne mortgagee 896 [O 34 r 1 Expln]
  - persons claiming by paramount title 897
  - to suits
    - by mortgagee for personal decree 897
    - by sub mortgagee 900
    - for foreclosure redemption or sale 898
- personal decree against mortgagor for balance due after sale 922 [O 34 r 6]
  - limitation for 94 923
  - not to be passed until after sale 923
  - whether can be passed against transferee from mortgagor 923
- persons having interest in mortgage security or right of redemption 891 898
- property accession to mortgaged whether determined in execution proceedings 153
- purchaser's right
  - where property bought subject to mortgage 717
  - where mere notice of mortgage given in proclamation 717
  - where purchase by one of several joint decree holders 222
- realization of attached mortgaged decree 705
- receiver in suits on mortgage 976
- redemption suit decrees in—
  - final 918
  - preliminary 920
- res judicata in suits on mortgage 913
- sale application of proceeds of 935 [O 34 r 13]
  - decrees in suit for—
    - final 918
    - preliminary 919
- second mortgagee non joinder of 901
- sub mortgagee 900 910
- successive purchasers at sales in execution of mortgage decrees 213
- suit by mortgagee and splitting of remedies 446
  - by sub sequent mortgagee for balance realized by sale under prior mortgage 441 242
  - for interest due on a mortgage when bars subsequent suit for principal 442
  - for sale when necessary 36 [O 34 r 14]
- what parties to purchaser of mortgaged property under a mortgage decree 770

**Movable property—**

- attachment liable to 191 [s 60 (1)]
- attachment of in possession judgment debtor 689 [O 21 r 43]
  - not in his possession 680 [O 21 r 12] 692 [O 21 r 46]

**Movable property—*contd***

- attachment of of share of judgment-debtor in movable property 670 [O 21 r 47]
- under and place of suing 91 [s. 16 (f)]
- decree for delivery of to state amount to be paid in alternative 616 [O 20 r 10]
- partition of 629 [O 20 r 18 (2)]
- specific movables and execution 670 [O 21 r 31]
- delivery of order for 969 [O 39 r 10]
- deposit in Court of order for 969 [O 39 r 10]
- distrain under and place of suing 91 [s. 16 (f)]
- execution decree for specific movables and 675 [O 21 r 31]
- growing crops 14 [s. 2 (13)]
- impounding of pending appeal to Privy Council, 1039 [O 40 r 13 (2) (a)]
- interim sale of where subject to speedy decay 968 [O 39 r 6]
- joinder of claims for recovery both of movable and immovable property 400
- minor receipt of movable property on behalf of 822 [O 32 r 6]
- partition of decree for 629 [O 20 r 18 (-)]
- rent accrued due 1. 93
- rent to accrue due is immovable property 93
- sale of in execution 734-739 [O 21 rr 74-81] See Sale
  - where subject to speedy decay 689 [O 21 r 43]
- seizure of in dwelling house 203 [s. 6-]
- suits for partition of property partly outside jurisdiction 1246

**Multifariousness—**

- amendment of plaint when plaint defective for 401-400
- appeal no ground for reversing decree in 297 [s. 99] 401
- causes of action arising out of same transaction and, 449
- procedure in case of 401-400
- resjudicata dismissal of suit for multifariousness and 70
- suits held to be multifarious 449-401
  - not multifarious 400
- what is 400 449

**Munsif's Court—**

- jurisdiction of 89 89

**Native State—See Chiefs (ruling) and Princes**

- British Indian Court cannot restrain party from proceeding with suit in a 963.
- execution of decree of in British India 147 [s. 44]
- when British Courts may refuse 82
- execution of decree passed by British Courts in 147 [s. 43]
- limitation for 148
- judgment of Court of Native State suit upon 81
- subject of Native State suit against in British Indian Court 110

**Negligence—**

- meaning and pleading of 477
- particulars of when to be stated in pleadings 493
- receiver loss occasioned by gross negligence of 93 [Ca. e 4] 902 [O 40 r 3 (d)]

**Negotiable instrument—See Bill of exchange Hundi Promissory note**

- attachment of 700 [O 21 r 31] 191 [s. 60 (1)]
- debt not secured by 690 [O 21 r 46 (1) (a)]
- Courts to which summary procedure on applies 913 O 37 r 1]
- definition of 947

**Negotiable instrument—contd**

execution of decree for endorsement of 680 [O 21 r 34]  
 lost suit on 519 [O 7 r 16]  
 place of suing in suit on 10,  
 sale of in execution 736 [O 21 r 76]  
 summary suit on—See Summary suit  
 transfer of in execution 738 [O 21 r 80]

**Newspaper—**

whether proprietor of can be sued in name of the newspaper 860

**Next Friend—See Minor Guardian *ad litem***

abandonment of suit by whether amounts to compromise 876  
 agreement not to appeal how far binding on minor 89  
 appointment of new application for 878 [O 32 r 8 (2)]  
 compromise by 873 [O 32 r 7]  
 consent of on behalf of persons under disability 397 [s 147]  
 costs liability of next friend for 863  
 defendant cannot act as 869 [O 32 r 4 (1)]  
 duty where next friend does not do his 89  
 minor decree against by fraud of next friend 868  
     decree for in suit instituted by him without next friend 860  
     plaintiff and dismissal of suit for non appearance of next friend 541  
     representation of by next friend 870 [O 32 r 5]  
     to sue by next friend 862 [O 32 r 1]  
     when interest of next friend adverse to that of 869  
     when may sue without next friend 863  
 non appearance of 879  
 notice of application for taking plaint off file in suit without 864 [O 32 r 2 (2)]  
     to when minor elects to proceed with suit in his own name 880 [O 32  
     r 12 (o)]  
 object of having next friend 862  
 objection to authority of 863  
 pleader liability of for costs in suit for minor without 864 [O 32 r 2 (1)] 865  
 receipt by of property under a decree 872 [O 32 r 6]  
 removal of 878 [O 32 r 9]  
 retirement of 878 [O 32 r 8]  
 security for costs already incurred retiring next friend to give 878 [O 32 r 8 (1)]  
     when next friend required to give 862 [O 32 r 6 (2)]  
 stay of proceedings on retirement removal or death of 869 [O 32 r 10 (1)]  
 suit instituted without next friend procedure where 864 [O 32 r 2]  
 who may act as 869 [O 32 r 4]  
 withdrawal from compromise by before leave of Court is applied for 873  
 withdrawal of suit by 871

**Non appearance—See Appearance****Non joinder—See Joinder**

cross objections dismissal of appeal for non joinder of party and 1006  
 effect of non joinder of parties 420  
 non joinder includes for purposes of appeal 298  
 mortgage suit of parties in 900 903  
 objection as to when to be taken 434 [O 1 r 13]  
 of parties 400  
 suit not to be defeated by reason of 426 [O 1 r 9]



## Notice—

- adjourned hearing of to be given to defendant 535 [O 9 r 6 (1) (c)]
- admission of opponent's case of 576 [O 12 r 1]
- amendment of plaint and notice under s 80 p 2o1
- appellate Court to give to lower Court when 999 [O 41 r 13 (1)]
- application of for order for detention preservation or inspection of subject matter of suit 969 [O 39 r 8]
- arbitration of application to file an agreement to refer to 1187 [Sch. II para 1 (3)]
- arbitrator to appoint new 1170 [Sch. II para 5]
- arrest issue of notice before 680 [O 21 r 37]
- award made under an order of reference of the filing of 1173 [Sch. II para 10]
- award made on reference without intervention of Court for filing 1192 [Sch. II, para 20]
- cause of action notice as part of and pleading 491 [O 6 r 11]
- Collector by to decree holder in certain cases 1202 [Sch. III para 3]
- Court when property sought to be attached is in custody of 702 [O 21 r 5<sup>1</sup>]
- decree notice to set aside 554 [O 9 r 14]
  - notice to attach 704 [O 21 r 3 (1) (b)]
- decree holder, to before final order for stay of execution 991
  - for recording payment to him out of Court 630 [O 21 r 2 (2)]
- documents to admit 122 [s 30 (a)] 576 [O 12 r 2]
  - form of 577 [O 12 r 3]
    - to produce 581 [O 12 r 8]
      - for inspection 570 571 [O 11 r 5] 512 [O 11, r 16]
- execution against legal representative 665 [O 21 r 22 (1) (b)]
  - by transferee of decree 654 [O 21 r 16] 600
  - more than one year after date of decree 668 [O 21 r 22 (1) (a)]
- facts to admit 577 [O 12 r 4]
  - form of 577 [O 12 r 5]
- firm notice to accompany summons in suit against 806 [O 30 r 1]
- government devolution of interest upon pending suit and 248
- guardian *ad litem* of application for appointment of 860 [O 32, r 3 (4)]
- injunction to opposite party before granting 967 [O 39 r 3]
  - whether necessary where suit against public officer is one for 200
    - official assignee is one for 201 250
- judgment debtor to prohibiting him from transferring his share in movable 690 [O 21 r 41]
- legal representative notice before executing decree against 668 [O 21 r 22]
- next friend of application to have plaint taken off file in suit without 861 [O 3 r 2 (2)]
  - to when minor elects to proceed with suit 850 [O 3, r 12 (5)]
- notices to be in writing 373 [s 142]
- pauperism notice to take evidence of 888 [O 33 r 6]
- payment into Court of 829 [O 24 r 2]
- pleading allegation of notice in 491 [O 6 r 11]
- public officer of suit against 247 [s 80] 218 00
- purdia lady to to withdraw at seizure of property in a dwelling house 103 [s. 6, (3)]
- review of application for to opposite party 1017 [O 47 r 4 (2) (a)]
- Secretary of State of suit against 247 [s 80] 113
- service of 1000 [O 48 r 2]
- sufficiency of 213
- suit against Administrator General and 1000

**Notice—contd**

- suit against Official Trustee and 252
- Official Assignee and 251
- Manager under Bengal Tenancy Act and 252
- for injunction and necessity of 250
- on contracts and torts and 250
- surety to for enforcement of his liability 382 [s 145 proviso] 385
- transfer of suit without 119
- umpire to appoint new 1170 [Sch II para 5] 1171
- waiver of by Secretary of State 248

**Nuisance—**

- suits relating to public nuisance 261 [s 91] *See* Public Nuisance

**Oath—**

- agreement by next friend of minor to be bound by under the Indian Oaths Act 876.
- oath on affidavits by whom to be administered 369 [s 139]

**Obiter dicta—**

- and res judicata 70

**Objection—**

- appeal grounds of objection in 983 985 [O 41 rr 1 2]
- irregularity in orders as ground of objection in 313 [s 105 (1)]
- objections which may be taken for first time in special or second 306.
- attachment objection to "11 [O 21 r 39]
- cross objections by respondent 1004 1005 [O 41 r 22] *See* Cross-objections.
- documents grounds of objection to production of 565 567
- execution of decree objections to 672 [O 21 r 21 (\*)]
- findings of lower Court on issue referred as to 1015 [O 41 r 26]
- interrogatories objections to by affidavit in answer 560 [O 11 r 6]
- joinder of claims under O 2 r 4 objection as to 456
- jurisdiction objection as to when to be taken 110 [s 21] 114
- misjoinder or non joinder of parties as to when to be taken 434 [O 1 r 13].
- particulars objections to application for 487

**Office—**

- religious suits for 25 27

**Officer—See Public Officer Officer of Court**

- arrest judicial officer when exempt from 365 [s 135 (1)]
- Chartered High Court appointment of officers of 1237 1238 [Charter cl 8].

**Officer of Court—**

- amendment of memorandum of appeal to be signed by 987 [O 41 r 3 (3)].
- costs incurred by as guardian *ad litem* 569 [O 3. r 4 (4)]
- Court sale not to bid for or purchase property at 735 [O 21 r 73]
- delegation to of judicial quasi judicial and non official duties 361 [s. 123 (5)].
- execution of documents by on failure of judgment debtor 630 [O 21 r 34].
- guardian *ad litem* Court may appoint its officer as 569 [O 3 r 4 (4)].
- receiver is an officer of Court 971
- registration of documents by 650 [O 21 r 34 (6)]
- registry by of appeal on admission 994 [O 41 r 9]

**Official Assignee—**

- attaching creditor has no priority over 213
- attachment after judgment effect of vesting order on 213
  - before judgment effect of vesting order on 957
- insolvency of defendant pending suit and joinder of 803
- insolvent judgment debtor whether Official Assignee represent 157 [Case 7]
- notice to in suit for injunction 252
- party whether necessary to suit against insolvent 430 803
- plaintiff insolvency of pending suit 797 [O 22 r 8 (2)]
- security for costs by on plaintiff's insolvency 797 [O 22 r 8]

**Official Trustee—**

- suit against and notice under s 80 p 252

**Omission—See Irregularity Material irregularity in conducting sale**

- to attached property before sale 754
- file written statement 524
- frame and try issues by lower Court 1014 [O 41 r 25]
- plead a material fact 478
- sue in respect of a portion of a claim 435 [O 2 r 2 (2)]
- sue for one of several reliefs 436 [O 2 r 2 (3)]
- sue for portions of arrears of rent 436 [O 2 r 2 III]

**Onus—**

- burden of proving some issues lies on the other party where 606 [O 18, r 3]
- party need not plead any fact as to which onus lies on other side 497 [O 6 r 13]

**Order—See Interlocutory Orders**

- affidavit of documents for 504 [O 11 r 12]
- amendment of 396 [s 15-]
- appealable orders 10 310 [s 104] [O 43 r 1]
- appeal from orders procedure in 317 [s 108] [O 43 r 2]
- commission order for issue of 836 [O 26 r 2]
- decree distinguished from 5 6
- definition of 14 [s 2 (14)]
- dismissal for default order for is not a decree 5 [s 2 (a) (b)]
  - of appeal for default order for and second appeal 306
- distinguished from decree 6 7
- disposing defendant's claim to set off and appeal 531
- error in order may be ground of objection in appeal from final decree 313 [s 105]
- execution of orders provisions relating to 135 [s 36]
- inherent power of Court to amend orders 397 398
- interlocutory—See Interlocutory Orders
- judgments under cl. 15 of the Charter and appealable what orders are 1256 1 57
- memorandum of appeal order returning 10
- non appealable instances of 11
- orders to be in writing 373 [s 142]
- order under s 144 (restitution) is a decree 5 [s 2 (2)] 10 391
  - s 47 (execution proceedings) is a decree 5 [s 2 (2)]
- Political Agent order of deposing high priest from his *gad*, 81
- Privy Council what amounts to a final order to entitle party to appeal to 314 319
- receiver order appointing or refusing to appoint and appeal 318
- res judicata interlocutory order and 77

Order—*contd*

- review order refusing leave to sue as pauper and 1000
- whether order granting leave to appeal to Privy Council is open to 334
- revocation order made on application for leave to sue as pauper and 342
- order refusing to sue of commission to examine witness and 838
- order sanctioning or refusing sanction to prosecute and 354
- service of 1060 [O 48 r 2]
- transfer of suit order for without notice 119

## Particulars—480 487 [O 6 rr 4 5]

- amendment of 487
- application for 485
- breach of trust in case of 480 [O 6 r 4] 483
- defence of 484 485
- delivery of further particulars 487
- discovery before particulars 480 486
- fraud *etc* in case of 480 [O 6 r 4] 483
- further and better when required 480 [O 6 r 5]
- libel suit and discovery before particulars 486
- material facts only may be ordered of 487
- misrepresentation in case of 482 [O 6 r 4] 483
- object of in pleadings 482
- objections to delivery of 487
- when to be given 482 [O 6 r 4] 483 485

## Parties—404 430 [O 1] See Plaintiff Defendant Cause of Action.

- adding of 420 426 [O 1 r 10]
  - improper 431
  - in second appeal 1003
  - respondent 1003 [O 41 r 90]
- adjourned hearing procedure where parties fail to appear at 601 [O 17 r 2] 602.
- administrators joinder of 861 [O 31 r 2]
- agreement of proceedings on 943 900 [O 36]
- appeal who may 290 291
- appearance 538 540
- appellants joinder of 491
- arrest exemption from while going to and returning from Court 365 [s 135]
- assignment of interest pending suit and substitution of parties 800
- beneficiaries 861 [O 31 r 1]
- bills of exchange parties liable on 417
- cause of action parties cannot be added so as to introduce new 429
- charity suit whether absence from trustee necessary party to 277 278
- commissioner appearance of parties before 840 [O 26 r 18 (1)].
  - examination of parties by 844 [O 26 r 18 (2)]
- common ground and reversal of decree in appeal 987 [O 41 r 4].
- consent on behalf of parties under disability 387 [s 147].
- contract joinder of parties liable on same 416 [O 1 r 6].
- death of party and abatement of suit 78 [O 22 r 1]. See Abatement
- defendants who may be joined as 410 [O 1 r 3]. See Defendant.
  - unnecessary parties as 402
- ejectment suit who may be joined as defendants in 450
- evidence refusal of party to give when required by Court 600 [O 16 r 20].
- examination of by Court at first hearing 504 550 [O 10].
  - in order to frame issues 586 [O 14 r 1 (3)].

**Official Assignee—**

- attaching creditor has no priority over 213
- attachment after judgment effect of vesting order on 213
  - before judgment effect of vesting order on 957
- insolvency of defendant pending suit and joinder of 803
- insolvent judgment debtor whether Official Assignee represent 107 [Case 7]
- notice to in suit for injunction 252
- party whether necessary to suit against insolvent 430 803
- plaintiff insolvency of pending suit 797 [O 22 r 8 (2)]
- security for costs by on plaintiffs in olvency 797 [O 22 r 81]

**Official Trustee—**

- suit against and notice under s 80 p 202

**Omission—See Irregularity Material irregularity in conducting sale**

- to attached property before sale 704
- file written statement 524
- frame and try issues by lower Court 1014 [O 41 r 20]
- plead a material fact 478
- sue in respect of a portion of a claim 435 [O 2 r 2 (2)]
- sue for one of several reliefs 436 [O 2 r 2 (3)]
- sue for portions of arrears of rent 436 [O 2 r 2 III]

**Onus—**

- burden of proving some issues lies on the other party where 600 [O 18 r 3].
- party need not plead any fact as to which onus lies on other side 492 [O 6 r 13]

**Order—See Interlocutory Orders**

- affidavit of documents for 564 [O 11 r 12]
- amendment of 396 [s 152]
- appealable orders 10 310 [s 104] [O 43 r 1]
- appeal from orders procedure in 317 [s 108] [O 43 r 2].
- commission order for issue of 836 [O 20 r 2]
- decree distinguished from 5 6
- definition of 14 [s 2 (14)]
- dismissal for default order for is not a decree 5 [s 2 (2) (b)]
  - of appeal for default order for and second appeal 306
- distinguished from decree 6 7
- disposing defendant's claim to set off and appeal 31
- error in order may be ground of objection in appeal from final decree 313 [s 105]
- execution of orders provisions relating to 130 [s 36]
- inherent power of Court to amend orders 397 398
- interlocutory—See Interlocutory Orders
- judgments under cl 10 of the Charter and appealable what orders are 106 15
- memorandum of appeal, order returning 10
- non appealable instances of 11
- orders to be in writing 373 [s 142]
- order under s 144 (restitution) is a decree 5 [s 2 (-)] 10 391
  - s 47 (execution proceedings) is a decree 5 [s 2 (-)]
- Political Agent order of deposing high priest from his god, 81
- Privy Council what amounts to a final order to entitle party to appeal to 318 319
- receiver order appointing or refusing to appoint and appeal 318
- res judicata int interlocutory order and 7

**Order—contd**

- review order refusing leave to sue as pauper and 1000
- whether order granting leave to appeal to Privy Council is open to 334
- revision order made on application for leave to sue as pauper and 342
- order refusing issue of commission to examine witness and 538
- order sanctioning or refusing sanction to prosecute and 304
- service of 1060 [O 48 r 1]
- transfer of suit order for without notice 119

**Particulars—480 481 [O 6 r 4 5]**

- amendment of 487
- application for 480
- breach of trust in case of 482 [O 6 r 4] 483
- defence of 484 480
- delivery of further particulars 487
- discovery before particulars 480 486
- fraud etc in case of 482 [O 6 r 4] 483
- further and better when required 480 [O 6 r 5]
- libel suit and discovery before particulars 486
- material facts only may be ordered of 487
- misrepresentation in case of 482 [O 6 r 4] 483
- object of in pleadings 482
- objections to delivery of 487
- when to be given 482 [O 6 r 4] 483 485

**Parties—404 430 [O 1] See Plaintiff Defendant Cause of Action.**

- adding of 425 406 [O 1 r 10]
  - unproper 431
  - in second appeal 1003
  - respondent 1003 [O 41 r 20]
- adjourned hearing procedure where parties fail to appear at 601 [O 17 r 2] 602.
- administrators joinder of 861 [O 31 r 2]
- agreement of proceedings on 943 900 [O 36]
- appeal who may 290 291
- appearance 538 540
- appellants joinder of 291
- arrest exemption from while going to and returning from Court 365 [s 135]
- assignment of interest pending suit and substitution of parties 805
- beneficiaries 861 [O 31 r 1]
- bills of exchange parties liable on 417
- cause of action parties cannot be added so as to introduce new 409
- charity suit whether absence from trustee necessary party to 277 28
- commissioner appearance of parties before 840 [O 26 r 18 (1)].
- examination of parties by 844 [O 26 r 16 (a)]
- common ground and reversal of decree in appeal 987 [O 41 r 4]
- consent on behalf of parties under disability 387 [s 147].
- contract joinder of parties liable on same 416 [O 1 r 6].
- death of party and abatement of suit 78 [O 22 r 1]. See Abatement
- defendants who may be joined as 410 [O 1 r 3] See Defendant
- unnecessary parties 402
- ejectment suit who may be joined as defendants in 452
- evidence refusal of party to give when required by Court 600 [O 16 r 20].
- examination of by Court at first hearing 504 500 [O 10].
- in order to frame issues 586 [O 14 r 1 (c)].

Parties—*contd*

- execution questions in between parties to suits 149 150 [s 47]
- executors joinder of 861 [O 31 r 2]
- foreclosure suit for and parties 896 [O 34 r 1]
- fraudulent transfer of property parties to a suit relating to 421
- hearing party appearing by pleader at 539
- inherent power of Court to add a party 394
- insolvent Official Assignee whether necessary party to suit against 430
- insolvent plaintiff and continuance of suit by Official Assignee 797 [O 2<sup>o</sup> r 8]
- joinder of appellants 291
- joinder of plaintiff 404 [O 1 r 1] *See* Joinder
  - defendants 410 411 [O 1 r 3]
- judgment debtor whether necessary party to suits regarding claims to attached property 718
- legal representative of plaintiff when to be brought on record 787 [O 22 r 3]
  - defendant when to be brought on record 788 [O 2<sup>o</sup> r 4]
- limitation addition of parties and 432
  - substitution of plaintiff and 428
  - suit by member of a joint Hindu family and 433
  - newly added defendant and 426 [O 1 r 10 (5)]
- marriage of female party no abatement of suit by 797 [O 22 r 7]
- meaning of parties to the suit n s 47 p 150 [s 47 Explan] 150 156
- misdescription of effect of 433
- misjoinder of parties—*See* Misjoinder
- mortgage parties to suits on 896 [O 34 r 1]
- mortgagor parties to suit by mortgagee for personal decree against 897
- negotiable instrument joinder of parties liable on same 416 [O 1 r 6]
- non joinder of parties—*See* Non joinder
- numerous parties having same interest 418 [O 1 r 8]
- objection as to misjoinder and non joinder when to be taken 434 [O 1 r 13]
- Official Assignee whether necessary party to suits on mortgage 899
- oral examination of party or companion of party 534 [O 10 r -]
- partition suit parties to 430
- personal appearance of when can or cannot be ordered 460 [O 5 rr 3 4 5]
- plaint to be amended when defendant added as a party 436 [O 1 r 10 (4)]
- plaintiffs who may be joined as 404 [O 1 r 1] *See* Plaintiff
- power of Court to strike out or add parties 436 [O 1 r 10 (2)]
- prior mortgagees when necessary parties 896 [O 34 r 1 Explan]
- promisors joinder of 416 [O 1 r 6] 41<sup>n</sup>
- rateable distribution suit to set aside order for and necessary parties 430
- receiver for insolvent mortgagor or mortgagee necessary party to mortgage suit 899
- redemption parties to suit for 896 [O 34 r 1]
- reference application by parties to suit for order of 1161 [Sch II para 1]
- relators as parties to charity suits 260 266 [s 9-]
- to suits relating to public nuisance 261 [s 91]
- res judicata dismissal of suit for misjoinder or non joinder of parties and 70
  - parties not expressly named in former suit and 53
  - same parties and 53
- respondents who have not filed cross-objections or cross appeal power of Court
  - to make order for or against 1073 [O 41 r 33]
- restitution by 33 [s 144]
- sale of mortgaged property parties to suit for 896 [O 34 r 1]

Parties—*contd*

- ale application to set aside on deposit of purchase money and parties 748
- application to set aside on ground of irregularity or fraud and parties 750
- sub mortgagee parties to suit by 600
- suit questions between and execution proceedings 155
- subsequent parties in claiming under parties in former suit 56 57
- trustees joinder of 861 [O 31 r 1]
- unnecessary as defendants 152
- with rules as to to apply to parties 600 [O 16 r 21]

## Partition—

- communion to make partition 244 [s 10 (d)] 842 [O 26 r 13]
- coparcener born after institution of suit for 435
- Government partition of estate paying revenue to 184 [s 54]
- immovable property decree in suit for partition of 69 [O 20 r 18 (2)]
- movable property decree in suit for partition of 69 [O 20 r 18 (1)]
- place of suing suit for partition and 91 [s 16 (b)]
  - of land situate in different districts and 96
- res judicata 57
- suit for is a suit for land within meaning of cl 12 of the Charter 144
  - of land of which a part only is within jurisdiction [Charter cl 12] 1240
  - of moveable and lands the lands being outside jurisdiction 1240 144
  - [Charter cl 14]

## Partners—850 860 [O 30] See Firm

- accounts on attachment of a partner's share 697 [O 21 r 49]
- appeal from preliminary decree for dissolution of partnership 678
- appearance of 857 [O 30 r 6]
  - under protest 859 [O 30 r 8]
- attachment partnership property when liable to 697 [O 21 r 49] 698 699 [ib r 10]
  - of partner's share 697 [O 21 r 49]
  - before judgment in suits for partnership accounts 694
- co partners suits between 859 [O 30 r 9]
- costs in partnership suits 131
- Court sale property purchased at by a partner with partnership money 22
- dis closure of names of partners in defendant's firm 850 [O 30 r 1 (i)] 852
  - in plaintiff's firm 853 [O 30 r 2 (1)]
- dissolution of partnership decree in suit for 627 [O 20 r 15]
  - suit in firm name after 851
- documents production of in case of partners 570
- execution in suits between co partners 859 [O 30 r 9]
  - of decree against a firm 698 699 [O 21 r 50]
  - of decree against a partner 697 [O 21 r 49]
- firm name partners may be sued in 850 [O 30 r 1]
  - partners may sue in 850 [O 30 r 1]
- leave of Court to execute decree in suits between co partners 859 [O 30 r 9]
  - to execute decree against a partner personally 699 [O 21 r 10 (1)]
- legal representative of deceased partner not necessary party 855 [O 30 r 4]
- manager not to appear though served unless he is a partner 858 [O 30 r 7]
- minor partner and execution 701
- notice to accompany summons in suits against firm 856 [O 30 r 5]
- persons entitled to appear in suits against firms 857
  - served when deemed to be served as partners 855 [O 30 r 5]



Partners—*contd*

- place of suing and partnership 103
- receiver in partnership suits 976
  - on attachment of a partner's share 697 [O 21 r 49 (2)]
  - Court can appoint though there is arbitration clause in partnership deed 97
- service of summons on firm how effected 853 854 [O 30 r 3]
  - firm which has been dissolved 854 [O 30 r 3 proviso].
  - manager subsequent service on partner 856
- signature and verification of pleadings in suit by firm 850 [O 30 r 1 (2)].
- stay of suit on failure to disclose names of partners 850 [O 30 r 2 (2)]
- suits by or against individual partners 853
- written statement of in suit against a firm in firm name 857 858

## Pauper—[O 33 pp 892 896 O 44 pp 1030 1032]

- agreement champertous by 886 [O 33 r 5 (c)]
- appeal from order on question between Government and party as to court fees 89<sup>a</sup> 893
  - refusing to make an order for payment of court fees 894
  - rejecting application for leave to sue as a pauper 885
  - to Privy Council by pauper 1032
- appeals pauper 1030 1032 [O 44]
  - when Court may admit 1030 [O 44 r 1 proviso]
- application for leave to sue as 882 [O 33 r 2]
  - presentation of 885 [O 33 r 3]
  - procedure on granting of 890 [O 33 r 8]
  - subsequent when not allowed 895 [O 33 r 15]
- application for leave to appeal as 1030 [O 44 r 1]
  - rejection of 1030 [O 44 r 1 proviso]
  - inquiry into pauperism 1032 [O 44 r 2]
- cause of action when none shown in application 886 [O 33 r 5 (d)]
- Collector when copy of decree to be sent to 895 [O 33 r 14]
- commission examination of applicant by 885 [O 33 r 4 ( )]
- costs of application and inquiry into pauperism 895 [O 33 r 16]
  - of successful defendant in a pauper suit Court may award 894
  - where pauper succeeds 891 [O 33 r 10]
  - where pauper partly succeeds and partly fails 891
- court fees to be first charge on subject matter of suit 891 [O 33 r 10]
  - when pauper fails or is dispaupered 893 [O 33 r 11]
  - when pauper succeeds 891 [O 33 r 10]
- Crown's prerogative of precedence in respect of court fees 895
- death of pauper applicant and abatement 896
  - plaintiff and continuation of suit 895
- decree refusal of leave to sue in *forma pauperis* not a and not appealable 894
- defendant pauper 894 884
- definition of 882 [O 33 r 1 Expln.]
- dismissal of pauper application for default effect of 896
- dispaupering 890 [O 33 r 9]
- evidence of applicant's pauperism 886 [O 33 r 5]
- examination of applicant 895 [O 33 r 4]
- fraudulent disposal of property by pauper 886 [O 33 r 5 (c)]

**Pauper—*contd***

- Government charge of for court fees on subject matter of suit 891 [O 33 r 10]
  - application by for payment of court fee 890 [O 33 r 12]
  - mode of realization of court fees by 891
  - to be deemed a party 890 [O 33 r 13]
- hearing of application for leave to sue as pauper 888 [O 33 r 7]
- inherent power of Court to allow a defence *in forma pauperis* 394
- inquiry into pauperism of appellant 1042 [O 44 r 2]
- legal representative of deceased pauper suit by 884
- limitation for leave to appeal as a pauper 1030
  - where application converted into suit by payment of fees 889
  - where application granted or refused 889
- married woman as 884
- minor pauper 894
- official liquidator of company and application to sue as 884
- order allowing applicant to sue as cannot be questioned in appeal from decree 889
- parda naslin* women application by for leave to sue as 885
- plaintiff may prosecute as pauper suit instituted in ordinary way 884
- Privy Council appeal to by pauper 1032
  - security for costs in appeal to by pauper 1033
- recognised agent application to sue *in forma pauperis* cannot be made by 409
- refusal of application to sue as pauper effect of 895 [O 33 r 15]
- rejection of application for leave to sue as 886 [O 33 r 11]
- review order refusing leave to sue as pauper and 889 1055
- revision of order rejecting application for leave to sue *in forma pauperis* 887
- revision order made on application for leave to sue *in forma pauperis* and 342
- security for costs in appeal to Privy Council by pauper 1033
  - where leave granted to plaintiff to sue as 833
  - whether pauper appellant can be called upon to furnish 996
- transfer of interest by in subject matter of proposed suit 886 [O 33 r 5 (e)] 887

**Payment—*See* Payment into Court Payment out of Court**

- to be specially pleaded in defence 520 [O 8 r 2]
- decree conditional on of dower 43

**Payment into Court—828 831 [O 24]**

- costs where amount claimed deposited in Court 830 [O 24 r 4]
- deposit by defendant in Court of amount in satisfaction of claim 828 [O 24 r 1]
  - may be paid to plaintiff 829 [O 24 r 2]
- interest on deposit not allowed to plaintiff after notice 830 [O 24 r 3]
- money under decree of 634 [O 21 r 1]
- money held as trustee for another of 969 970 [O 39 r 10]
- money admitted to belong to another of 969 970 [O 39 r 10]
- notice of deposit to plaintiff 829 [O 24 r 2]
- procedure where plaintiff accepts deposit—in full or part satisfaction of his claim 830 [O 24 r 4]
- property admitted to belong to another deposit in Court of 969 970 [O 39 r 10]
- suit for debt or damages *together with* other relief 829

**Payment out of Court—**

- certified to be 605 [O 21 r 2 (2)]
- joint decree to one of several holders of 603
- money payable under decree of 630 [O 21 r 2]

**Payment out of Court—*contd***

- restitution of uncertified payment on reversal of decree in appeal 643
- suit upon uncertified payment when maintainable 639
- uncertified payment when not recognized by Court 635 [O 21 r 2 (3)]

**Pecuniary jurisdiction—See Valuation of Suits**

of Courts 19 [s 6]

**Pending suit—**

- assignment 804
- when a bar to trial of subsequently instituted suit 31 [s 10]

**Pension—**

- High Court judges pension of 1211 [Charter Act s 6]
- political not attachable 192 [s 60 (g)] 199
- private attachable 199

**Performance—**

- to be specially pleaded in defence 520 [O 8 r 2]

**Personally work for gain—**

- meaning of 103

**Place of suing—See Jurisdiction.**

- acquiescence of defendant and 99 [O 20 (b)]
- agency contract and 105
- Chartered High Court suits cognizable by and 1240 1241 [Charter cl 12]
- compensation for wrong to immovable property suits for 91 [s 16 (e)]
  - person or movables suits for 93 [s 10].
- conjugal rights restitution of suits for 108
- contract as to 33
- contracts suits on 103 108 [s 20]
- debtor 106
- effect of instituting suit in Court of wrong grade 89
  - maxim debtor must find his creditor and 102
- foreclosure suit for 91 [s 16 (c)] 93
- fraud suit to set aside decree obtained by 109
  - to set aside sale in execution of decree obtained by 109
- Government suits against 247
- grade suits to be instituted in Court of lowest when 87 [s 15]
- immovable property suits for recovery of 91 [s 16 (a)] 91
- injunction to restrain sale in execution suit for 109
- in personam* suits 93
- jurisdiction of different Courts where land is situated within 96 [s 1]
- land suits for determination of any right to or interest in 91 [s 16 (f)] 93
  - suits for within meaning of cl 12 of the Charter 1241 1245
- land situate within jurisdiction of different Courts 96 [s 17]
- local limits of jurisdiction of Courts where uncertain 97 [s 18]
- negotiable instruments suit on and 107
- non resident foreigners suits against 110
- partition suit for 91 [s 16 (f)] 93
- partnership suits and 108
- redemption suits for 91 [s 16 (c)] 93
- residence of defendant and 99 [s 20] 100
- sale of mortgaged property suit for 91 [s 16 (c)] 93
- suits under cl 12 of the Charter 1241

## Plaint—506 520 [O 7]

alternative and inconsistent allegations in 481

relief *will* 512

amended copy of to be served on newly added defendant 426 [O 1 r 10 (4)]

amendment of 496 505 [O 6 r 17] 496

when defective for multifariousness 449

breach of trust allegation of in 482 [O 6 r 4]

claiming more or less than what is due 510

concise statement 513 [O 7 r 9 (1)]

condition precedent specification of in 487 [O 6 r 6]

copy of to accompany summons 463 [O 5 r ~]

court fee and return of 514

documents list of to be annexed to 513 [O 7 r 9 (1)]

relied on 518 [O 7 r 14 (2)]

inspection of mentioned in plaint 570 571 [O 11 r 15]

not in possession of plaintiff statement in plaint as to 518 [O 7 r 15]

not produced when plaint filed inadmissibility of 519 [O 7 r 18]

production of on which plaintiff sues 519 [O 7 r 14]

evidentiary facts not to be stated in 480

facts which law presumes in plaintiff's favour need not be stated in 492 [O 6 r 13]—

failure to amend within times specified by Court effect of 506 [O 6 r 18]

forms of and their use 431 [O 6 r 3] *See* Forms of Plaints

fraud allegations of in 482 [O 6 r 4]

plaint cannot be amended by substituting another kind of fraud 502

fraudulent intention how to be pleaded in 491 [O 6 r 10]

further or other relief need not be claimed 510 [O 7 r 7]

general relief need not be asked for 510 [O 7 r 7]

immovable property where suit is for [O 7 r 3] 507

implied contract allegation of in 492 [O 6 r 12]

inconsistent allegations of facts adding of in plaint 488 [O 6 r 7]

interpleader suits plaint in 491 [O 3 r 1]

issue where case disclosed in evidence is different from that disclosed in plaint 539—

knowledge how to be pleaded 491 [O 6 r 10]

law plaint not to state 477

leave to amend, where given 496 497

leave to amend where may be refused 497 500

liability of defendant plaint must disclose 509 [O 7 r ~]

limitation law plaint must show grounds of exemption from 509 [O 7 r 6].

malice how to be pleaded 491 [O 6 r 10]

material facts only plaint to contain 476 [O 6 r 2]

misconduct allegation of in 483

misrepresentation allegation of in 482 [O 6 r 4]

money suit in 507 [O 7 r 2]

negligence allegation of in 492

negotiable instrument suit on lot 519 [O 7 r 16].

new ground of claim in plaint raising 488 [O 6 r 7].

notice how to be pleaded 491 [O 6 r 11]

omission to sign 493

particulars to be contained in plaint 506 [O ~ r 11]

pre-entation of after office hours 464

procedure on admitting plaint 513 [O ~ r 9].

**Plaint—*contd***

- procedure on rejecting plaint 518 [O 7 r 12]
  - returning plaint 513 [O 7 r 10 (2)]
- rejection of 514 [O 7 r 11]
  - appeal from order directing 517
  - may be at any stage of suit 515
  - where particulars of fraud not stated in plaint 483
  - where does not preclude presentation of fresh plaint 518 [O 7 r 13]
- relief claimed plaint must state specifically 510 [O 7 r 7]
  - general relief need not be asked for 510 [O 7 r 7]
  - alternative 511-512
    - when found on separate grounds 512 [O 7 r 8]
- representation where verbal or in writing must be stated in plaint 483
- representative where plaintiff sues as 507 [O 7 r 4]
- return of plaint an appealable order 514 1078 [O 43 r 1 cl (a)]
  - for presentation to proper Court 513 [O 7 r 10 (1)]
- shop book production of 519 [O 7 r 17]
- signing of 492 [O 6 r 14]
- signing and verifying in suit
  - by corporations 848 [O 29 r 1]
  - by firm in firm name 850 [O 30 r 1]
  - by Government 845 [O 27 r 1]
- stamped written on paper insufficiently 516
- striking out unnecessary scandalous or embarrassing matter from 493 [O 6 r 6]
- suits instituted by presenting plaint 121 [s 56] 464 [O 4 r 1]
- undue influence allegation of in 482 [O 6 r 4]
- verification of 493 [O 6 r 15]
- wilful default allegation of in 482 [O 6 r 4]

**Plaintiff—*See* Parties Plaintiff**

- abandonment of part of claim by 807 [O 23 r 1]
- added when may or may not be 429 430
- affidavit of documents when there are two or more plaintiffs 569
- alternative claim 410
- amendment of plaint—*See* Plaintiff
- appearance of one of several plaintiffs for others 434 [O 1 r 12]
- appearance of plaintiff in person when may be ordered 405 [O 5 r 3]
- assignment by of interest in suit 802 [O 2 r 10]
- causes of action several plaintiffs having separate in one suit 406 408 409 409
- claiming more or less than what is found due 510
- club who should be joined as plaintiffs in suit by 420 471
- commission to examine plaintiff 837
- co-plaintiff *res judicata* between 56
- consent of person added as plaintiff 426 [O 1 r 10 (3)] 429 431
- consequence of non attendance of when ordered to appear in person 544 [O 9 r 1]
- cost of postponement through not serving summons in due time 535 [O 9 r 6 (2)]
- cost payable by plaintiff prior to his insolvency 793
- death of—*See* Abatement
- dismissal of suit when plaintiff does not appear at the hearing 536 [O 9 r 8]
- fresh suit decree against plaintiff by default bars 537 [O 9 r 9]
- inherent power to enquire whether a plaintiff entitled to sue as an adult 391
- insolvency of when bars suit 797 [O 2 r 6]
- interests different and joinder of 408

**Plaintiff—*contd***

- joinder of plaintiff 404 [O 1 r 1] -- *see* Joinder
- joint claim 409
- judgment for one or more of the plaintiffs 416 [O 1 r 4 (a)]
- legal representative of deceased when to be brought on record 781 [O 2 r 3 (1)]
- legatee suit by on behalf of him self and other legatees 419
- limitation substitution of plaintiff where suit brought in wrong name and 428
- limitation addition of plaintiff and 437 438
- marriage of female suit not abated by 797 [O 2 r 7]
- misjoinder of 404—*see* Misjoinder
- name description and residence of must be stated in plaint 506 [O 1 r 1 (c)]
- non attendance of one of several 517 [O 9 r 10]
- non joinder of 405—*see* Non joinder
- numerous plaintiffs having same interest 418 [O 1 r 8]
- omission to sue for all reliefs 436 [O 2 r 2 (3)] 444 445
  - in respect of portion of a claim 436 [O 2 r 2 (3)]
- personal appearance of 465 [O 3 r 3] 535 [O 10 r 4 (1)]
- person refusing to join as plaintiff may be joined as defendant 431
- procedure when only plaintiff appears at the hearing 535 [O 9 r 6]
- relinquishment of part of claim 437 [O 2 r 2 (2)] 438
- remedies of on dismissal of suit 538
- representative character suit brought in 407 [O 7 r 4]
- right to begin 607 [O 18 r 1]
  - same interest 418 [O 1 r 8]
- security for costs when may be required from plaintiff 831 832 [O 20 r 1]
- severally interest and joinder of 409
- substitution of plaintiff 425 [O 1 r 10 (1)]
- withdrawal of suit by 807 [O 23 r 1]
- worship suit to assert right of 411
- written statement when plaintiff may file 476
- wrong plaintiff suit in name of 45 [O 1 r 10 (1)]

**Pleader—**

- adjournment application for and appearance 539
- appearance of party by 459 [O 3 r 1] 539
- appointment of [O 3 r 4] 460 461
  - to act 461
  - to plead by a pleader appointed to act 461
- Arrest when exempt from 365 [s 135 (2)]
- authority of to bind client by admissions 15
  - to compromise 14 15
  - to refer to arbitration 15
  - to withdraw suit 15
    - determination of 463
- costs liability for in suit for minor without next friend 864 [O 31 r 2 (1)] 865
- costs lien for 574 [O 8 r 6 ( )] 579 581
- definition of [s 2 (15)] 14
- delegation of authority by 463
- Government for—*See* Government Pleader
- High Court judgeship when pleader eligible for 1-10 [Charter Act 2]
- issues power to abandon 16
- leave of Court for discharge of 461 [O 3 r 4 (—)]

**Pleader—*contd***

- law abandoning point of or omitting to argue 16
- pleadings when to be signed by 492 [O 6 r 14]
- refusal or inability of to answer questions relating to suit 555 [O 10 r 4]
- service of process on 463 [O 3 r 5]

**Pleadings generally—475 506 [O 6] See *Plaint* *Written Statement*.**

- accounts particulars of in 484
- admissions made by mistake in and amendment of 497
  - by opponent should not be pleaded 480
- agreement how pleaded 484
- alternative and inconsistent allegations in, 491
- amending particulars 487
- amendment of 496 [O 6 r 17] 496 505
- application for particulars 485
- ascertainment whether allegations in are admitted or denied 504 [O 10 r 1]
- breach of trust particulars of to be stated in 482 [O 6 r 4]
- condition precedent when to be distinctly specified in 487 [O 6 r 6]
- contract denial of [O 6 r 8] 490
  - implied how to be pleaded 492 [O 6 r 12]
- costs unnecessary matters in pleadings and 494
- damages matters affecting 478 479
- defamation particulars of 484
- defence particulars of 484 485
- defendant to plead facts to show that he is not liable 477 478
- definition of 475 [O 6 r 1]
- delay mere is no ground for refusing leave to amend 505
- delivering further particulars 497
- departure in pleadings by new ground or inconsistent allegation 488
  - [O 6 r 7] 489 490
- discovery before particulars 485 486
- document when effect only of to be stated 490 [O 6 r 9]
- donatio mortis causa* plaintiff claiming under a 477
- draft of privileged from discovery and inspection 500
- embarrassing pleadings 493 [O 6 r 16] 495
- evidence pleadings to state facts and not 480
  - facta probanda* and *facta probantia* 480
- facts giving rise to a right or creating a duty 477
  - not yet material to a case 479 480
  - pleadings to state and not law 477 478
  - upon which plaintiff relies as showing act complained of was wrongful & presumed by law in plaintiff's favour need not be alleged 492 [O 6 r 13]
- failure to amend within time fixed by Court 506 [O 6 r 18]
- forms of and their use 491 [O 6 r 3]
- fraud particulars of to be stated in 482 [O 6 r 4]
  - pleadings not to be amended by substituting another kind of 502
  - right of principal to inspect agent's books before giving particulars of 486.
- fraudulent intention* how to be pleaded [O 6 r 10] 493
- function of 476
- funerary rules of 477
- general principles on which system of pleading in England is founded 483
  - rules relating to 476 477

**Pleadings generally—*contd***

- inconsistent allegations must be by amendment 488 [O 6 r 7]
- infringement of trade mark particulars in case of 483
- inherent power of Court to strike out scandalous matter from 494 495
- inheritance plaintiff claiming by and 48
- inpection of documents referred to in 510 [O 11 r 15]
- issues must not be inconsistent with 589
- judgment upon admission in 517 [O 12 r 6]
- knowledge how to be pleaded 491 [O 6 r 10]
- malice how be pleaded 491 [O 6 r 10]
- material facts only pleadings to state 476 [O 6 r 2] 478
  - facts in a concise form pleadings to state 480 491
- meaning of 475 [O 6 r 1]
- misconduct particulars of 483
- misrepresentation particulars of 482 [O 6 r 4]
- negligence how to be pleaded 483
  - particulars of 483
- notice how to be pleaded 491 [O 6 r 11]
- object of particulars in pleadings 482
- objection to application for particulars 487
- omission by party to plead a material fact 475
  - to sign pleadings 493
- onus and facts which need not be pleaded 492 [O 6 r 13]
- particulars when necessary to be given in 482 [O 6 r 4]
  - further and better statement of 485 [O 6 r 5]
- pedigree facts in when to be set out in pleadings 490
- power of Court to order whole pleading to be struck out 494
- privilege from inspection and draft pleadings 566
- rejection of plaint where particulars of fraud not stated in plaint 483
- representation whether verbal or in writing must be stated 483
- rules of 476 477
- scandalous matter in 493 [O 6 r 16] 494 495
- signing of 492 [O 6 r 14]
- signing and verifying in suits by corporations 848 [O 29 r 1]
  - by firm in firm name 850 [O 30 r 1]
  - by Government 848 [O 27 r 1]
- subsequent pleadings when allowed 531 [O 8 r 9]
- time within which pleadings should be amended 506 [O 6 r 18]
- title facts showing plaintiffs to be pleaded 477
- trade mark infringement of particulars in case of 485 483
- undue influence particulars of 482 [O 6 r 4]
- unnecessary matter in 493 [O 6 r 16]
- verification of 493 [O 6 r 15]
- wagering contract defence of 490
- wilful default particulars of 482 [O 6 r 4]

**Political Agent—**

- foreign judgment order of deposing high priest from *gadis* is not 81
- Prince whether Political Agent can use on behalf of 555
- service of summons through 473 [O 5 r 26]

**Political questions—**

- suits involving 31



**Preliminary decree—*contd***

- in suit for possession and mesne profits 618 [O 20 r 12]
- redemption 920 927 [O 34 7]
- sale of mortgaged property 915 916 [O 34 r 4]
- suits in which preliminary decree may be passed 9

**Prescribed—**

- definition of 16 [s 2 (16)]

**Presidency Small Cause Courts—**

- application of Orders and Rules to 1064 [O 51 r 1]
- of sections of Code to 21 [s 8]
- pecuniary limit of jurisdiction of 87
- power to attach immovable property 909 [O 38 r 13]
- reference to High Court by 1040
- stay of suits pending in 963
- transfer of certain decrees for execution to 640 [O 21 r 4]
- of suit from to High Court 1249

**Presumption—**

- documents non disclosure of and 068
- foreign judgment as to 200 [s 86]
- of law and pleadings 490 [O 6 r 13]

**Price—**

- deficiency of on resale 731 [O 21 r 71]

**Princes and Chiefs—*See* Chiefs (ruling) and Princes****Principal—**

- decree in suit for account between principal and agent 6 8 [O 20 r 16]
- right of to inspect agent's books before delivery of particulars of fraud 406

**Private rights—**

- explained 59
- res judicata and litigation for in common with others 34 [s 11 Explan. 11] 03

**Privilege—**

- arrest privilege from 360 [s 130]
- confidential communications between client and legal adviser and 060 060
- inspection by Court when privilege claimed 074 [O 11 r 19 (7)]
- inspection when privilege may be claimed as regards 060 060
- party interrogated claim of privilege by 563
- principal and agent communication between when privileged 566
- wavier of 010

**Privy Council—317 336 [ss 109 112] 1032 1040 [O 40]**

- abandonment of appeal in part after grant of certificate 3 0
- admission of appeal and procedure thereon 1038 [O 40 r 8]
- amount of money payable under order of how estimated 1042 [O 40 r 10 (3)]
- appeal to when it lies 317 330 [ss 109 110] 1040 [Charter cl 39]
- by pauper 1032
- from interlocutory judgments of High Court 1040 [Charter cl 40]
- from decree from which no second appeal lies 335 [s 111 (1)]
- from preliminary decree 318
- in cases under Provincial Insolvency Act 318
- in criminal cases 127 1273 [Charter cl 41]
- right of 319
- under the Charter 1040 1273 [Charter cls 39 42]

Privy Council—*contd*

- appeal from order granting order or refusing leave to appeal to 1034
  - in execution of orders of King in Council 1045 [O 45 r 16]
  - of a single judge of High Court refusing to transmit for execution order of King in Council 1045
  - refusing to extend time for furnishing security for costs of appeal to King in Council and directing appeal to be struck off 1037
- application for execution of order of by a signee of order 1043 1044
- bar of certain appeals to 330 [s 111]
- certificate as to fitness for appeal to 317 [s 109 (c)] 322 323
  - as to value or fitness petition for grant of 1033 [O 45 r 3] 1034
  - effect of refusal of [O 45 r 6] 1036
- Charter appeal to Privy Council under 1270 1272 [Charter cls 39 40]
- concurrent findings of facts and appeal to 323 [s 110] 330 333
- consolidation of suits for purposes of valuation for appeal to 1034 [O 45 r 4]
- Crown prerogative of to admit appeal 321 336 [s 112 (1) (a)]
- decisions appealable to under cl 39 of the Charter 12 0
- decree definition of in order 45 1032 [O r 1]
  - involving claim to property of the value of Rs 11 000 or upwards 328 330
  - preliminary appeal from to 318
  - single decree in several appeals and valuation for 328
  - when said to affirm the decision of the lower Court 330 332
  - deposition on grant of certificate 1036 1037 [O 45 r 7]
  - further 1039 [O 45 r 10]
  - refund of balance of 1039 [O 45 r 12]
- dismissal of appeal for not furnishing security for costs not a ground of appeal 334
- dispute as to amount or value of subject matter 1035 [O 45 r 5]
- documents which need not be translated or transmitted 1036 1037 [O 45 r 7]
- enforcing orders of procedure for 1042 [O 45 r 15]
- execution of decree appeal to Privy Council no bar to 1029 [O 45 r 13 (1)]
  - stay of 1040 [O 45 r 13 (2) (c)]
  - of order of by Courts in India 1042 [O 45 r 15]
- final order what amounts to to entitle party to appeal to 318 322
- foreign Court Privy Council is not 12
- functions of High Court in enforcing orders of 1043
- impounding of movable property pending appeal to 1039 [O 45 r 13 (2) (a)]
- Indian Courts rules observed by Privy Council in appeal from decrees of 334 335
- inherent power of Court to direct a party to pay costs on dismissal of application for leave to appeal to 394
- interest on costs where not allowed in order of 1044
- judgment failure to state reasons for decision in no ground of appeal to 334 1022
- Land Acquisition Act no appeal to Privy Council from certain awards under 1271
- law question of and appeal to 323 [s 110] 333 334
- leave to amend plaint in appeal to 500
- limitation period of for appeal to 321
- mean profits pending appeal to restitution of 1044
- order passed on appeal appeal to Privy Council from 317 [s 109 (a)] 321
- pauper appeal to Privy Council by 103-
- petition for leave to appeal to contents of 1033 [O 45 r 3]
  - dismissal of 1034 [O 45 r 6]
- prerogative of the Crown to admit appeals 336 [s 112]
- plaint leave to amend when granted by 500

Privy Council—*contd*

- powers of Court pending to 1039 1040 [O 4, r 13]
- preliminary decree appeal from to 318
- Provincial Insolvency Act right to appeal to Privy Council under 318
- receiver appointment of pending appeal to 1040 [O 4, r 13 (2) (d)]
  - order refusing to appoint not appealable to 318 9,9
- refund of balance of deposit 1039 [O 45 r 12]
- refusal to allow additional evidence gives no right of appeal to 1020
- restitution of immovable property sold in execution pending appeal to 1044
- review concurrent findings of lower Court power of Judicial Committee to 33, 333
  - of order refusing leave to appeal to 105,9
  - reversal of a decision by Privy Council and 10,1
  - whether order granting leave to appeal to Privy Council is open to 334
- revision order made on whether appealable to 1271
- revocation of acceptance of security 1038 [O 4, r 9]
- right of appeal to 318
- rules as to transmission of copies of evidence etc 1273 [Charter cl 4']
- rules made by Judicial Committee saving of 336 [s 112]
- rules observed by in appeal from decrees of Indian Court 334 33,9
- security as regards execution—
  - from respondent where decree to be executed 1039 [O 4, r 13 (1) (b)],
  - from appellant where execution stayed 1039 [O 4, r 13 (1)]
  - further security pending appeal to Privy Council 1041 1042 [O 4, r 14]
- security for costs on grant of certificate 1036 1037 [O 4, r 7]
  - in appeal to by pauper 1033
  - order for further before transmission of record 1039 [O 4, r 10]
  - effect of failure to give further security 1039 [O 4, r 11]
- special leave by Privy Council when granted 322 1034
- stay of execution of decree 1046 [O 4, r 13 (2) (c)] 1041
  - in view of application for special leave to appeal 39, 1044
- stay of further execution when ordered 1039 [O 4, r 13 (1) (b)]
- surety enforcement of liability of in Privy Council appeal 1044
- time within which security and deposit to be given 1036 [O 4, r 7 (1)]
- value dispute as to 1035 [O 4, r 5]
  - of subject matter of suit or in appeal 3,3 [s 110]
- valuation consolidation of suits for purposes of 1034 [O 4, r 4]
  - date of for purposes to 3,4
  - where matter is under appellable value or is not capable of 330

## Probate—

- compromise of probate proceedings 8,3 8,4
- costs of probate proceedings 131
- executor suit by and 107,109
  - who has not joined in probate need not be made party 861 [O 31 r 2]
- injunction whether can be granted in probate proceedings 964
- necessary when 107,109
- procedure in Code in regard to suits applies to probate proceedings 3"
- reference to High Court in a matter of probate 1046
- re judicata* dismissal of suit for failure to produce probate and 70
- decision of Probate Court and 6,9

## Procedure—

- adjourned hearing where parties fail to appear at 601 [O 1<sup>st</sup> r 2] 602.
- appeals from order procedure in 31<sup>st</sup> [s. 10<sup>th</sup>], 1030 [O 43 r 2].
- application for execution of decrees what procedure applies to 3<sup>rd</sup> 3<sup>rd</sup> 2
- consent decree for settling a side 9.
- defendant only appearing at hearing 536 [O 9 r 8].
  - refusing to accept service 468 [O 3 r 1<sup>st</sup>].
- execution on receiving application for 66 [O 21 r 17]
- interrogatories omission to answer 563 [O 11 r 11].
- issue where parties are at 59 [O 15 r 3]
- judge vacating office before signing decree 615 [O 21 r 8]
- judgment-debtor on appearance of upon notice or after arrest 687 688 [O 21 r 40]
- jurisdiction when objection is taken to 114.
  - for arrest or attachment outside not in execution 36<sup>th</sup> [s. 136]
- lunatics in suits by or against 881 [O 3. r 1a]
- memorandum of appeal on rejecting 518
- minors in suits by or against 862 863 [O 3.]
- miscellaneous proceedings in 30 [s. 141]
- neither party appearing 533 [O 9 r 3]
- non attendance of one of several defendants in case of 544 [O 9 r 11]
  - plaintiffs in case of 543 [O 9 r 10]
- notice for execution against legal representative after issue of 6<sup>th</sup> 2 [O 21 r 23]
- pauper at hearing of application for leave to sue as 686 [O 33 r 7]
- payment into Court acceptance of by plaintiff 830 [O 24 r 4]
- plaint on admission 513 [O 7 r 9]
  - rejecting 518 [O 7 r 1.]
  - returning 513 [O 7 r 10 (2)]
- plaintiff only appears at hearing where 535 [O 9 r 6]
- Privy Council on admission of appeal to 1033 [O 43 r 8]
  - to enforce orders of 1042 [O 45 r 15]
- restitution under s. 144 p. 3<sup>rd</sup>
- rules of in Schedule I effect of 308 [s. 121]
  - powers of Courts to frame—See Rules
- second appeals in 317 [s. 103] 10<sup>th</sup> [O 4. r 1]
- summary suits in 900 [O 37 r 7]
- witness failure of to appear 597 598 [O 16 rr 10 13]
  - where insufficient sum paid in Court for expenses of 599 [O 16 r 4]
- written statement when party fails to present called for by Court 53. [O 8 r 10].

## Process—See Summons Warrant

- civil exemption from arrest under 366
- endorsement on process for execution 613 [O 41 r 2.]
- execution issue of process for 6<sup>th</sup> [O 21 r 4]
- return of with endorsement to Court 613 [O 21 r 25 (1)]
- Secretary of State agent to receive process against 846 [O 27 r 4]
- service of and expenses 1062 [O 45 r 1]
  - of Chartered High Courts 1063 [O 49 r 1]
  - on pleader 463 [O 3 r 3]
  - on recognised agent 460 [O 3 r 3]
  - on special agent to accept service 463 [O 3 r 6].
- witnesses issue of process to on application of commissioner 844 [O 26, r 17 (2)].

**Proclamation—**

of sale by public auction—725 [O 21 r 66]

costs and interest not recovered by proclamation liability for 743 [O 21 r 89 (3)]

examination of persons to ascertain matters for proclamation 725 [O 21 r 66 (4)]

matters to be specified in 725 [O 21 r 66 (2)]

mode of making proclamation of sale 729 [O 21 r 67]

non compliance with provisions for making proclamations 729

omission as to—See Material irregularity in conducting sale

purchaser rights of when mere notice given of mortgage in 717

resale in default of purchase money and fresh proclamation 742 [O 21 r 87]

sale adjournment of and fresh proclamation 730 [O 21 r 69 (2)]

separate proclamation unnecessary where sale of property in lots 720 [O 21 r 67 (3)]

variance between sale-certificate and proclamation 770

**In other cases—**

attachment of immovable property proclamation of order of 708 [O 21 r 54 (\*)]

tenant where property is in occupation of—

(a) and possession to go to holder of decree for possession 684 685 [O 21 r 36]

(b) and possession is to be delivered to execution purchaser 712 [O 21 r 96]

witness proclamation requiring attendance of 697 [O 18 r 10 (\*)]

**Production—See Documents****Pro forma defendant—**

meaning of 56

*res judicata* between plaintiff and 56

**Promissory note—See Negotiable instrument Summary Suit.**

costs recovery of of noting non acceptance of dishonoured 950 [O 37 r 6]

definition of 948

instalments omission to sue for 437

joinder of parties liable on same 416 [O 1 r 6]

**Property—See Movable Property Immovable Property**

ancestral liability of in execution 182 [s 53]

attachment what property liable to 191 193 [s 60]

injunction temporary when—in regard to property in dispute 99 [O 39 r 1] 961

Private transfer of pending attachment in execution 206 [s 64] 207 209

pending attachment before judgment 955

**Protest—**

jurisdiction of foreign Court protest against 84

**Provincial Small Cause Courts—**

application of Order and Rules to 1064 [O 60 r 1]

of sections of Code to 20 [s 7]

compensation for wrongful arrest or attachment jurisdiction to award 286

jurisdiction of 89

Mesne profits suit for and jurisdiction 307

Power of to direct injunction, 20 [s 7]

to order attachment of immovable property 20 [s 7] 958 [O 33 r 13]

to appoint receiver of immovable property 20 [s 7]

to pass orders under s. 94 p 20 [s 7]

reference to High Court where is mistake as to jurisdiction 1066 1067 [O 60 rr 6, 7]

second appeal in suits cognizable by 307 [s 10<sup>2</sup>]

title, suit for and jurisdiction 308.

## Public charities—260 283 [s 93]

- account claim for in suits relating to 260 [s 92 (1) (d)] 272
- Advocate General consent of in suits relating to 260 266 [s 92] 268
- arbitration without intervention of Court in matters relating to 1194
- Courts competent to try suits relating to 260 [s 92] 278 279
- cy pris doctrine* power of Courts to apply 283
- death of party pending suit relating to 82
- decree for possession whether it can be passed against alienee from trustee 276-277
- limitations as against Advocate General 283
- mandatory section 9 is 279
- public purposes of a religious or charitable nature 219
- relators cannot appeal in their own right 293
  - who may be in suits relating to 267 268
- reliefs what may be claimed in suits relating to 270 274
- Religious Endowments Act applicability of 280 282
- settling a scheme for 266 [s 92 (g)] 272 273
- Specific Relief Act section 42 of inapplicable to suits under s 92 282
- suits against alienees from trustees for possession of trust property 276 278
  - between two persons each claiming rights as trustees 270 [Case 3]
  - brought to remedy a particular infringement of an individual right 275 276
  - for declaration that plaintiff entitled to joint management of trust property 275
  - for mere declaration that certain property is *wakf* property 276
  - relating to 265 [s 92]
    - outside Presidency towns 283 [s 93]
    - relating to mosques 270 276 [Case 5]
- trustee *de son tort* 271
  - of appointing new 265 [s 92 (1) (b)] 272
  - removal of 265 [s 92 (1) (a)] 270 271
- when s 92 applies 274
- who may bring suits relating to 267

## Public religious trust—See Public Charities

## Public nuisance—261 260 [s 91]

- acts which merely offend sentiments of a class not a public nuisance 260
- convenience or advantage not excused on ground of 264
- damage special not necessary to institute suit relating to 261 [s 91]
- definition of 261
- injunction restraining 263 264
- instances of 262 264 265
- interest of persons suing 263
- nature of proceedings in suits relating to 262 263
- Presidency towns suits outside 283 [s 93]
- private action by person suffering special damage from 262
- private nuisance 265
- relators interest in suits relating to 263
- remedies for 261 262
- suits relating to 261 [s 91]
  - by Advocate-General acting *ex-officio* 263
  - by Advocate-General at the relation of others 263.
- taboos* suit by Mahomedans for carrying of in procession along a public road 264
- time whether length of can legalize 264

## Public officer—

- attachment allowances (being less than salary) of not liable to 191 [a 60 (1) (A)] 199
- of property in custody of 702 [O 21 r 32]
- of salary of 192 [s 60 (1) (a)] 199
  - mode of 693 696 [O 21 r 48]
- of salary of officer of His Majesty's Regular forces 201 202
- Cantonment Committee whether 231
- death of complainant after notice but before suit against 231
- definition of 16 [s 2 (17)]
- execution salary of public officer and jurisdiction in 693 696 [O 21 r 48]
- of decree against 232 [s 82]
- exemption from mesne arrest 232 [s 81 (a)] 847 [O 27 r 8]
- mesne attachment of property of 232 [s 81 (a)] 84 [O 27 r 8]
- personal appearance in certain cases 232 [s 81 (b)]
- extension of time to enable to make reference to Government 846 [O 21 r 7]
- Government undertaking defence of suit against 847 [O 27 r 8]
- jurisdiction in execution proceedings against 693 696 [O 21 r 48]
- notice before suit 247 [s 80]
  - whether necessary in suit against public officer for injunction, 230 231
  - whether should be given to and in what cases 248 250
- official capacity act purporting to be done by a public officer in his 248
- procedure in suit against 848 [O 27 r 8]
- public official document objection to produce for inspection 66
- service of summons on 474 [O 5 r 27]
- stay of execution no security from public officer on 994 [O 41 r 7]
- suits by or against 843 847 [O 27]
- who is 16 [s 2 (17)]

## Public rights—

- explained 39
- res judicata* litigation for and public rights 34 [s 11 Expln. VI] 39

## Purchaser—See Auction purchaser

## Purda ladies—

- arrest of in execution of civil process in certain cases 364 [s 13 (a)]
- of person in a room in occupation of 185 [s 53 (1)]
- commission examination on 833 [O 26 r 1] 833
- delivery of possession when property in occupation of 691 [O 21 r 35 (3)]
- decree *ex parte* against and service of summons 548
- dismissal of suit for non-compliance with order for discovery 373
- exemption from personal appearance in Court 364 [s 13]
- pauper application for leave to sue as 844
- seizure of property where room is in occupation of 203 [s 62 (3)]
- service of summons where serving officer cannot obtain access to 471

## Questions—

- appeal new questions of fact raised for the first time in 93
- Court executing decree questions relating to execution are for 147 150 [s 47]
- execution proceedings questions between parties to suit in, 150 156
- Inherent power of Court to decide one question and reserve another 394
- of law in appeal to Privy Council 333 [s 110]
- in second appeal 299 300 [s 100]

## Railway servant—

- arrest of procedure as to 186 [s 55 (2)] 187
- attachment allowances (being less than salary) of not liable to 192 [s 60 (1) (h)] 199
- bonus sanctioned to a railway servant whether liable to 190
- salary of when liable to 192 [s 60 (1) (i)] 199
- mode of attachment of salary of 690 696 [O 21 r 48]
- service of summons on 474 [O 5 r 27]

## Rateable distribution—s 73 [s 73]

- appeal from order made under s 73 for 240 243
- assets available for 233 234
- assets not available for 234 235
- assets held by a Court 233 239
- attachment before judgment and 241
- attorney's fees and 242
- claims for rateable distribution of assets 241
  - enforceable under an attachment 210 211
- conditions for 231
- Court to which application for execution should be made for a share in 231
- decree holders when entitled to rateable distribution of assets 229 [s 73 (3)] 231
- deposit of amount of decree after sale whether subject to rateable distribution 747
- execution application for should be made before receipt of assets by Court 231 233
- fraud or irregularity right of person entitled to share in to apply to set aside sale of
  - immovable property on ground of 750
- fraudulent where decree obtained by one of the claimants is 242
- Government rights of to rateable distribution 230 [s 73 (3)]
- immovable property sold and distribution of sale proceeds 229 [s 73 (1)]
- inquiry as to validity of decree and 242
- insolvency of judgment debtor and order for 240
- legal representative of judgment debtor decree against and 241
- money decree for payment of and 239 240
- money voluntarily paid by judgment debtor into Court or under arrest and 233 239
- mortgage where property is affected by 229 [s 73 (1)]
- receipt of assets by Court 231 233
- refund of assets suit for from person not entitled to receive same 230 [s 73 (2)]
  - 241 242
- sale proceeds of property attached but sold by a private sale 230 231
- same judgment debtor and 240 241
- suit declaratory as to right of 240
- summary inquiry when decree obtained by one of claimants is fraudulent 242

## Receiver—179 [s 51 (d)] 234 [s 94 (d)] 970 983 [O 40]

- account liability of receiver to 981 [O 40 r 3 (b)]
- agreement restricting powers of 973 [Case v]
- appeal from directions given by Court in passing receiver's accounts 9 9
  - order directing receiver to advance moneys to guardian *ad litem* 980
  - directing attachment and sale of receiver's property or 982 1009
  - [O 43 r 1 (a)]
  - granting or rejecting an application to appoint a receiver 9 9
  - 1009 [O 43 r 1 cl (a)]
- appointment of in execution proceedings 179 [s 51 (d)]
  - in other cases 234 [s 94 (d)] 9 9 [O 40 r 1]
  - new receiver 978
  - pendente lite* 978



Receiver—*contd*

- arbitration clause in partnership agreement no bar to Court appointing receiver 976
- attachment of property in hands of 972 [Case 1] 702.
  - of receiver in enforcement of his duties 982 [O 40 r 4].
- cases in which a receiver may be appointed 975 977
- Collector when may be appointed 983 [O 40 r 5].
- contempt proceedings for 978
- Court which may appoint a receiver 971 974
- Criminal Court cannot interfere with possession of 973 [Case 7] 977
- debts contracted by in course of business 973 [Case 3].
- decree realization of execution and appointment of 179 [s 51 (d)],
  - receiver after 978
- delegation of powers by receiver 980
- duration of office of 978 979
- duties of 981 [O 40 r 3]
- enforcement of receiver's duties mode of 982 [O 40 r 4].
- execution proceedings and 179 [s 51 (d)].
- executor in possession 975
- future earnings of judgment debtor receiver of 977
  - maintenance of 180
- garnishee denial of debt by and appointment of 694
- joint 979
- judgment debtor of future earnings of 977
- leave of Courts receiver cannot sue or be sued without 972 [Case 2].
- lien of 979
- loss occasioned by default of 973 [Case 4], 982 [O 40 r 3 (d)].
- maintenance in a decree for 977
  - future of 180
- mortgaged property of in suit for foreclosure or sale 976
- officer of Court is 971
- partner's share of where it is attached 697 [O 21 r 49 (2)].
- partnership suits, in 976
- party receiver for insolvent mortgagor or mortgagee necessary to mortgage suit 899
  - Necessary to suit for possession of property of which he is receiver 972.
- payment out of state of pressing claims 975
- powers of 970 [O 40 r 1 (d)]
- Privy Council order refusing appointment of not appealable to 318 979
  - receiver pending appeal to 1040 [O 45 r 13 (2) (d)].
- property in hand of attachment 702
- prosecution of 974.
- remuneration of 973 [Case 6] 981 [O 40 r 2].
- security furnishing of by 981 [O 40 r 3 (a)]
  - for costs by receiver on plaintiff's insolvency 707 [O 22 r 8].
- suit when receiver may bring in his own name 978
- temporary injunction and appointment of receiver distinction between 975.
- testamentary suit in 977

Recognized agent—*See* Agent

## Record—

- evidence taken on commission to form part of record of suit, 839
- power of Court to send for record of any suit or proceeding 345 386 [O 13 r 10].

**Redemption—**

beneficiaries whether necessary parties to suit for brought by trustees 900  
 charges provisions respecting redemption and sale apply to 940 [O 34 r 15]  
 equity of redemption persons interested in 899  
 final decree in suit for 928 929 [O 34 r 8]  
 finality of decree in redemption suits 73  
 foreclosure decree for in redemption suit 978 9 9 [O 34 r 8 (2)]  
 parties to suit for 896 [O 34 r 1] 898 899  
 place of suing in suits for redemption governed by the Code 91 [s 16 (c)]  
     governed by the Charter 124.  
 possession claim for in suit for redemption 454 [O 2 r 4 proviso]  
 preliminary decree in suit for redemption 925 927 [O 34 r 7]  
 res judicata and suit for redemption 2 73  
 right of redemption what is 908  
 time power to enlarge fixed for payment in decree 927 [O 34 r 7 (2)] 928

**Reference—1045 1050 [O 46]**

application for reference to High Court 1045 [O 46 r 1]  
 Court trying suit or appeal reference to High Court by 1045 [O 46 r 1]  
 costs of reference to High Court 1045 [O 46 r 4]  
 decree contingent upon decision of High Court Court may pass 1047 [O 46 r 2]  
 District Court reference by in certain cases 1048 [O 46 r 7]  
 execution of decree not allowed pending reference to High Court 1047 [O 46 r 2]  
 High Court no reference to in matter in which appeal lies to High Court 1040  
     to when lies 1045 [O 46 r 1]  
 jurisdiction in small causes doubt as to and 1047 1048 [O 46 r 6]  
     in small causes mistake as to and 1048 [O 46 r 7]  
 opinion of High Court power to refer case for 337 [s 113]  
 powers of High Court on reference 1047 [O 46 r 5]  
 Presidency Small Cause Court reference by 1046  
 probate matter of and reference to High Court 1046  
 procedure after judgment of High Court 1047 [O 46 r 3]  
 reasonable doubt on question of law 1046  
 stay proceedings power of Court making reference to 1047 [O 46 r 2]  
 to arbitration—See Arbitration.

**Refund of stamp duty—**

inherent power to order 396

**Registered post—**

service by 471 [O 5 r 21] 472

**Registrar—**

delegation of judicial and non judicial work to 361 [s 123 (a)]

**Registration—**

compromise affecting land not in suit registration of 898  
 documents of by judge or officer of Court 689 [O 21 r 34 (6)]

**Rejection—**

of appeal where security for costs not furnished within time 925 [O 41 r 10 (2)]  
     application for execution, 662 [O 21 r 17 (1)]  
         for leave to sue as pauper 886 [O 33 r 5].  
 documents irrelevant or inadmissible 582 [O 13 r 3]  
 memorandum of appeal 987 [O 41 r 3]

**Rejection—*contd***

- of plaint 514 [O 7 r 11]
  - appeal from order rejecting 517
  - procedure on 518 [O 7 r 12]
    - where particulars of fraud are not stated in plaint 483
- review rejection of application for 1057 [O 47 r 4 (1)] 1059 [O 47, r 6 (1)]

**Relators—**

- affidavit of documents from 569
- appeal by 283
- public charities in suit for 265 286 [s 92] 267
- nuisance in suits for 261 [s 91] 263

**Release—**

- attachment effect of order of release from 715
- of property from attachment 714 [O 21 r 60]
- or judgment debtor from jail 189 [s 58] 190 [s 59]
- private transfer of property by claimant after order of release from attachment 715
- release to be specifically pleaded 520 [O 8 r 2]

**Relief—**

- alternative 511 512
- amendment of plaint by adding new reliefs 504
- events after institution of suit and granting appropriate relief 512
- further or other need not be claimed 510 [O 7 r 7]
- general or other 510 511
- in personam* and jurisdiction 95
- omission to sue for one of several reliefs 436 [O 2 r 2 (3)]
- plaint must state specifically relief claimed 506 [O 7 r 1 (g)] 510 [O 7 r 7]
- rejection of plaint when relief claimed is under valued 514 [O 7 r 11 (b)]
- res judicata* relief claimed in plaint but not granted and 34 [s 11 Explan. V] 74 75
- specific ground in plaint where relief claimed upon 510
- splitting of reliefs exception to rule against 445
- when founded upon separate grounds 512 [O 7, r 8]

**Religious ceremonies—**

- suits relating to 24
- to recover fees for performing 25

**Religious office—**

- suit by holder of to which fees are attached against a usurper 25
- for 25 27

**Religious trusts—See Public Religious Trusts****Relinquishment—**

- amount relinquished to be stated in plaint 506 [O 7 r 1 (h)]
- of portion of claim by plaintiff 435 [O 2 r 2 (2)]

**Remand—**

- appeal from order of remand 313 [s 105 (2)] 1012
- appellate Court by remand of case by 1003 [O 41 r 23]
- decree *ex parte* remand in appeal from 545
- remand in appeal from order refusing to set aside 1011
- High Court powers of in appeal from order of remand 1013
- improper order of remand 1013
- inherent power of Court to remand 1010
- of High Court to remand in second appeal 1008
- irregularity or error not affecting merits of jurisdiction 297 [s 99]

**Remand—*contd***

issues remand by appellate Court for trial of 1014 [O 41 r 25]  
 jurisdiction plea of want of after remand in second appeal 114  
 limitation period of for appeal from order of remand 101\*

**Removal—**

of attachment after satisfaction of decree 709 709 [O 21 r 55]  
     before judgment when security furnished 956 [O 38 r 9]  
     guardian *ad litem* of 879 [O 32 r 11]  
     next friend of 878 [O 32 r 9]  
         stay of proceedings on 879 [O 32 r 10 (1)]  
 of person from possession or custody of property 970 [O 40 r 1 (b)] 977  
 of trustee appointed under a scheme by application in execution 271  
     in suit relating to public charities 260 [s 92 (1)] 270 271

**Rent—**

attachment before amount of rent ascertained 689 [O 21 r 42]  
 cause of action each year's rent is in itself a separate and entire 41  
 claim for arrears of may be joined with suit for recovery of land 454 [O 2 r 4a]  
 decree for possession and for rent 618 [O 20 r 12]  
 jurisdiction suits as to rent 93  
 omission to sue for *portion* of arrears of 436 [O 2 r 2 III]  
 receiver collection of rents by 970 [O 40 r 1 (d)]  
*res judicata* claim in rent-suits and 40 42  
 special provisions enabling landlord to recover not affected by Code 18 [s 4 (2)]  
 suit for and Small Cause Court 308

**Repeal—**

continuance of orders under repealed enactments 402 [s 157]  
 enactments repealed 402 [s 156]  
 reference to Code of Civil Procedure and other repealed enactments 403 [s 158]

**Representative—See Legal representative**

decree in a representative suit 58 424  
 execution representatives of parties to suit for purposes of 156 158  
 holder of decree to be executed by attachment of another decree 704 [O 21,  
     r 53 (3)]  
 meaning of for purposes of execution 156  
 proceedings by or against 386 [s 146]  
 representative suit 58 419 424  
     adding parties in, 423  
     costs in 424  
     decree in 424

**Resale—**

in default of deposit of 25 per cent by purchaser 741 [O 21 r 84]  
 in default of payment of purchase-money by purchaser 742 [O 21 r 86].

**Reside—**

actually and voluntarily resides 100  
 arrest of person residing outside jurisdiction in cases other than execution 367  
     [s 136]  
 Charter same as dwell in cl 12 of 100 101  
 meaning of in ss 16 19 and 20 p 100  
 residence and appearance of party in person 485 [O 5 r 4].  
     attendance of witness in person 600 [O 16 r 19].  
 security for costs in case of residence outside British India 831 [O 25 r 1].

## Res judicata—33 80 [s 11]

Act of state 81

administrator decree against and 59

amendment of decree application for and 79 80

appellate court and jurisdiction, 68

appellate decree and 73

award decree on an award 70

cause of action different erroneous decision 53

decision not to operate as 53

collusion judgment obtained by 69

competence of Court not dependent on right of appeal 34 [s 11 Explan II] 68

to deliver judgment and 69

conditions of 37

consent decree and estoppel 74

conflicting decrees and 80

in a representative suit 61

Court competent to try subsequent suit 63

Court of exclusive jurisdiction and 63

Court of concurrent jurisdiction and 64

Criminal Court decision of and 66 67

decree conditional on payment of dower 43

conflicting 80

defendants res judicata as between 55 56

decision on merits 70

Duchess of Kingston's case 34 35

estoppel 35

against statute 51

and consent decree 74

Evidence Act s 44 p 69

execution proceedings 77 78

consent orders in 79

ex parte orders in 79

ex parte decree 42 70

foreign judgment and 80 [s 13] 81—See Foreign judgment

former suit meaning of 36

fraud judgment obtained by 69

heard and finally decided 69 70

Hindu widow decree against 60

joint family suit against members of 59 60

income tax proceedings 80

injunction 43

issue of fact 52A

issue of law and 52A 54

issue mixed of law and fact 52A

judgment in rem 61

delivered by Court not competent to deliver it 69

karnavan decree against and 59

Land Acquisition proceedings and 77

limitation issue of and 53

litigating under same title 62 63

maintenance and 42

manager of joint Hindu family decree against 59

matter collaterally or incidentally in issue 38 39

**Res judicata—*contd***

- matter collaterally or incidentally in issue distinguished from matter directly and substantially in issue 39
- matter constructively in issue 44-46
- matter directly and substantially in issue 38
  - distinguished from cause of action 38
- matter which might and ought to have been made ground of attack or defence 44-55
- meaning of 34 35
- mere profits and 76
- minor decree against 61
- mortgage suits 51 52A.
- partition, suit for 52A.
- party in subsequent suit claiming under parties in former suit 56 57
- parties identity of 55
- plaintiffs res judicata as between 56
- pleadings examination of and judgment 39 40
- Probate Court decree of 85
- pro forma defendant 56
- recurring liability 40-42
- redemption suits and 73
- relief claimed but not expressly granted 34 [s 11 Explan. iv] 74 75
- rent suits and 40-42
- representative suit and 58 267
- restitution of conjugal rights and, 43
- res judicata in same suit 77
- Revenue Court decision of and 66 68
- reversioners and 60
- review application for and 80
- rules as to concurrent jurisdiction 64-68
- rules as to matter constructively in issue 46 51
- section not exhaustive 77
- shibait decree against and 59
- stare decisis and 54
- statute estoppel against and 54
- subject matter of suit identity of not a test of res judicata 43 44.
- suit dismissal of under O 17 r 3 p 70
  - liberty to bring fresh suit 75
  - meaning of 35 36
- suits tried together one judgment 36
  - separate judgments 37
- test as to whether matter might have been ground of attack or defence 46-51
- title litigating under same 62 63
  - suit for 40
- trustee decree against and 59
- waiver of plea of 80

**Resistance—**

to delivery of possession in execution—See Possession.

**Respondent—**

- cross-objection by 1004 [O 41 r 22]. See Cross-objections.
- dismissal of appeal without serving notice on 997 [O 41 r 11 (1)].
- power of appellate Court, to—
  - (1) add person interested in result of appeal as 1001 [O 41 r 20].
  - (2) vary decree as regards all respondents 1023 [O 41 r 33].
- right to begin when preliminary issue raised that appeal does not lie 603.
- security for costs at what stage respondent should apply for 900.

Review—*contd*

second application for review 1061  
taxation of rules as to 133

## Revision—337 339 [s 115]

Aden Court of Resident at how far subordinate to Bombay High Court 345  
*Amir Hasvan Khan's case* different interpretations put upon decision in 347 350  
amendment of decree and revision 399  
appeal from orders in revision 355  
    no revision where appeal lies 339  
    power of Court to treat an appeal as an application for revision 339  
award decree on whether subject to revision 1180 1186  
    order setting aside or refusing to set aside whether subject to 1181  
Collector acting under s 18 of Land Acquisition Act not a Court 345  
    acting under Mamlatdar's Courts Act not a Court 345  
    acting in the course of execution proceedings under sec 70 p 276  
    [s 70 (2)] 227  
commission order refusing issue of to examine person outside British India 839  
decision of single judge of chartered High Court and 345  
    of Chief Court of Oudh and 345  
decision wrong as to jurisdiction and, 353  
District Registrar whether subordinate to High Court 341  
expediency or in expediency of order no ground for revision 338  
gross miscarriage of justice condition precedent to revision 351  
grounds on which revision may be granted 337 338 [s 115]  
High Court cases in which will not interfere in revision 347 351  
    decision of single judge of and 345  
    powers and functions of as to 337 [s 115] 339  
    whether can call for record of its own motion 344  
illegality or irregularity instances of 351 353  
injunction temporary refusal of by lower appellate Court and 962  
inspection of documents produced before Court order refusing and 570  
interlocutory orders whether subject to revision 339 349  
jurisdiction non exercise or wrong exercise of 345 347  
    order passed without when not set aside in revision 114  
    wrong decision of first appellate Court as to and 353  
laches 355  
leave to plaintiff to withdraw suit order granting and 816 817  
legal representative of plaintiff failure of Court to bring on record and 787  
lunatic against order on inquiry whether person is a 88—  
multifarious decision whether suit bad for and revision 453  
pauper order made on application for leave to sue as and revision 342  
    order rejecting application for leave to sue as is open to revision 897  
plaintiff order directing making up deficiency of Court fees 51  
remedy revision where party has got another 343  
review order granting and 354  
    refusing and 354  
sanction to prosecute revision of order granting or refusing 354  
stay of suit under s 10 and 23  
subordinate Court meaning of 344  
withdrawal of plaintiff from suit and 816 817  
Zanzibar Court subordinate to Bombay High Court for purposes of revision 345

Right to sue—*See Abatement*

Right to begin—

appeal at hearing of 1000 [O 41 r 1c]

preliminary issue raised that suit or appeal does not lie and 605

suit at hearing of 605 [O 18 r 1]

where burden of proving some of the issues lies on the other side 606 [O 18 r 3]

Rules—

Allahabad High Court rules made by under s 122 pp 1322 1347

Bombay High Court rules made by under s 122 pp 1317 1321

Calcutta High Court rules made by under s 122 pp 1311 1316

definition of 17 [s 2 (18)]

High Court to frame rules for subordinate Courts 1213 [Charter Act, s 15]

Lahore High Court of rules made by under s 122 pp 1350 1357

Madras High Court rules made by under s 122 pp 1348 1379

matters for which rules may provide 361 [s 128]

Patna High Court rules made under s 122 pp 1338 1391

pleading of 476 477

power of Chartered High Courts to make rules regulating—

(1) their own procedure on the original side 302 303 [s 129 131]

(2) their own procedure other than on the original side 358 [s 122]

Rule committee for such rules 359-360 [ss 123 124]

such rules to be subject to sanction and published 360 [s 126] 361 [s 127]

(3) procedure of Courts subject to their jurisdiction 358 [s 122] 361 [s 129]

Rule committee for such rules 359 360 [ss 123 124]

such rules to be subject to sanction and published 360 [s 126 127]

power of Chief Courts of Punjab and Lower Burma to make rules 359 [s 122] 361 [s 128]

Rule committee for such rules 359 360 [ss 123 124]

such rules to be subject to sanction and published 360 [s 126] 361 [s 127]

power of other High Courts to make rules 360 [s 122] 361 [s 128]

power of Courts other than Chartered High Courts to make rules 363 [s 130]

power to make rules for proceedings in civil cases under the Charter 1269 [Charter cl 37]

Rule committee—

constitution of 359 [s 123]

functions of 360 [s 124]

Ruling Chief—*See Chiefs (ruling) and Princes*

Sale—

auction purchaser rights of—*See Auction purchaser* and sub-head (a) below

Collector by how to be conducted 1907 [Sch III para 10] *See Collector*  
Court sale when purchaser at not bound to inquire into correctness of decree  
or order of sale 216 *See Auction purchaser*

execution of decree sale when void and when voidable 210 217

execution purchaser rights of—*See Auction purchaser* and sub-head (a) below

execution proceedings sale set aside decree obtained by fraud 165

exemption from of certain property 191 [s 60 (1) proviso]

fraud suit to set aside property in execution of decree obtained by 109 165 167

immediate sale of movable property subject to speedy decree 968 [O 39 r 6]

immovable property of—*See sub head (4) below*

interim of securities where state of market requires such sale 965



Sale—*contd*

- limitation for setting aside in execution proceedings 167
  - mortgaged property of—*See* sub head (1) below
  - movable property of—*See* sub head (3) below
  - partner's interest in property sale of in execution 697 [O 21 r 49 (7)]
  - purchaser at Court sale rights of—*See* Auction purchaser and sub head (5) below
  - rateable distribution of proceeds of sale in execution 229 [s 73]
  - reversal of decree effect of upon sale 217 218
  - stay of public sale of land where execution transferred to Collector 228 [s 72]
  - void and voidable when 216
  - witness sale of property of defaulting 593 [O 16 r 12]
- (1) *In suits relating to Mortgages of immovable property—*
- beneficiaries whether necessary parties to suit for sale brought by trustees 900
  - charge provisions respecting redemption and sale apply to 940 [O 34 r 15]
  - final decree in suit for sale 918 919 [O 34 r 5]
  - foreclosure suit power to decree sale in 913 [O 34 r 4 (2)] 914
  - interest where decree is for sale of mortgaged property 932 [O 34 r 11] 933
  - mortgage decree effect of sale under 921
  - mortgage sale of property subject to prior 935 [O 34 r 12]
  - mortgaged property effect of sale of without instituting a regular suit for sale 934
  - mortgagee second rights of in suit for sale by first mortgagee 917 918
  - parties to suits for sale 896 [O 34 r 1] 898 899
  - personal decree against mortgagor for balance due after sale 922 [O 34 r 6]
  - preliminary decree in suit for sale 915 916 [O 34 r 4]
  - receiver of mortgaged property in suit for sale 976
  - res judicata* suits for sale and 52
  - sale proceeds in mortgage suits application of 914 936 [O 34 r 13]
  - suit for sale when it may be brought 908
    - when mortgaged property not to be sold without 936 [O 34 r 14]
  - transferee of money decree from mortgagee whether can bring mortgaged property to sale in execution of decree 940
- (2) *Of property under attachment—generally—*
- adjournment and stoppage of sale 730 [O 21 r 69]
  - appeal from order on applications for recovery of loss by resale 732
    - refusing permission to decree holder to purchase at Court sale 735
    - setting aside or refusing to set aside sale to decree-holder 735
  - attached property power of Court to order sale of 724 [O 21 r 64]
  - attachment before judgment no bar to applying for sale 954 [O 38 r 10]
  - conduct of sale of attached property 724 [O 21 r 64]
  - Court duty of in execution sales 727
  - decree holder not to bid for or buy property without leave of Court 733 [O 21 r 72]
    - purchase by without leave of Court not *ipso facto* void 734
  - duty of Court in sales by Court 727
  - leave to bid to decree holder 733 [O 21 r 72]
  - non compliance with provisions relating to time of sale 730
  - officers not to bid for or purchase 735 [O 21 r 73]
  - postponement of sale pending investigation of claims or objections 711 [O 21 r 58 (2)] *See* Attachment sub head Investigation of claims and objections.
  - private sale to decreeholder effect of 211
  - proclamation of sale 725 [O 21 r 66]
    - mode of making 729 [O 21 r 67]

Sale—*contd*(2) Of property under attachment—generally—*contd*

resale defaulting purchaser answerable for loss on 731 [O 21 r 71]  
 sale of attached property power of Court to order 724 [O 21 r 64]  
 sale of goods belonging to a third person who liable for damages for 724  
 time of sale 730 [O 21 r 69]  
 value of property to be sold specification of proclamation 726

## (3) Of Movable property under attachment—

agricultural produce sale of 35 [O 21 r 74]  
 bid of co owner to have preference 737 [O 21 r 77 (3)]  
 delivery of movable property debts and shares 738 [O 21 r 79]  
 growing crops special provisions relating to 736 [O 21 r 75]  
 immediate sale of movable property subject to decay—  
   (1) where it is property attached before judgment 968 [O 39 r 6]  
   (2) where it is property attached in execution 689 [O 21 r 43 proviso]  
 irregularity not to vitiate sale but person injured may sue 737 [O 21 r 76]  
 negotiable instruments sale of 736 [O 21 r 76]  
   transfer of 38 [O 21 r 80]  
 public auction and payments of purchase money 737 [O 21 r 77 (1)]  
 sale when becomes absolute 737 [O 21 r 77 (2)]  
 shares in a corporation sale of 736 [O 21 r 76]  
   transfer of 738 [O 21 r 80]  
 vesting order in case of movable property not specially mentioned 739 [O 21 r 81]

## (4) Of Immovable property under attachment—

absolute sale when to become 763 [O 21 r 92]  
 appeal from order made on application to set aside sale on deposit 748 749  
   setting aside or refusing to set aside sale 761 1079 [O 43 r 1  
   cl (j)]  
 attach omission to before sale 754  
 bid of co owner to have preference 742 [O 21 r 88]  
 confirmation of sale 763 [O 21 r 92]  
   limitation plea of not available after 765  
 Courts by which sales of immovable property may be ordered 739 [O 21 r 82].  
 deposit by purchaser 741 [O 21 r 84]  
   of decretal amount and setting aside of sale 743 [O 21 r 89]  
 estoppel of judgment debtor from impeaching sale 739  
 fraud in publishing or conducting sale setting aside for 749 [O 21 r 90] 755.  
 fresh proclamation on resale in default of payment in time 742 [O 21 r 87]  
 irregularity in attaching property effect of 754.  
   publishing or conducting sale effect of 749 [O 21 r 90] 753  
 judgment debtor when estopped from impeaching sale 759  
 limitation period of for return of purchase money 763  
   for application to set aside sale for fraud or irregularity 780  
 omission to attach property before sale 754  
 order confirming or setting aside sale 743 [O 21 r 92].  
 parties necessary to application to set aside sale on deposit 748.  
   to set aside sale for fraud or irregularity 759  
 postponement of sale for judgment-debtor to raise decretal amount 739 [O 21  
   r 83].  
 resale on default in payment of deposit by purchaser 741 [O 21 r 84].  
   in payment of purchase money 742 [O 21 r 86]

Sale—*contd*(4) Of immovable property under attachment—*contd*

- return of purchase money when sale set aside 765 [O 21 r 33]
  - sale when set aside on deposit 743 [O 21 r 89]
    - when set aside on ground of irregularity or fraud 749 [O 21 r 90]
    - when set aside for absence of saleable interest 762 [O 21 r 91]
    - when to become absolute 763 [O 21 r 92 (1)]
    - when to be set aside 763 [O 21 r 92 (2)]
  - saleable interest when judgment-debtor has none 762 [O 21 r 91]
    - of mortgagor 762
  - substantial injury and setting aside of sale 749 [O 21 r 90] 757 759
  - suit for return of purchase money where no saleable interest 764
  - suit to set aside order confirming sale 764
  - stay of sale pending appeal 993 [O 41 r 6 (2)]
  - time for payment in full of purchase money 741 [O 21 r 85]
- (5) *Purchaser title and his rights*—*See* Auction purchaser
- Court sale what passes to purchaser at 719 769
  - delivery of property in occupancy of judgment-debtor 771 [O 21 r 95]
    - of tenants 712 [O 21 r 96]
  - joint mortgage decree property purchased by one of several holders of 272
  - jurisdiction where none sale void 216
  - law effect of new interpretation of on sale 770
  - limitation for application or suit for delivery of possession 771
    - for application for sale-certificate 771
  - meane profits right of purchaser to 216
  - money decrees since six purchasers at sales in execution of 215
  - mortgage when property sold subject to 716
    - where mere notice of given in proclamation 717
  - mortgage decree successive purchasers at sales in execution of 215
    - what passes on sales of mortgaged property in execution of 770
  - partner purchase by in his name but with partnership funds 272
  - reversal of decree effect of on sale 217 219
  - sale certificate 768 [O 21 r 94]
  - successor in title of certified purchaser 223
  - suit by purchaser whether maintainable without certificate 215
  - validity of decree or order for sale purchaser not bound to inquire into 216
  - variance between proclamation of sale and sale certificate 770
  - vesting of property sold in purchaser date of 213 [s. 65]
  - waiver by certificated purchaser of right of possession 223

Sale certificate—*See* Certificate

## Sale proceeds—

rateable distribution of 29 230 [s 73] *See* Rateable distribution.

## Saleable interest—

- absence of and setting aside of sale 762 [O 21 r 91]
- return of purchase money when no saleable interest 765 [O 21 r 93] 765 766

## Saleable Property—191 193 [S 60]

- bonus to Railway servant 193
- equity of redemption 194
- instances of property liable or not liable to attachment and sale 193 196
- objection to attachment because property not saleable when to be raised 192

**Salvage—**

assessors in case of 340 [s 140]

**Satisfaction—**

attachment removal of after satisfaction of decree 708 [O 21 r 55]

costs where deposit accepted in part or full satisfaction of debt 830 [O 24 r 4]

cross claim in case of under same decree 667 [O 21 r 19]

cross-decrees in case of 664 [O 21 r 18]

decree of out of Court 635 [O 21 r 2]

when said to have been fully satisfied 177

decree *ex parte* of under protest no bar to application to set aside the decree 553

deposit by defendant in Court of amount in satisfaction of claim 828 [O 24 r 1]

question as to satisfaction of decree is for Court executing decree 149 150 [s 47]

**Scandalous—**

interrogatories power of Court to disallow scandalous 558

objections to scandalous 560 [O 11 r 6]

pleadings and striking out scandalous matter 493 [O 6 r 16] 494

appeal from order 495

relevant nothing can be scandalous which is 495 551

**Scheduled districts—1****Scheme—**

*cy pres* doctrine application of in schemes of public charities 283

liquidation of decrees for payment of money for 1204 1205 [Sch III para 7]

public or religious charities setting schemes in suits relating to 266 [s 92 (1) (g)]

**Second appeal—299 310 [ss 100 103] 10-7 1028 [O 42]—**

amendment of pleadings in 505

award second appeal from appellate decree on 1185

case new in 306

changing nature of suit in 306

construction of deed question of and 301

cross objections may be filed in 1008

second appeal from decree of first appellate Court disallowing 1008

fact findings of erroneous or without any evidence to support them and 304

fact undetermined issues of when may be determined in second appeal 309 [s 103]

fraud in publishing or conducting sale and 755

High Court lies only to 299 305 [s 100]

in second appeal may refer issues of fact to lower appellate Court 1016

jurisdiction when objection as to may be taken for first time in 114 306

law where decision is contrary to and 299 [s 100] 301 303

conclusions drawn from findings of fact and 303

issue of when not determined and 299 [s 100]

leave to amend pleadings may be granted in 305

misconception of the real question to try by lower Court and 305

order dismissing appeal for default second appeal does not lie from 306

made in appeal from orders does not lie from 311 [s 104 (2)]

from orders under s 47 lies from 166

parties adding of in second appeal 1003

plea which may be taken for the first time in 306

Privy Council no appeal lies to when no second appeal lies 335 [s 111 (b)]

procedure in second appeal 317 [s 108] 10-7 [O 42 r 1]

Sale—*contd*(4) *Of Immovable property under attachment—contd*

return of purchase money when sale set aside 763 [O 21 r 93]

sale when set aside on deposit 743 [O 21 r 89]

when set aside on ground of irregularity or fraud 749 [O 21 r 90]

when set aside for absence of saleable interest 762 [O 21 r 91]

when to become absolute 763 [O 21 r 92 (1)]

when to be set aside 763 [O 21 r 92 (2)]

saleable interest when judgment debtor has none 762 [O 21 r 91]  
of mortgagor 762

substantial injury and setting aside of sale 749 [O 21 r 90] 757 759

suit for return of purchase money where no saleable interest 764

suit to set aside order confirming sale 764

stay of sale pending appeal 993 [O 41 r 6 (2)]

time for payment in full of purchase money 741 [O 21 r 85]

(5) *For the vendor's title and his rights—See Auction purchaser*

Court sale what passes to purchaser at 768 769

delivery of property in occupancy of judgment debtor 771 [O 21 r 95]  
of tenants 742 [O 21 r 96]

joint mortgage decree property purchased by one of several holders of 223  
jurisdiction where none sale void 216

law effect of new interpretation of on sale 770

limitation for application or suit for delivery of possession 771  
for application for sale certificate 771

mesne profits right of purchaser to 216

money decrees successive purchasers at sales in execution of 215

mortgage when property sold subject to 716

where mere notice of given in proclamation 717

mortgage decree successive purchasers at sales in execution of 215

what passes on sales of mortgaged property in execution of 770.

partner purchase by in his name but with partnership funds 21.

reversal of decree effect of on sale 217 218

sale certificate 768 [O 21 r 94]

successor in title of certified purchaser 223

suit by purchaser whether maintainable without certificate 215

validity of decree or order for sale purchaser not bound to inquire into 216

variance between proclamation of sale and sale certificate 770

vesting of property sold in purchaser date of 213 [s 65]

waiver by certificated purchaser of right of possession 223

Sale certificate—*See Certificate*

## Sale proceeds—

rateable distribution of 229 230 [s 73] *See Rateable distribution.*

## Saleable interest—

absence of and setting aside of sale 762 [O 21 r 91]

return of purchase money when no saleable interest 765 [O 21 r 93] 765 *ibid.*

## Saleable Property—191 193 [S 60]

bonus to Railway servant 195

equity of redemption 194.

instances of property liable or not liable to attachment and sale 195 196

objection to attachment because property not saleable when to be raised 190.

## Salvage—

assessors in case of 30 [140]

## Satisfaction—

attachment removal of after satisfaction of decree 408 709 [O 21 r 50]

costs where deposit accepted in part or full satisfaction of debt 830 [O 24 r 4]

cross claim in case of under same decree 664 [O 21 r 19]

cross decrees in case of 664 [O 21 r 18]

decree of out of Court 634 [O 21 r 2]

when said to have been fully satisfied 177

decree *ex parte* of under protest no bar to application to set aside the decree 503

deposit by defendant in Court of amount in satisfaction of claim 878 [O 24 r 1]

question as to satisfaction of decrees is for Court executing decree 149 150 [s 47]

## Scandalous—

interrogatories power of Court to disallow scandalous 508

objections to scandalous 500 [O 11 r 6]

pleadings and striking out scandalous matter 493 [O 6 r 16] 494

appeal from order 490

relevant nothing can be scandalous which is 490 501

## Scheduled districts—

## Scheme—

*ejusdem* doctrine application of in schemes of public charities 283

liquidation of decrees for payment of money for 1204 1205 [Sch III para 7]

public or religious charities setting schemes in suits relating to 266 [s 92 (1) (f)]

## Second appeal—299 310 [ss 100 103] 10.7 1028 [O 42]—

amendment of pleadings in 500

award second appeal from appellate decrees on 1185

case new in 306

changing nature of suit in 306

construction of deed question of and 301

cross objections may be filed in 1008

second appeal from decree of first appellate Court disallowing 1008

fact findings of erroneous or without any evidence to support them and 304

fact undetermined issues of when may be determined in second appeal 309 [s 103]

fraud in publishing or conducting sale and 755

High Court lies only to 299 300 [s 100]

in second appeal may refer issues of fact to lower appellate Court 1016

jurisdiction when objection as to may be taken for first time in 114 306

law where decision is contrary to and 299 [s 100] 301 303

conclusions of drawn from findings of fact and 303

issue of when not determined and 299 [s 100]

leave to amend pleadings may be granted in 500

misconception of the real question to try by lower Court and 300

order dismissing appeal for default second appeal does not lie from 306

made in appeal from orders does not lie from 311 [s 104 (2)]

from orders under s 47 lies from 165

parties adding of in second appeal 1003

plea which may be taken for the first time in 306

Privy Council no appeal lies to when no second appeal lies 335 [s 111 (b)]

procedure in second appeal 317 [s 108] 10.7 [O 42 r 1].

Second appeal—*contd*

procedure substantial error or defect in and 300 [s 100]  
 refusal by Court of first appeal to extend time for filing an appeal and 300 306.  
 remand inherent power of High Court to in second appeal 1028  
     order of made by a single Judge in second appeal 1013  
*res judicata* plea of in second appeal 306  
 review no second appeal from order in appeal from order granting 1000  
 revision no where second appeal lies 338  
 rules relating to first appeal to apply to second appeals 1027 [O 42 r 1]  
 sections relating to first appeals to apply to second appeals 317 [s 108]  
 Small Cause Court suits and execution proceedings no second appeal in certain  
     307 [s 102] 308 309  
 substantial error or defect in procedure and 300 [s 100] 304 305  
 usage having the force of law and 299 [s 100] 303 304  
 when second appeal will lie 299 300 [s 100]

## Secretary of State—

agent to receive process against 846 [O 27 r 4]  
 claims or liabilities enforceable by or against 246  
 death of complainant after notice but before suit against 201  
 execution of decree against 252 [s 82]  
 notice before institution of suit against 247 [s 60] 248  
 place of suing in suit against 247  
 plaint in suits by or against 846 [O 27 r 3]  
 security not required from pending appeal 994 [O 41 r 7]  
 signature and verification of pleadings 845 [O 27 r 1]  
 suits by or against 246 [s 79]  
 waiver of notice by 248

## Secular Office—

suit for 24 25  
     by the secretary of an Association 24

## Security—

## (1) For costs of suit—

appeal under cl 15 of Charter from order requiring plaintiff to give 834  
     from order refusing to set aside dismissal of suit for failure to give 835  
 British India residence outside and 831 [O 25 r 1 (2)] 832  
 cross claim by defendant residing outside British India and 834  
 failure to furnish effect of 834 835 [O 25 r 2]  
 insolvency of plaintiff on 797 [O 22 r 8]  
 minor plaintiff and 833  
 next friend retiring to give security for costs already incurred 878 [O 3 r 8 (1)]  
 non resident plaintiffs discretion of Court in requiring security for costs from 830  
 Official A signee failure of to give security 797 [O 22 r 8 (2)]  
 pauper where leave is granted to plaintiff to sue as 833  
 plaintiff when taken from 831 [O 25 r 1]  
     insolvency of and security for costs 797 [O 22 r 8 (2)]  
 poverty no ground for requiring 833  
*res judicata* dismissal of suit for failure to furnish security for costs and 835  
 time within which application lies to set aside dismissal for failure to furnish 835  
 trustees of public charity and order for 270  
 woman in suit for money by 831 832 [O 25 r 1 (3)] 833

Security—*contd*

## (2) For costs of appeal—

at what stage respondent should apply for 996

Charter appeal under cl 15 of and security for costs 997

consequence of not furnishing 990 [O 41 r 10 (2)]

extension of time for furnishing 996

High Court rules inconsistent with provisions of Code effect of 990

insolvent pauper or poor appellant and 996

may be costs of appeal or of original suit or both 990 [O 41 r 10]

Privy Council no appeal to from order dismissing appeal for default in giving 334  
provisions of O 41 r 10 apply to appeals under cl 15 of Charter, 990

## (3) For costs of appeal: Privy Council—

admission of appeal on furnishing security 1038 [O 40 r 8]

appeal from order refusing to extend time for furnishing 1037

appellant to furnish security for costs of respondent 1036 [O 40 r 7 (1)]

certificate security on grant of 1033 [O 40 r 7 (1) (a)]

further security before sending of record of Privy Council 1039 [O 40 r 10]

failure to give 1039 [O 45 r 11]

pending appeal to Privy Council 1041 [O 45 r 14]

pauper where appeal preferred by 1033

revocation of acceptance of security 1039 [O 45 r 9]

## (4) Where execution is either stayed or allowed—

appellant security from where execution stayed pending appeal 989 [O 41 r 5]

pending appeal to P C 1040 [O 45 r 13 (2) (c)]

respondent security from where execution allowed pending appeal 993 [O 41 r 6]

pending appeal to P C 1039 [O 4 r 13 (2) (b)]

## (5) In other cases—

appellate decree security for performance 383

attachment before judgment removal of on furnishing of security 956 [O 38 r 9]

attache's property to produce 690

condition security for fulfilling imposed on any person 384

decree security for performance of 991

defendant from for appearance 284 [s 94 (a)] 900 951 [O 38 r 1] 952 [s 94 (b) 2]

for production of property 951 904 [O 38 r 5] 284 [s 94 (b)]

ex parte decree security for carrying out on rehearing 383

failure to furnish security for appearance effect of 53 [O 38 r 4]

guardian *ad litem* when security required from 812 [O 32 r 6 (2)]

judgment debtor when security required from 671 [O 21 r 26 (3)]

money security for payment of instances, 38

next friend when security required from 672 [O 32 r 6 (2)]

public officer when security could not be required from 994 [O 41 r 7]

receiver security from 981 [O 40 r 3 (a)]

restitution security for of property taken in execution of decree 383

Secretary of State when security not to be required from 994 [O 41 r 7]

summary suit from defendant on granting of leave to defend 19 [O 37 r 3 (2)]

witness security from for his attendance 594 [O 16 r 16 (2)]

## Service—

dismissal of suit where plaintiff after summons returned unserved fails for three  
months to apply for fresh summons 931 [O 9 r 5]

when plaintiff fails to pay for service 931 [O 9 r 2]

of foreign summons 1 [s 29]

orders notices and other documents 101 [O 48 r 2]



Service—*cont'd*

- of process issued under the Code 162 [O 48 r 1]
  - of Chartered High Courts 1063 [O 49 r 1]
  - on pleader 463 [O 3 r 5]
  - on recognized agent 460 [O 3 r 3]
  - on special agent to accept service 463 [O 3, r 6]
  - object of 466
- of summons when defendant resides in another province 121 122 [s 28]
  - on corporation 81<sup>a</sup> 850 [O 29 r 2]
  - firm 853 854 [O 30 r 3]
  - guardian *ad litem* 868
  - minor 8 8
  - persons authorized by military men to sue or defend for them 848 [O 28 r 3]
  - registered post service by 472

## (1) of summons on Defendant—464 475 [O 5]

- acknowledgment person served to sign 468 [O 5 r 16]
  - refusal to sign 46<sup>a</sup>
- adult male member of defendant's family service on 467 [O 5 r 15]
- agent by whom defendant carries on business service on 467 [O 5 r 13]
  - empowered to accept service 467 [O 5 r 12]
  - in charge service on in suits for immovable property 46 [O 5 r 14]
- defendant refuses service or cannot be found procedure when 468 [O 5, r 17]
  - in person service to be on when practicable 467 [O 5 r 12]
  - in prison service on 473 [O 5 r 24]
  - keeping out of way for purpose of avoiding service 471 [O 5 r 20]
  - residing out of British India 473 [O 5 r 25]
  - residing within jurisdiction of another Court where 471 [O 5 r 21]
- delivery of summons for service where defendant within jurisdiction 466 [O 5 r 9]
- duty of Court to which summons is sent for service 472 [O 5 r 23]
  - of persons to whom Summons is delivered or sent for service 4 5 [O 5 r 29]
- endorsement of time and manner of service 470 [O 5 r 18]
- examination of serving officer 470 [O 5 r 19]
- foreign territory service in through Political Agent or Court 473 [O 5 r 26]
- letter substitution of for summons 475 [O 5 r 30]
- manager or agent personally carrying on business service on 467
- master of a ship service on 467 [O 5 r 13 (2)]
- minor defendant on 868
- mode of service on defendant within jurisdiction 466 [O 5 r 10]
- object of 466
- Presidency towns service of within summons from Courts outside 472 [O 5 r 22]
- public officer service on 474 [O 5 r 27]
- purda-nashin* woman and substituted service 471
- railway servant service on 474 [O 5 r 27]
- registered post by 472
- return by serving officer form of 470
  - of summons where from any cause service is impossible 475 [O 5 r 29 (2)]
- servant is not a member of family for purposes of service 467 [O 5 r 15 Expln]
- serving officer when deemed to have used all due and reasonable diligence 469
- 470
- several defendants service on 467 [O 5 r 11]

**Service—*contd*****(1) of summons on Defendant—*contd***

soldiers' service on 474 [O 5 r 28] 848 [O 28 r 3]  
 substituted service 471 [O 5 r 20]  
 sufficiency of service 473  
 temporary absence of defendant from home and service of summons 470

**(2) of summons on Witness—**

time for serving summons 596 [O 16 r 9]  
 to be made in same manner as summons to a defendant 596 [O 16 r 8]

**Set off—**

amount claimed as to be legally recoverable 524 [O 8 r 6] and ascertained 524  
 appeal from decree relating to set off 630 [O 20 r 19 (—)]  
 costs to be set off Court may direct 610 [O 20 r 6 (3)]  
 cross decrees when may be set off against each other 664 [O 21 r 18] 665 666  
 decree for payment of money may be set off against mortgage 666  
     defendant when set off claimed 639  
     when set off is allowed 629 [O 20 r 19 (1)] 630  
 decree holder purchaser right of to set off purchase money 733 [O 21 r 72 (2)]  
 effect of set-off 594 [O 8 r 6 (2)]  
 equitable set off 595 626  
 garnishee a right of set off 694  
 insolvency proceedings set-off in 520  
 joint and several debt separate debt cannot be set off against 529  
 jurisdiction pecuniary limits of not to exceed 524 [O 8 r 6] 528  
     legally recoverable 527  
 lien of plea for costs where set off is claimed 524 [O 8 r 6 (2)]  
 new grounds of defence arising after claiming a set off 531 [O 8 r 8]  
 order disposing of defendant's claim to set off appeal from 531  
 particulars of to be given in written statement 54 [O 8 r 6]  
 pauper suits set off in 892  
 pecuniary limits of Court amount of set off not to exceed 524 [O 8 r 6 (1)] 524  
 plaintiff set off allowed by to be mentioned in plaint 606 [O 8 r 1 (A)]  
 right of equitable set off does not exist when cross-demand relates to different transaction 526  
 set off founded on separate grounds 531 [O 8 r 7]  
 suit must be one for recovery of money 525  
 when set off may be claimed 594 [O 8 r 6]  
 winding up proceeding set off in 529  
 written statement in answer to a claim of set off 594 [O 8 r 6 (3)]

**Share—*See* Shares in a Corporation Co sharer**

attachment of a share in movables 695 [O 21 r 47]  
 execution share in immovable property how delivered in 651 [O 21 r 35 (2)]  
 sale of share and bid of co sharer 737 [O 21 r 77 (3)] 742 [O 21 r 85]

**Shares in a Corporation—**

attachment liable to 191 [s 60]  
     mode of 695 [O 21 r 46 (1) (b)]  
 definition of 17 [s 2 (19)]  
 delivery of in execution 738 [O 21 r 79 (3)]  
 sale of in execution 736 [O 21 r 76]  
 transfer of in execution 738 [O 21 r 80]

**Sheriff—**

conversion, not liable for 724

**Shop book—**

evidence receiving in, copies of entries in 83 384 [O 13 r 5].

production of 519 [O 1 r 1].

**Signed—**

award to be signed and filed 1173 [Sch. II para 10]

definition of 17 [s 2 (20)]

execution, application for by whom to be signed 648 [O 21 r 11 (2)]

judgments to be dated and signed 613 [O 20 r 3]

pleadings by whom to be signed in ordinary cases 492 [O 6 r 14].

suits by or against Corporation 848 [O 29 r 1].

suits by or against Government 845 [O 27 r 1].

suits by or against firms 850 [O 30 r 1]

summons by whom to be signed 464 [O 5 r 1 (3)]

**Slander of title—**

malice how pleaded in suit for 491

**Small Cause Courts—See Presidency Small Cause Courts Provincial Small Cause Courts.**

application of sections of Code to Provincial and Presidency 20 21 [ss. 7 8].

attachment no of immovable property of witness by 597 [O 16 r 10 proviso].

contents of judgments of 614 [O 20 r 4 (1)]

execution proceedings included in suit for sec 102 p 308

reference to High Court in regard to jurisdiction of 1047 1048 [O 46 rr 6 7]

case of doubt as to jurisdiction of 1047 1048 [O 46 r 6].

of mistake as to jurisdiction of 1048 [O 46 r 7]

rent suit for in 308

sale of immovable property in execution of decree cannot order 739 [O 21 r 82].

suit includes execution proceedings for sec 102 p. 308

summons in Small Cause suits to be for final disposal 465 [O 5 r 5 proviso].

title suit for in 308

transfer of certain decrees for execution to 645 [O 21 r 4]

**Soldier—See Military men.**

service of summons on, 474 [O 5 r 28].

**Solicitor—See Attorney****Sovereign—See Chiefs (ruling) and Princes.****Special appeal—See Second appeal.****Special Case—**

agreement to state case for Court's opinion and procedure thereon, 943 945 [O 36 rr 1-5] be filed and registered as suit 944 [O 36 r 3]

arbitrator or umpire statement of by 1174 [Sch. II, para. 11]

opinion of Court power to state case for 261 [s. 90] 943 944 [O 36 r 1].

value of subject matter to be stated in certain cases 944 [O 36 r 2].

**Specific performance—**

mode (ordinary) of enforcing decree for 6 6 [O 21 r 32 (1)]

(special) of enforcing decree for 677 [O 21 r 32 (5)], 678 679

temporary injunction not to issue against breach of contract, if case not one for 965.

**Specific Relief Act—**

exclusion of certain words in s. 21 of 1193 [Sch. II para. 2-].

perpetual injunction regulated by ss. 55 57 of 950

section 42 of does not apply to suits relating to public charities 292 283

**Splitting—**

of claim 436

**Stamp—**

appeal from decision rejecting memorandum of appeal for insufficient stamp 987  
 deficiency of Court fees power to make up 389 [s 149]  
 plaint where insufficiently stamped 513 [O 7 r 11 (c)]

**State—See Foreign State****Statute—**

estoppel against 54

**Stay—**

appeal does not operate as stay of proceedings under decree 989 [O 41 r 5 (1)]  
 arbitration stay of suit where there is an agreement to refer to 1189 1190 [Sch. II para 18]

execution stay of—*See* sub head Stay of execution

inherent power of Court to stay—

- (1) cross suits and other proceedings 393
- (2) criminal proceedings under sec 476 of Criminal Procedure Code 390
- (3) execution pending decision in another suit 674
- (4) suit which is an abuse of process of Court 116
- (5) suit even in cases not covered by sec 10 p 396

interlocutory orders pending stay of suit under sec 10 p 33

interpleader suit stay of suit brought against plaintiff in 941 [O 35 r 3]

next friend stay of proceedings on removal etc of 849 [O 32 r 10 (1)]

of suit pending disposal of previously instituted suit 31 [s 10]

where there is an agreement to refer to arbitration 1180 1190 [Sch II para. 18]

in firm name where names of partners not disclosed 803 [O 30 r 2 (2)]

partnership firm stay of suit brought in name of 853 [O 30 r 2 (2)]

public sale of land stay of 278 [a 72]

reference to High Court stay of proceedings on 1047 [O 46 r 2]

summary suit stay of execution of decree in 950 [O 37 r 4]

**Stay of execution—**

appeal from order made by Appellate Court refusing stay of execution 99.

made by High Court refusing stay pending appeal to P C 1041

award stay of execution of 674

by Appellate Court or by Court which passed decree 989 [O 41 r 5]

Court to which decree is sent for execution 673 [O 21 r 26]

Court pending appeal to Privy Council 1040 [O 45 r 13 (2) (c)]

execution stay of—

- (1) before appeal is preferred or pending 989 [O 41 r 5]
- (2) pending or in view of appeal to Privy Council 1040 [O 45 r 13 (2) (c)], 1041
- (3) by Court to which decree is sent for execution 673 674 [O 21 rr 26-28].
- (4) pending suit between decree-holder and judgment-debtor 674 [O 21 r 29]

immovable property stay of sale of pending appeal 993 [O 41 r 6 (2)].

security for restitution where stay refused 993 [O 41 r 6 (1)]

where order made for stay of execution 989 [O 41 r 5 (3) (c)]

summary suit stay of execution of decree in 950 [O 37 r 4].

uncommunicated order staying execution effect of 992.

## Stipends—

allowed to Government pensioners attachment of 192 [s 60 (1) (g)]

## Striking out—

execution proceedings effect of 709 [O 21 r 57]

interrogatories when prolix oppressive unnecessary or scandalous 562 [O 11 r 7]

issues 690 [O 14 r 5 (2)]

names of parties 426 [O 1 r 10 (2)]

pleadings (unnecessary scandalous or embarrassing), 493 [O 6 r 16]

## Subordinate Court—

law to be followed by 18

single judge of Chartered High Court court of not subordinate to High Court 345

single judge of Chief Court of Oudh, court of not subordinate to Chief Court 345

stay of suit pending in 963 964

## Subordinate Judge's Court—

District Court is a Court of superior grade to 88

jurisdiction of 89

receiver may be appointed by 971

## Subsistence allowance—

arrest to be paid into Court before 636 [O 21 r 39 (1)]

costs in the suit to be 687 [O 21 r 39 (5)]

further monthly payments to be made in advance 636 [O 21, r 39 (3)]

judgment debtor to be released if subsistence allowance not paid 189 [s 58 (1) (iv)]

scales of 189 [s 57]

## Substituted service—

when and how allowed 471 [O 5 r 20]

## Substitution—

of plaintiff 425 426 [O 1 r 10]

## Succession Act—

letters of administration or probate when necessary under 507-509

persons governed by 507 508

## Succession certificate—

*res judicata* dismissal of suit for failure to produce succession certificate and 70

## Suits—See Place of suing Court Dismissal of suit

abatement of 778 807 [O 22] See Abatement

adult sued as minor 863

attached property to establish right to 717 [O 21 r 63]

award suit on an 61

bar of suits which are not of a civil nature 22 [s 9]

benamidar against by beneficial owner 221

third person 220

caste questions relating to—See Caste

certified purchaser against or ground of 218 [s 66 (2)] 220

civil nature suits to be of a 22 [s 9]

club by or against 420 421

collector to set aside orders passed by 226 227

sale held by 227

company by or against 849

conduct of 434 [O 1 r 11]

consolidation of on appeal to Privy Council 1034 [O 4, r 4]

Suits—*contd*

- contract providing place of suit 33
- co-partners between 853 [O 30 r 9]
- costs for contribution in respect of 133
- dead person suit against 431
- deed of gift or trust made in fraud of creditors to set aside 421
- disposal of—*See* sub head (1) below
- ejectment suit and interrogatories 557
- frame of—*See* sub head (2) below
- foreign firm by or against 848 849
- Government by or against to be instituted against Secretary of State 246 [s 79]
- hearing of—*See* Hearing
- Hindu debtor to administer the estate of a living 29
- immovable property by decree holder against person obstructing him as to 773  
for recovery of 50: [O 7 r 3]
- Income Tax Act to set aside assessment made under 29
- inherent power to postpone hearing of a suit pending decision of a selected action 393
- in personam 95
- instituted how 121 [s 26] 463 [O 4 r 1]
- institution of suit events happening after and granting relief 512
- interest subsequent to decree no separate suit for 124 [s 34 (2)]
- interpleader suits 258 [s 88] *See* Interpleader suits
- jurisdiction of Courts—*See* Jurisdiction
- lunatics by or against procedure in 881 [O 32 r 15] *See* Lunatic
- major suit against treating him as minor 863  
sued as minor 863
- mesne profits for 507 [O 7 r 2]
- minor plaintiff or co plaintiff on majority may repudiate suit 880 881 [O 32  
rr 13 14]
- money for recovery of 507 [O 7 r 2]
- Native Prince to settle right of succession to throne 31
- negotiable instrument on lost 519 [O 7 r 16] *See* Negotiable instrument
- no fresh suit when suit abates or is dismissed under O 22 p 799 [O 22 r 9]
- partition suit for and *res judicata* 52a
- pauper by legal representative of deceased 884
- Pension Act where suit relating to pension barred by 29
- person carrying on business in name not his own suit against 810 [O 30 r 10]
- political questions relating to 31
- possession by purchaser at sale of property in execution of decree suit for 215 216  
of property to establish right to 7:7 [O 2 r 103]
- public charities or nuisance relating to—*S e* Public Charities Public Nuisance
- rateable distribution and declaratory suit as to right of, 242
- register of 464 [O 4 r 2]
- rent for and Small Cause Court 308
- representative character by plaintiff in a 507 [O 7 r 4]
- special suits—*See* sub-head (3) below
- specific performance for against certified purchaser 2:3  
amendment of plaint in 504
- stay of certain suits 31 [s 10]
- summary—*See* Summary suits
- surety to enforce liability of 386
- title of 509

Suits—*contd*

title for and Small Cause Court 308  
 transfer of—*See* Transfer of suits  
 transferee of decree for declaration that transfer is valid 661  
 trust property—*See* Public Charities  
 uncertified adjustments suits on 639  
 unregistered and unincorporated society suits by 849  
 withdrawal of by next friend 877  
     by plaintiff 807 [O 23 r 1]  
 worship to assert right of 421

## (1) Disposal of suit at first hearing—

defendants where all or one of several not at issue with plaintiff 59 [O 15 r 1-3]  
 evidence failure to produce at first hearing 593 [O 15 r 4]  
 parties at issue where 492 [O 15 r 3]

## (2) Frame of suit—430-439 [O 2]

appeal from order rejecting application to join a claim with claim for land 456  
 arrears of rent joinder of claim for with claim for land 404 [O 2 r 4 (a)]  
 causes of action different arising out of same transaction 440 443  
 claims in which relief sought is based on same cause of action 450  
     omission of portion of a claim against one of several promisors 438  
     relinquishment of part of 430 [O 2 r 2 (2)]  
     splitting of 436 438  
     successive arising under same obligation 430 [O 2 r 2 Expln.] 432 439  
     suit to include whole claim 430 [O 2 r 2 (1)]

counterclaims and suits for recovery of land 456

Deccan Agriculturists Relief Act and splitting of remedies by mortgagor 446  
 decree for balance when sale proceeds not sufficient to pay mortgage debt 003  
 ejectment suit who may be joined as defendants in 450  
 foreclosure suit for and joinder of claim for possession 454 [O 2 r 4]

heir as such meaning of 450 408

Hindu widow suit by for ornaments and for share in husband's estate 458

instalments effect of omission to sue for those already due 437

joinder of causes of action 446 [O 2 r 3]

of claims 404 450

by or against executor administrator or heir 456 [O 2 r 5]

jurisdiction where several causes of action are united 441 [O 2 r 3 (a)]

land suit for recovery of and joinder of claims 404 [O r r 4]

leave of Court and omission to sue for some reliefs 435 [O 2 r 2]

mesne profits joinder of claim for with suit for land 404 [O 2 r 4 (a)]

misjoinder—*See* Misjoinder

multifariousness—*See* Multifariousness

next friend suit by recover portion of claim bars fresh suit by minor 446

omission of portion of claim against one of several promisors 438

to sue for one of several reliefs 436 [O 2 r 2 (3)] 444 445

redemption suit for and joinder of claim for possession 454 [O 2 r 4]

reliefs exception to the rule against splitting of 445 446

separate trials of causes of action 458 [O 2 r 6]

setting off part of claim and omitting to counterclaim for the balance 437 [ul. 5]

unnecessary parties added as defendants 402

Suits—*contd*(3) *Special suits*—

- aliens by 253 [s 83]
- ambassadors against 255 [s 86]
- corporations by or against 848 850 [O 29] *See* Corporation
- firms by or against 850 860 [O 30] *See* Firm Partners
- foreign and Native Rulers by or against 253 258 [ss 83 87] *See* Chiefs (ruling) and Princes
- Government and Public officers by or against 246 257 [ss 79 82] 845 847 [O 27]  
*See* Government Public Officer
- Government and public officers against for injunction notice in 250 251
- Interpleader suits 941 943 [O 35] *See* Interpleader
- military men by or against 847 848 [O 28] *See* Military men
- minors and persons of unsound mind by or against 862 882 [O 32] *See* Minors Lunatics
- mortgages relating to 996 940 [O 34] *See* Mortgage Foreclosure Redemption
- paupers by 882 896 [O 33] *See* Pauper
- public charities relating to 265 266 [s 92] *See* Public Charities
- nuisance relating to 261 [s 91] *See* Public Nuisance
- summary suit on negotiable instruments 945 950 [O 34] *See* Summary Suits
- trustees executors and administrators by or against 861 862 [O 31] *See* Trustees Executors

## Summary Suit—

- arrest privilege from before granting of leave to defend 368
- costs of noting non acceptances or non payment recovery of 950 [O 37 r 6]
- counterclaim for wrongful arrest before judgment in 286
- Courts in which summary suits may be brought 945 [O 37 r 1]
- decree leave to appear and defend after passing of 950 [O 37 r 4]
- defendant not entitled to defend unless leave obtained 946 [O 37 r 2 (2)]
- deposit of bill hundis or note power of Court to order 950 [O 37 r 5]
- interest not to be awarded in unless specified in promissory note 948 949
- leave to appear and defend when granted 949 [O 37 r 3] 950 [ib r 4]
- negotiable instrument summary suit upon 946 [O 37 r 2 (1)]
- procedure in 950 [O 37 r 7]
- stay of execution and granting of leave to defend 950 [O 37 r 4]
- summons in 946 [O 37 r 2 (1)]  
form of 1091
- time fixed in summons Court has no power to extend 948  
within which summary suit must be brought 947  
defendant in should apply for leave to defend 947

Summons—*See* Service Witness

- Summons to defendant to appear and answer claim 464 475 [O 5]
- amended copy of to be served on newly added defendant 426 [O 1 r 10 (4)]
- appearance of defendant 464 [O 5 r 1 (2)]
- copy of plaint or concise statement to accompany summons 465 [O 5 r 2]
- day for appearance of defendant how fixed 466 [O 5 r 6]  
to be specified 464 [O 5 r 1] 466 [ib r 6]
- decree without issue of summons 464
- defendant residing in another province service on 121 122 [a, 23].



**Summons—*contd***

- dismissal of suit where plaintiff after summons returned unserved fails to apply for fresh summons for three months 534 [O 9 r 5]
- documents relied on by defendant order on defendant to produce 466 [O 5 r 7]
- duty of persons to whom summons is delivered or sent for service 415 [O 5 r 29]
- expense of serving summons 1062 [O 48 r 1]
- foreign service of 123 [s 29]
- issue of 464 [O 5 r 1] 121 [s 27]
- letter substitution of for summons 475 [O 5 r 30]
- option to defendant to appear in person or by pleader 464 [O 5 r 1 (?)]
- penalty for default of compliance with 123 [s 32]
- personal appearance of parties when can or cannot be ordered 465 [O 5 rr 3 4]
- return of when from any cause service is impossible 475 [O 5 r 29 (2)].
- service of 466 475—*See Service*
- settlement of issues or final disposal summons to be for 465 [O 5 r 5]
- Small Cause Court suits in to be for final disposal only 465 [O 5 r 5 proviso].
- summary suit form of summons in 948 1091
- witnesses direction to defendant to produce his 466 [O 5 r 8]

**Summons to witness—593 (00 [O 16] *See Witness***

- arbitrator summoning of witnesses before 1172 [Sch II para 7]
- attendance to specify time place and purpose of 595 [O 16 r 5]
- Court power of to summon strangers to suit as witnesses 599 [O 16 r 14]
- documents summons to produce 593 [O 16 r 1]
- documents only summons to produce 596 [O 16 r 6]
- evidence summons to give 593 [O 16 r 1]
- mode of service of 596 [O 16 r 8]
- no fresh summons necessary where hearing postponed 596
- parties provisions as to witness to apply to 600 [O 16 r 21]
- personal attendance of witness when cannot be required 600 [O 16 r 19]
- power of Court to issue summons to witness 122 [s 30 (b)]
  - to require person present in Court to give evidence 596 [O 16 r 7]
- procedure where witness fails to comply with summons 597 598 [O 16 rr 10 13].
- service of 596 [O 16 r 8] *See Service*
- time for serving 596 [O 16 r 9]

**Surety—**

- appeal against order enforcing liability of 386
- appellate decree and enforcement of liability of 383
- decree surety for performance of 382 [s 145 (a)] 383
- discharge of surety 386
- discharge of surety for appearance of defendant 953 [O 33 r 3]
  - judgment debtor 186 [s 55 (4)] 187
- enforcement of liability of surety 382 [s 145]
- ex parte* decree and liability of 383
- fulfilment of condition imposed on a person by Court surety for 382 [s 145 (c)] 384
- limitation for enforcing liability of 386
- notice to surety 382 [s 145 proviso] 383
- payment of money under order of Court surety for 382 [s 145 (c)], 383
- Privy Council appeal liability of surety in how enforced 1044
- restitution of property taken in execution of decree surety for 382 [s 145 (b)], 383.
- security for payment of money 383.
- suit to enforce liability of 386
- summary remedy for enforcement of liability of 383

## Tenant—

delivery of property in occupancy of—

(1) to holder of decree for possession 694 685 [O 21 r 36]

(2) to execution purchaser 772 [O 21 r 96]

interpleader suit when tenant may institute 942 [O 35 r 5]

suit by against Ruling Chief or Prince 256 [s 86 (5)]

## Tender—

of expenses to witness 595 [O 16 r 3]

## Title—

execution purchaser 216

suit for and Small Cause Court 308

of and correction in case of minor 880

## Time—

Act prescribed or allowed by Code extension of time for doing 387 [s 148]

agreement to give time to judgment-debtor 636

amendment of pleadings for 506 [O 6 r 18]

appeal whether lies from order extending 389

appearance of defendant for to be specified in summons 464 [O 5 r 1 (1)]

when service substituted 471 [O 5 r 20 (3)]

application for extension of to be made to which court 389

award extension of time for making 1172 [Sch II para 8]

consent order and enlargement of time by Court 389

Court to which application should be made for extension of time 389

decree effect of appeal on time fixed for payment in 136

execution amendment of application for and extension of time by Court 388

limit of time for 167 [s 48]

time for sale in 730 [O 21 r 68]

extension of 387 [s 148]

for filing appeal refusal of 30.

for giving security and making deposit in Privy Council appeals 1037

failure to amend pleadings etc and extension of time by Court 388

foreclosure decree enlarging of time fixed for payment in 906 [O 34 r 2] 910

inspection time for when notice given 572 [O 11 r 17]

interrogatories time for delivery of 558

for filing affidavit in answer to 562 [O 11 r 8]

within which application lies to set aside 562 [O 11 r 7]

mortgage suits effect of appeal on time fixed for payment in 913

power of Court to enlarge time 387 [s 148]

pre-emption, extension of time fixed for payment of money in suits for 388

Privy Council time for security and deposit on appeal to 1036 [O 45 r 7].

purchase-money time for payment of 741 [O 21 r 85]

redemption decree enlarging of time fixed for payment in, 927 [O 34 r 7], 928.

refusal to extend for filing appeal 30.

respondent for appearance of in appeal, 999 [O 41 r 12 ("")]

Secretary of State or public officer for satisfaction of decree against 22 (c) 27.

summons served but not in due time 530 [O 9 r 6 (1) (c)]

witness, for attendance of to be specified in summons 596 [O 16 r 5].

for serving summons on 596 [O 16 r 9]

written statement or additional written statement extension of time for 223

**Tort—**

- British India tort committed beyond and place of sung 98
- immovable property tort in respect of and place of sung 91 [s 16 (c)] 94
- joint tort feasons suit against 414
- movables tort in respect of and place of sung 98 [s 19]
- person, tort in respect of and place of sung 98 [s 19]

**Trade mark—**

- particulars in case of infringement of 482 483

**Transfer of business—**

- of one Court to another 391 [s 140]

**Transfer of decree for execution—142 144 645 647 [Ss 39 42 O 21 rr 5 9]**

- appeal from order rejecting application for transfer of decree 144.
- attachment under precept how long to continue 149 [s 46 proviso]
- Collector transfer of certain decrees for execution by 224 [s 68]
- company in liquidation against 661
- Court passing decree power of to send it to a Subordinate Court 143 [s 39 (?)]
- to which decree is sent to certify result of proceedings 144 [s 41]
- decree when may be transferred for execution 142 143 [s 39]
- filing of by Court to which it is transferred without proof 646 [O 21 r 7]
- dismissal of application for execution for decree holders failure to prosecute 146
- documents Courts receiving to file same without proof 646 [O 21 r 7]
- to be sent to Court to which decree is transferred 646 [O 21 r 6]
- execution by Court to which decree is transferred 647 [O 21 r 8]
- foreign territory execution in of decrees of Courts of British India 148 [s 40]
- High Court execution by of decree transferred by other Courts 647 [O 21 r 9]
- jurisdiction of Court executing transferred decree continuance of 146
- passing decree proof of 646 [O 21 r 7]
- imitation whether Court executing transferred decree can go into question of 146.
- mode of transfer 645 [O 21 r 5]
- Native States execution in British India of decrees of Courts of 147 [s 44]
- objections to execution what can or cannot be entertained 140
- powers of Court in executing transferred decrees 140 [s 42]
- precepts 149 [s 46]
- Presidency Small Cause Court. transfer of decrees for execution to 645 [O 21 r 4]
- rejection of application for execution on ground of informality 146
- rules by Local Government as to by Collector 225 [s 70]
- simultaneous execution in several places 144.
- subordinate Judge by to Small Cause Court 144
- transfer of decree to court in another province 144 [s. 40].
- for execution 143

**Transfer of Property—**

- fraudulent transfer parties to suit relating to 4-1
- private pending attachment effect of 207 210
- under O 21 r 83 effect of 211

**Transfer of property Act—**

- charge definition of 939
- lis pendens* doctrine of 80
- res judicata and suits on mortgage 51 *et seq*
- saving of powers conferred by s 67 of 1936 [O 34 r 13 (2)]

**Transfer of suits—**

- Charter under cl 13 of 1248 [Charter cl 13]
- District Court general power of as to transfer and withdrawal 117 [s 24]
- Governor General in Council power of to transfer from one High Court to another 121 [s 25]
- grounds of 118
- High Court by from one Court to another 1213 [Charter Act s 15]
  - general power of respecting transfer and withdrawal 117 [s 24]
- Presidency Small Cause Court from to High Court 1249
- re transfer of suits and appeals 117 [s 24 (1) (b) (iii)]
- transfer of suits which may be filed in more than one Court 115 [s 23]

**Transferee of decree—**

- application for execution by 654 [O 21 r 16]
- equities of judgment debtor transfer subject to 175 [s 49]
- execution transferee entitled to as of right 659
- law by operation of who is 65
- maintenance transfer of decree awarding 657
- money decree whether transferee of from mortgagee can bring mortgaged property to sale in execution of the decree 940
- transfer of money decree to one of several judgment debtors 659 660
- who is 655 657

**Trusts (public religious or charitable)—**

- suit for administration of 265 266 [s 92] See Public Charities
  - breach of 265 [s 92] See Public Charities
  - possession of trust property against trespassers or alienances 276 277
  - removal of trustee and against alienances from trustees 277 278

**Trustee—**

- appointment of in suits relating to public charities 265 [s 92]
- attachment property held in trust for judgment debtor liable to 191 [s 60 (1)]
- beneficiaries when may be added as parties 561 [O 31 r 1]
  - whether necessary parties to suit brought by trustees for redemption foreclosure or sale 900
- costs of 131
- death of defendant trustee pending suit relating to public charities 254
- deposit in Court order for of moneys etc held as trustee 969 970 [O 39 r 10]

**Trustee—*contd***

- husband of married trustee need not join in suit by or against her 867 [O 31 r 3]
- joinder of in suit's 862
- parties when there are several trustees all to be made 861 [O 31 r 2]
- release from attachment of property held in trust by judgment debtor 860
- removal of in suits relating to public charities 265 [s 92]
- suit by or against 861 862 [O 31]
- vesting of trust property in 265 [s 92]

**Trust property—**

- authorizing sale etc of in suits relating to public charities 266 [s 92 (1) (f)]
- declaring allocation of to any particular object of trust 266 [s 92 (1) (e)]
- vesting of in trustees of a public charity 265 [s 92]

**Umpire—*See* Arbitration**

- appointment of 1169 [Sch II para 4 (1) (a)]
  - of new 1170 [Sch II para 5]
- corruption or misconduct of 1177 [Sch II para 10 (1) (a)] 1172
- death of 1170 [Sch II para 5 (b) (i)]
- leaving British India 1170 [Sch II para 5 (b) (iii)]
- notice for appointment of new 1170 [Sch II para 5]
- power of Court to appoint new may be limited by agreement 1171
- statement of special case by 1174 [Sch II para 11]
- umpire when may arbitrate 1173 [Sch II para 9]

**Undue influence—**

- particulars of to be stated in pleadings 492 [O 6 r 4]

**Unsound mind—**

- interrogatories and person of 559
- plaint statement in where party is of unsound mind 506 [O 7 r 1 (d)]
- suits by or against persons of 881 [O 32 r 15] *See* Lunatics

**Usage—**

- having the force of law and second appeal 299 [s 100 (1)] 303 304
  - and reference to High Court 1040 [O 46 r 1]
  - and pauper appeal 1030 [O 44 r 1]

**Valuation of suits—**

- jurisdiction of appellate Court and 299
- jurisdiction rules relating to valuation of suits for determining 90 91
  - undervaluation of claim and objection as to 89 111
- overvaluation and undervaluation 89 90
- plaint statement in of value of subject matter of suit 90 [O 7 r 1 (i)]
- Privy Council appeal to and matter not capable of valuation 330
  - date of valuation for purposes of 34
  - decree single in several appeals and valuation 793

**Valuation of suits—*contd***

- Privy Council appeal to and consolidation of suits 1034 [O 40 r 4]
- and remitting dispute to lower Court 1035 [O 40 r 5]
- rejection of plaint where relief claimed is undervalued 514 [O 7 r 11 (b)]
- special case for Court's opinion and valuation 924 [O 36 r 2]
- subject matter not capable of valuation 90
- undervaluation and effect on appeal to District Court instead of High Court 90

**Verification—**

- application for execution of 647 649 [O 21 r 11 (2)]
- leave to sue as pauper of 884 [O 33 r 2]
- order for sale of 725 [O 21 r 66 (3)]
- defective and its effect 493
- pleadings in general of 493 [O 6 r 15]
- in suits against Government of 845 [O 27 r 1]
- in suits by or against corporations of 848 [O 29 r 1]
- firm of 850 [O 30 r 1 (2)]

**Vesting—**

- of property in trustees of a public charity 266 [s 92 (1) (c)]
- of property in purchaser of movable property at a Court sale 739 [O 21 r 81]

**Vesting order—**

- attachment after judgment effect of adjudication order on 213
- before judgment effect of vesting order on 957

**Wagering—**

- defence of wagering, contract to be specifically pleaded 490
- under Gaming Act and question of costs 128
- interrogatories in cases where defence of is set up 567

**Waiver—**

- benami purchaser by of right of possession 293
- jurisdiction waiver of objection to 112
- objection as to misjoinder and non joinder waiver of 434 [O 1 r 13]
- objection to grant of leave under cl 12 of Charter waiver of 147
- to want of consent under s 86 waiver of 256
- privilege waiver of relating to documents 570
- Secretary of State waiver of notice by 249

**Warrant—**

- affixing copy of and delivery of joint possession 681 [O 21 r 35 (-)] 684
- arrest of defendant before judgment 284 [s 94 (a)] 920 921 [O 38 r 1]
- outside jurisdiction in cases other than execution of decrees 367 [s 136]
- without warrant illegal 672
- arrest or attachment in execution for 62 [O 21 r 24]

**Warrant—*contd***

- delegation of authority to execute 672
- endorsement on 673 [O 21 r 2]
- specification of day on or before which warrant should be executed 679
- warrant for arrest to direct judgment debtor to be brought up 686 [O 21 r 38]
- witness for arrest of defaulting 597 [O 16 r 10 (3)]

**Will—*See* Executors**

- executors who have not proved not necessary parties 861 [O 31 r 2]
- probate when necessary 507 509

**Withdrawal—**

- appeal from granting leave to withdraw suit or abandon part of claim 816
- arbitration and withdrawal of suit 815 816 1076
- cross objections effect of withdrawal of appeal on 1005 [O 41 r 22 (4)] 100
- formal defect and leave to withdraw suit 807 808 [O 23 r 1]
- from suit 807 [O 23 r 1 (3)] 809
- grounds sufficient for withdrawal of suit 810 811
- leave withdrawal of suit without 807 808 [O 23 r 1 (3)] 814
- limitation governing second suit after withdrawal of first suit 818 [O 23 r 2]
- of admissions 581
  - application for execution 372 809
  - withdrawal of suit 809
- application to file an award made without intervention of Court 1198
- attachment before judgment 935 [O 38 r 6 (2)]
- attachment on property of defaulting witness 597 [O 16 r 11]
- suit with liberty to bring a fresh suit 807 [O 23 r 1] 814
  - without permission to bring fresh suit 814
- suit appeal etc by High Court from subordinate Courts 117 [s 24 (1) (b)]
- suit by next friend 877
  - plaintiff 808
    - appellant 808
    - respondent 808 809
  - one plaintiff without consent of others 808 [O 23 r 1 (4)]
  - pauper and payment of Court fees 893 [O 33 r 11] 894
  - pending appeal 808
  - with consent of defendant but without leave of Court 81

**Witness—**

- admissibility of evidence of a foreign witness taken on commission 878
- arbitrator summoning of witnesses before 1172 [Sch II para 7]
- arrest witness when exempt from 36 [s 135 (2)]
- commission to examine witnesses 83, 839 [O 26 rr 1 8] *See* Commission
- commissioner attendance and examination of witness before 844 [O 26 r 17 (1)].
- issue of process to witness on application of 844 [O 26 r 17 (2)].

**Witness—contd**

contempt proceedings against 598

costs of suit when witnesses of successful party are guilty of exaggeration 130  
(credibility of 98)

cross examination of witnesses on commission 539

penalty for default of compliance with summons 123 [s 32]

power of Court to issue summons to witnesses 172 [s 30 (b)]

remedy of party when witness summons refused 594

summons to defendant to direct defendant to produce his witnesses 466 [O 5 r 8]

**summoning and attendance of—**

appeal from order of attachment of property of witness 107 1028 [O 43 r 1  
cl (g)]

pronouncing judgment against party refusing to give evidence  
600 1028 [O 43 r 1 cl (h)]

application for issue of summons when may be made 93 [O 16 r 1]

attachment of property of witness 51 [O 16 r 10 (3)]

Court may summon stranger to suit as witness 109 [O 16 r 14]

documents where summons is for production of 106 [O 16 r 6]

duty of persons summoned to give evidence 109 [O 16 r 15]

examination of serving officer when witness fails to appear 107 [O 16 r 10 (1)]

expenses of witness detained more than a day 91 [O 16 r 4 (2)]

travelling 94 [O 16 r 2 (7)]

suit to recover 79

expenses scale of 594 [O 16 r 2 (3)]

tender of to witness 103 [O 16 r 3]

default of witness in appearing remedy 108 [O 16 r 12]

insufficient sum paid in for expenses procedure where 594 [O 16 r 4]

power of Court to refuse summons where application not made *bona fide* 593 94

to require persons present in Court to give evidence 596 [O 16 r 7]

procedure when witness fails to appear 593 [O 16 r 12 13]

where witness apprehended cannot give evidence 599 [O 16 r 18]

fails to comply with summons 594 [O 16 r 10]

proclamation requiring witness to attend 97 [O 16 r 10 (2)]

refusal to give evidence when required by Court consequence of 600 [O 16 r 20]

remedy of party when witness summons refused 594

witness if travelling expenses not paid 94 91

remuneration payable to experts 94 [O 16 r 2 ( )]

rules as to witness to apply to parties summoned 600 [O 16 r 21]

security for attendance from witness 599 [O 16 r 16 ( )]

Small Cause Court no attachment of immovable property of witness by 597 [O 16  
r 10 proviso]

suit to recover travelling expenses of witness barred 91

summons how served 796 [O 16 r 5]

may be to give evidence or produce documents 103 [O 16 r 1]

not to be refused except on ground of abuse of process of Court 103 104

time for serving summons 546 [O 16 r 9]



**Witness—*contd*****Summoning and attendance of—*contd***

- time place and purpose of attendance to be stated in summons 596 [O 16 r 5]
- travelling and other expenses of witness 91 [O 16 r 2]
- warrant of arrest issue of 597 [O 16 r 10 (3)]
- witness when cannot be ordered to attend in person 600 [O 16 r 19]
- may depart 599 [O 16 r 16]

**examination of—**

- commissioner by 844 [O 26 r 16 (a)]
- issues examination of witness before framing 590 [O 14 r 4]
- power to examine witness immediately 610 [O 18 r 16]
- to recall and examine witness 611 [O 18 r 17]
- remarks on demeanour of witness 609 [O 18 r 12]
- witness about to leave jurisdiction of Court 610 [O 18 r 16 (1)]
- to be examined in open Court 606 [O 18 r 4]

**Woman—**

- decree against wife when may be executed against husband 797 [O 22 r 7 (\*)]
- exemption of from arrest in execution of money decrees 188 [s 56]
- in certain cases from personal appearance 364 [s 132]
- guardian *ad litem* married woman as 869
- marriage of female party suit not to abate by 797 [O 22 r 7]
- ornaments of and attachment 191 [s 60 (1) (a)]
- substituted service in case of Hindu women of rank 471
- suit for money by and security for costs 831 832 [O 25 r 1 (3)]

**Written statement—**20 532 [O 6] See Pleadings

- additional written statement 532
- amendment of 490 [O 6 r 17]
- defence founded on separate grounds 531 [O 8 r 7]
- defendant when may file additional 476
- denial must be specific 532 [O 8 r 5]
- of contract how to be made 490 [O 6 r 8]
- evasive denial 531 [O 8 r 4]
- facts not denied in to be taken as admitted 522 [O 8 r 5]
- fact deemed to be admitted power of Court to require proof of 532 [O 8 r 5]
- proviso]
- failure to amend within time fixed by Court 508 [O 6 r 18]
- firm in suit brought against 857 858
- fraud defence of to be set forth in 20 [O 8 r 2]
- illegality defence of 520 [O 8 r 2]
- inspection of documents mentioned in 570 [O 11 r 15]
- leave to amend when granted 496 497
- leave to amend when may be refused 497 501
- limitation defence of 530 [O 8 r 2]

**Written statement—*contd***

- new facts must be specially pleaded 520 [O 8 r 2]
- ground of defence which has arisen after written statement 532 [O 8 r 8]
- omission to file 24
- payment or performance defence of 520 [O 8 r 2]
- plaintiff when may file 476
- pleading includes 475 [O 6 r 1]
- presentation of 520 [O 8 r 1]
- procedure where party fails to present called for by Court 532 [O 8 r 10]
- relief claimed by defendant must be specifically stated 510 [O 7 r 7]
- set off founded on separate grounds 531 [O 8 r 7]
- set off particulars of to be given in written statement 534 [O 8 r 6]
  - when may be claimed in 534 [O 8 r 6] 525 *See* set off
- signing of 490 [O 6 r 14]
- striking out unnecessary scandalous or embarrassing matter in 493 [O 6 r 16]
- subsequent pleadings 531 [O 8 r 9]
- surprise to state grounds which would take opposite party by 530 [O 8 r 2]
- verification of 493 [O 6 r 15]

**Wrong—*See* Tort****Zamindari**

- grant of by Government and attachment 199

# STUDENTS' CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE

BY  
D F MULLA M A, LL B,  
ADVOCATE HIGH COURT BOMBAY

Fifth Edition

1926

Price Rs 7 8 0

For the use of students no other or better edition of the Code of Civil Procedure exists than Mr Mulla's book. It is abridged from the well-known work of the learned author for practitioners. The comments are particularly useful to students. The rules framed by the different Courts of final jurisdiction in India have been given in appendices. The book has been so popular with students that they need only be reminded that a new edition of their tried favourite has appeared—*The Bombay Law Reporter* (January 15th, 1922)

---

## STUDENTS' EDITION OF POLLOCK & MULLA'S INDIAN CONTRACT ACT

BY  
D F MULLA, M A, LL B,  
AND  
J S KHERGAMVALA, I L D (LOND),  
B A LL M (BOM)

This book has been abridged for students from the larger Commentary on the Indian Contract Act, which has rapidly passed into three editions. All the explanatory portions in the commentary which explain and elucidate the provision of sections are given at length. The citation of cases has been confined to select and Typical cases. As an ideal students' edition of the Indian Contract Act, the book has no rival—*The Bombay Law Reporter*, January 15th, 1922

1921

Price Rs. 8

**LAW OF INSOLVENCY**  
**IN**  
**BRITISH INDIA**  
**(TAGORE LECTURES, 1929)**

**BY**  
**SIR DINSHAH F MULLA, KT**  
**ADVOCATE HIGH COURT, BOMBAY**  
*(About 700 pages)*  
**Will be out in May 1930**

---

The Lectures are the most exhaustive commentary ever written on the Presidency-towns Insolvency Act and the Provincial Insolvency Act. Except in the case of sections common to both the Acts the two Acts have been separately dealt with in the Lectures.

The Lectures are arranged (except in a few cases) in the order of sections and they constitute a commentary on each section.

The text of both the Acts amended up to date is printed at the end of the Lectures, and below each section reference is given to the paragraphs of the Lectures which constitute the commentary on that section.

**Price Rs 12**

**Price Rs 12**

---

**MESSRS JAMES & Co, PUBLISHERS,**  
**19 RAMPART ROW FORT BOMBAY**

RATANLAL AND DHIRAJLAL S

# INDIAN PENAL CODE

THIS book is prepared specially to meet the needs of the student of law. The comments are first set out shortly with a view to help to a thorough understanding of the principles underlying a given section.

The application of these principles to concrete facts is illustrated by a selection of typical cases decided under the Code. A number of questions are grouped together in the appendix, which will assist the student in testing his progress. The summary which is a special feature of this edition is meant to help the student in revising this subject for his examination.

No better and more reliable text book exists on the subject.

**12th Edition, 1928**

**Price Rs 5-**

---

RATANLAL AND DHIRAJLAL'S  
ENGLISH AND INDIAN

## LAW OF TORTS

(Prescribed as a text book in various Law Examinations)

THIS treatise contains a lucid exposition and methodical arrangement both of the principles of the English Common Law and of the Indian case law pertaining to the Law of Torts. The principles are first set out *in extenso*. These are followed by cases illustrative of their application and effect and are further supplemented by cognate cases explanatory of their precise meaning. The present edition has undergone a thorough and searching revision and has been carefully brought up to date. It is the only treatise which calls attention to all important English cases and at the same time contains a complete congruity of Indian cases.

**10th Edition, 1928**

**Price Rs. 5**

# JURISDICTION OF COURTS

&

IN

## MATTERS OF CASTE

BY

D F MULLA M A , LL B

In English

Out of Print

In Gujarati

Price Rs 3

---

## THE KEY TO INDIAN PRACTICE

BEING A SUMMARY OF

## THE CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE

IN 14 LECTURES

BY

D F MULLA, M A , LL B

1929

3rd Edn

Price Rs. 2

---

## INDIAN LIMITATION ACT

ON THE

## STARLING'S COMMENTARIES

*As adapted to Act IX of 1908*

Sixth Edition, 1918, with Supplement

(BRINGING THE WORK DOWN TO 1922)

BY

R S BROOMFIELD, ICS, Joint Judge, Ahmedabad

Price Rs 14-8-0.

RATANLAL AND DHIRAJLAL'S

# INDIAN PENAL CODE

THIS book is prepared specially to meet the needs of the student of law. The comments are first set out shortly with a view to help to a thorough understanding of the principles underlying a given section.

The application of these principles to concrete facts is illustrated by a selection of typical cases decided under the Code. A number of questions are grouped together in the appendix, which will assist the student in testing his progress. The summary which is a special feature of this edition is meant to help the student in revising this subject for his examination.

No better and more reliable text book exists on the subject.

**12th Edition, 1928**

**Price Rs 5-**

---

RATANLAL AND DHIRAJLAL'S  
ENGLISH AND INDIAN

## LAW OF TORTS

(Prescribed as a text book in various Law Examinations)

THIS treatise contains a lucid exposition and methodical arrangement both of the principles of the English Common Law and of the Indian case law pertaining to the Law of Torts. The principles are first set out *in extenso*. These are followed by cases illustrative of their application and effect and are further supplemented by cognate cases explanatory of their precise meaning. The present edition has undergone a thorough and searching revision and has been carefully brought up to date. It is the only treatise which calls attention to all important English cases and at the same time contains a complete congerie of Indian cases.

**10th Edition, 1928**

**Price Rs. 5.**

# JURISDICTION OF COURTS

## IN MATTERS OF CASTE

BY  
D F MULLA, M A , LL B

In English

Out of Print

In Gujarati

Price Rs 3

---

## THE KEY TO INDIAN PRACTICE

BEING A SUMMARY OF

## THE CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE

IN 14 LECTURES

BY  
D F MULLA, M A LL B

1929

3rd Edn

Price Rs 2

---

## INDIAN LIMITATION ACT

ON THE

## STARLING'S COMMENTARIES

*As adapted to Act IX of 1908*

Sixth Edition, 1918, with Supplement

(BRINGING THE WORK DOWN TO 1922)

BY  
R S BROOMFIELD 1cs, Joint Judge, Ahmedabad  
Price Rs 14-8-0.

MEWAR RESIDENCY, UDAH